

SECOND SESSION OF THE FOURTH KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

P O L I C Y S P E E C H

BY THE CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU

APRIL 1984

A new political chapter is being opened in South Africa. I believe that the country is taking steps into the future which in retrospective one day will be seen to be a definite breakaway from what is now the past. Whether this writing of a new political chapter is a breakaway into the better future and a new political chapter is a chapter of real change, is something which is in our hands in the hands of nobody else. As Blacks we are the custodians of the future and the kind of future that this country is one day going to enjoy will be the product of Black political astuteness, Black resolve and Black political ingeniousness.

I sincerely do not believe that Whites in this country are capable of taking us into a better future if they are unaided by Black political wisdom, and if they do not enter into a partnership with Blacks in their attempts to bring about change.

We have to face up to the fact that there is a duality in White politics. There is the theme of perpetuating White political control and there is the theme of moving away from White racist control along some kind of vague evolutionary path. Even in the best of White institutionalised political thinking, political values are dominated by those who think in terms of partnership, but think of it as a partnership of the future. In their conception it is a future which Whites have to ensure.

Political paternalism comes to us in two distinctive forms. The one is the paternalism of the National Party which believes that power-sharing must only be between racially determined states. Verkramp National Party thinking envisages permanent White political control over so-called independent homelands. Verlig National Party thinking envisages so-called White South Africa and so-called

independent homelands related to each other in a confederal structure.

The difference between verkrampt and verlig National Party thinking can perhaps be illustrated in the following way. If one considers there to be a bowl of dough with which to make bread, verkrampt thinking thinks in terms of giving a small little portion of this dough to Blacks and expects them to go away and bake it in their own oven, leaving the Whites to bake a huge loaf of bread in a huge oven. Verlig thinking is that all the dough must be baked in one oven but it must be baked in separate pans. A small portion of the dough must go in ten little pans for Black consumption and the bulk of the dough must go in a huge big pan for White consumption.

The liberal establishment in South Africa thinks in terms of an undefined kind of power-sharing which has to be brought about by White concessions. The liberal establishment has not committed itself to power-sharing in the form of one-man-one-vote in a unitary state. There are still those who think of qualified franchise or in terms of a mixture of federalism between states which are dominated by one race group or another, but in which other race groups are not subjected to the kind of apartheid controls which now exist.

We therefore have the clear-cut options of the National Party leading to, they hope, a confederal future with White South Africa the dominant partner, and we have the liberal White establishment pursuing a kind of laissez faire policy in which they recognise that the ultimate destiny of South Africa is one in which there will be power-sharing, but for them that destiny will be achieved by means they know not what, as they catch and bounce political balls in changing circumstances in an evolutionary progress towards a better future.

South Africa has always had these two themes in White politics. Both these themes were inherited by the first parliament after the Act of Union in 1910. There was then already the pure baaskap theme and there was then already the Cape liberal theme which was transplanted into the parliament created by the Act of Union. Ever since the Act of Union in 1910 we have had kragdaadige action leading to ever tightening White political control played out to the chorus refrains of White political conscience. It was as though White South Africa hit you with their hands and said nice things with their voices. There always has been a kind of schizophrenia in White political society. This has been the

fundamental nature of White politics; it is the fundamental nature of White politics today, and it will be the fundamental nature of White politics in the new chapter of history which is now opening.

We as Blacks come from a society in which human track records are important. We know that human themes persist over time in the same groups in which they are found. We are aware of the social and political nature of man, whether it be a lobola negotiation, or whether it be in a community selecting its leadership; whether it be in a traditional court settling a dispute, or whether it be an ongoing relationships between clans, or even on a larger scale, whether it be relationships between kingdoms, Black track records remain Black track records. We know from what families we should or should not take wives. We know with whom we can safely contract and with whom we can not safely contract ourselves. In deep-rooted disputes we know the line-up of the future from the line-ups of the past. We predict the future on the behaviour of the past; we have always done so and we will continue to do so. It would be rank foolishness on the part of Black South Africa to look at the future outside of White political track records.

Whichever way the National Party has twisted and turned and at times even wormed, and whichever way the National Party has blustered and cajoled, it has done no more than demonstrate the persistence with which White racial prejudice pursues the same track.

History is filled with the same kind of twisting and turning that has been evidenced in the National Party for over 33 years. When the Republic of South Africa was established in the Transvaal, we know it was done with brutality; we know that indigenous people in the area were driven out at the point of a gun and were subjugated and we know that the Boers then took by force whatever they wanted from whomever they wanted it. When, however, President Kruger wanted to expand his domains to the country's eastern seaboard, he attempted to do so by negotiation preceded by fine-sounding speeches because he was sensitive to the consequences in the international community - if he went beyond certain limits to subjugate the people of the Eastern Transvaal, North-eastern Natal and Southern Mocambique. This theme of conquest and negotiation has been the theme of the National Party ever since 1948. It is ridden rough-shod over Black South Africa wherever it wanted to establish exclusive White domains. But it also, like Paul Kruger, attempted to negotiate Black subservience with Blacks themselves where the international community would be offended beyond some limit or other. The National Party set out to rule in a baaskap vain and in 1948 the thinking was a permanent White control of the

country with Black areas set aside in which Blacks could administer their own miserable circumstances, permanently subjugated to White political decision-making. They found, however, that they could not do so, that there was just too much resistance to naked baaskap of the 1948 vintage. They found that the international community was becoming just too affronted and then they conceived of the so-called homeland policy and tried to negotiate with Black South Africa the permanent political acceptance of a homeland system which also accepted the rights of White might in so-called White South Africa. The theme remained the same as it has been ever since the establishment of Boer Republics in South Africa. The Republic of the Orange Free State behaved in the same; White colonial settlers in Natal behaved in the same way, and the White colonial settlers in the Cape Province behaved in the same way. White politics, whether in the guise of British colonialism, or whether it was under the guise of Boer Republicanism remained essentially the same. Whites whoever they may have been sought to subjugate Blacks and to establish the inalienable right of Whites to the best part of the country and to the riches of our soil. And while Whites were doing this, whoever they were, they were doing this to the accompaniment of those chorusing White conscience objections to what was going on.

There have been great White South Africans; men and women of immense stature with a deep and abiding commitment to justice and to human equality. We think of our own Bishop Colenso; we think of some of the Colenso daughters of this world; we think of some of the missionaries in the Cape; more latterly we think of our Alan Patons, of our Beyers Naudes, of our Trevor Huddlestons, of our Canon Collins; and we think of the bands of ordinary Whites whom they accumulated around themselves. We know their sincerity, their commitment and we have always been encouraged by them. We also think of other Whites who have not been canonised by Black veneration but who ride high in our esteem and earn our admiration for pursuing their consciences in attempts to entrench decency in the country. We think of the Helen Suzmans of this world; the Van Zyl Slabberts of this world; we think of the Harry Oppenheimers of this world. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we do not reject Whites because they are Whites. We reject or accept them on the basis of whether or not they are good South Africans. However terrible White politics has been the country has produced one crop after another of White decency. The problem, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members that White political decency in this country can be likened to a small oasis of freshness in wilderness of apartheid horrors. Perhaps little gardens which flourish around these oasis are important, but the harshness of the facts are that these little gardens have not fed the nation. The little oasis have not watered the nation. The islands of White human decency have not been large enough to change the character of South

Africa's White political terrain. We all know that throughout the history of this country, these true White sons and daughters of our soil have failed to transform apartheid. It may well be that the country would have been worse off without them. I believe the country would have been worse off without them. But the hard facts are that in all their endeavours and in all their braveness, they in the end remained politically impotent.

The theme of White conquest, White subjugation and the entrenchment of White political power and the perpetuation of White privileged vested interests dominated the theme.

We have had parallels in every phase of South Africa's political development. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, you must hear me when I say we have parallels in White behaviour between parliamentarians now and the first parliamentarians created by the Act of Union. And we have parallels in the international community's reaction to White political themes. The 1910 constitution excluded Blacks from real political power. Britain saw these deficiencies but in the end accepted them in the belief that the Act of Union was but an imperfect start by a new generation of politicians in whose hands they left the caring for the future. British influences ensured the inclusion in the Act of Union of political hopes for Blacks when they insisted on the retention of the Cape Common Voter's Roll which included Coloureds. Enlightened British thinking at the time assumed that the very meagre political representation which the Act of Union allowed for Coloureds and the presence in the Union parliament of Native representatives, as they were then called, could be driven ever deeper into the country's parliamentary system and that this thin end of the wedge was a small step in the right direction. History has confounded those hopes. Today international opinion has applauded the tricameral parliament in the same kind of way. Internationally it is recognised that it is an inadequate parliamentary system, but hopes are expressed and the Government is encouraged because in this abortion of a constitution they see a thin end of a Black wedge. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I say to you today, that we must judge White politics in terms of its track record, and not in terms of liberal hopes, or hopes of the international community. We know our fellow South Africans; we know that the White leopard will not change its political spots. We know that White politics will continue being true to the character it has developed over three generations of time. We know that white politics left to its own devices will continue to screw us into the dirt and to trample upon us. We know that White avarice will continue to pursue ever higher standards of living at our expense. And we know that it is only the mobilisation of Black democratic forces which can salvage this country. We cannot rely

on White liberal thought; we cannot rely on great White sons and daughters of our land to translate their countrymen's racial prejudice into democratic acceptance of the equality of man.

Black political voices at this point in time cry in the wilderness beyond White South African decency and beyond White international decency. Our aspirations are not recognised; our warnings are not heeded; our fears are regarded as invalid; what we say is regarded as politically unsubstantiated. The demands of decency we make fall on deaf ears. We are alone in the custody of what is good for South Africa. We are alone in the custody of sound principles of government. We are ultimately the sole custodians of decent politics and justice and we are the sole custodians of the economic future of this country.

Black South Africans bear the terrible responsibility of carrying White society on our backs as we grapple with the realities of our day and age, and labour to lay the foundations for a new and better future. We have, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, in this session to put our feet more firmly on the ground than they ever have been before. We need clearer heads than we have ever had before. We need greater resolve than we have ever had before. We need deeper insights than we have ever had before. And Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we need greater faith than we have ever had before.

No matter how harshly politics has treated Blacks; no matter how brutally Whites have attempted to subjugate Blacks; no matter how we have been depressed economically; no matter how our dignity has been affronted; no matter how our freedom of movement in the country of our birth has been curtailed, Black South Africa has to date not abandoned its deep commitment to things eminently worthwhile. Political, economic and social oppression has not stripped us of our humanity. If anything it has dramatised the need for decency, and kept our commitment pure. Ordinary Black South Africans, the ordinary peasant, the ordinary worker, are decent people seeking in their politics to establish a decent society based on the finest principles that civilised man has evolved. As we enter into the new era ahead of us; as we begin in this country to write a new chapter of our history, and as we begin to mobilise our strength to meet the challenges before us, we must remain true to that which is eternally valuable. We must remain true to our non-racist commitments to democracy; we must remain true to our commitment to bringing about change through non-violent means; and we must remain true to our desires to negotiate a future for the country and not to impose our brand of the future on it.

There are many Whites in this country and many in the international community who really do believe that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet have espoused the cause of change in this country and that they are capable of step by step taking their following with them. They believe that once having taken the step to include Coloureds and Indians as junior partners in the White parliamentary programme further steps towards change must necessarily follow and that with each step the Prime Minister will have to increase the pace with which change is brought about as though he is running down some kind of hill and will have to speed up and will not be able to slow down. Black South Africa must be aware of the fact that the Prime Minister has bought a considerable amount of political time for the National Party. The constitutional steps he has taken, the steps the liberalisation of urban Black local government; the steps he has taken to liberalise the economy; the steps he has taken to give the captains of mining, commerce and industry greater latitudes of choice; the steps he has taken to establish a partnership between big business and government; and the steps he has taken to withdraw South African troops from Angola and the steps he has taken which led to the signing of the Nkomati Accord with Mocambique are for so many convincing evidence of a commitment to real change from which he simply cannot withdraw. Those who seek the Prime Minister in this light see a new chapter of South African history being written by the big boss's White hand and believe that South Africa is at last moving away from the National Party's racist ideology of apartheid.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I have said that a new chapter in South Africa's political development has now opened, but I have not said so because I have been duped into believing that the Prime Minister has espoused the cause of real and fundamental change. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I call upon all the Honourable Members of this House to ponder what I am now saying. In human affairs when things go well with us, it is always possible to blunder and to make them worse. When we blunder when things go well, our blunders very seldom cause irretrievable losses. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, the worse things are for us, the more terrible are the consequences of blundering. When there is no urgent need for change, but change is nonetheless desirable, there is a kind of latitude within which one can experiment to find the best. When we have got that which is good, we can in fact afford to experi-

ment to find that which is best. If you are in a strong position you can recover from blundering; when, however, things are really tough, blundering becomes a life and death issue. This country would have been infinitely better off if we had attempted to achieve the most we could achieve in the old political dispensation, rather than blundering around in desperate

circumstances within the framework of a new constitution. I foresaw the terrible tragedy of making wrong constitutional moves in our desperate political circumstances. I pleaded with the Prime Minister to declare a moratorium on constitutional change until such time as Blacks and Whites had formed a partnership within which change could have been reduced to manageable proportions. I foresaw the very real danger of constitutional blundering taking this country ever deeper into the political mire which we know so well. The scope with which we can experiment in politics is deeply and seriously curtailed when we are living on the brink of a total national disaster. South Africa is on the brink of a total national disaster and we just do not have the latitude others think we have to experiment and fail and try again.

Whereas so many Whites and so many observers in the Western world see a new chapter being written by the Prime Minister and the National Party, I see a new chapter being written by Blacks as we set about salvaging the country from the horrible consequences that political blundering is going to have. In a very real sense Black South Africa is now being given yet another opportunity to grasp the realities which surround our oppression, and the realities which impair progress towards our liberation. In a very real sense history itself is confronting us anew with the burden of our responsibilities and it is confronting us anew with the kind of opportunities which must be pursued if ever we are to be victorious in the struggle. And on the other hand, history is again confronting us with the terrible consequences of failing political strategies. It is confronting us with the failure of Black South Africa to abandon internicine conflict, to abandon petty organisational and petty personal jealousies, and to abandon political one-up-manship in drives for fleeting eminence.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I have said blundering in dire circumstances is blundering indeed, and that the consequences of blundering in dire circumstances are terrible indeed. The White electorate is experimenting with a new constitution and establishing a new political dispensation, and the consequences of the blundering which this experimentation contains are going to be terrible. We just dare not compound that blundering by blundering on our side. History is confronting us with the need to be politically wise, both for ourselves and for the White electorate who are abandoning everything that is sensible in the achievement of a reconciled South Africa. In the crucial days, months and years ahead, every Black political blunder will be magnified tenfold by White political blundering which went before it. Let us take the time at the beginning of this Session of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly to take stock of South and Southern Africa and to put the evolving South and Southern African situation in the

proper liberational perspective.

The fundamental issue we face in this country is the issue of power-sharing. There is no single one amongst us who would for a single instant entertain any other political ideal than that of a one-man-one-vote in a unitary state as a solution to South Africa's problems. This has always been Black South Africa's first choice; it has been the first choice of Black South Africa ever since the founding fathers of the African National Congress met to establish organised Black opposition to the kind of apartheid which was foisted on them by the Act of Union. The founding fathers of the ANC were more than reasonable and they were prepared to work step by step for the achievement of this ideal. But their ideal was there and it has remained the ideal for Black South Africa ever since. But it is no use us having a political prescription which will kill the White body politic in the country. It is no use having an ideal which we have to thrust down people's throats and enforce on people at the point of a gun. There is no point in pursuing ideals which by their very nature deny other ideals. Black South Africa has always recognised that whatever we do in this country, we must ensure that there is a partnership between Black and White in the doing of it. Wisdom dictates that Blacks cannot run South Africa without Whites, in the same way that Whites cannot run South Africa without Blacks. Whites have tried to run this country on the basis of unilateral decision-making, and we know the consequences that this has had for the country. I do not believe that Blacks can make unilateral decisions any more wisely than Whites. Ultimately, it is only democratic procedures and democratic institutions and democratic parliaments which can translate the people's aspirations into good government. It is therefore self-defeating for any one section of South Africa, or any one population group in South Africa, or any one class in South Africa, or any one cultural group in South Africa, to indulge in unilateral decision-making if the aim is a reconciled and unified country. Unilateral decision-making must be left to those who dream of exclusive control and make unilateral decisions to perpetuate that control. There can be no future in this country unless it is a shared future, and we cannot guarantee a shared future if one race group imposes political solutions on another race group. The ideal of one-man-one-vote must be seen as an ideal not in itself, but it must be seen as a means to an end. The one-man-one-vote ideal expresses a form of democratic society and it is the democracy, it is the freedom of the citizens, it is the equality of opportunity and it is a society ruled by law that the ideal of a one-man-one-vote is seen best to serve. All political wisdom dictates that if it is not possible to serve these ideals through one-man-one-vote as a means to the ends we seek, then we must see whether there are alternatives. If one-man-one-vote as an ideal so frightens Whites that political partnerships between Black

and White are impossible, then we must examine whether there are other possibilities of achieving the ends which the one-man-one-vote ideal could achieve for us. For us in this House, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, a form of federalism or a type of federal constitution which establishes a democratic society and which establishes a government of national unity, is something we are prepared to look at. However, whatever we do and whatever means we employ, we must make each and every South African a free citizen in the land of his or her birth. Whatever we do must break away from racist politics in which colour determines both political rights and rights to participate in the economy of the country. We are prepared to think in terms of compromises away from the ideal of one-man-one-vote in a unitary state provided that we are compromising on means of achieving noble ends and not compromising on noble ends themselves. For us therefore the core issue in this country remains power-sharing leading to equality of opportunity and equality before the law and constitution. The new South African constitution denies us these equalities and goes further to deny us the opportunity of working for them through non-violent democratic means. In South Africa the core political issue is therefore power-sharing. When we go beyond the borders of South Africa and we look at the whole of Southern Africa, the ideal which is deeply embedded in our hearts and souls is the ideal of making South Africa a free and equal partner with other states in Southern Africa in the pursuit of the best possible development of this whole sub-continent.

At home the South African Government has pursued domestic policies which encapsulate Blacks in their Third World poverty-stricken circumstances and in its external relations, South Africa bludgeons neighbouring states into co-operative frames of mind by the rampages of South African armies and the employment of South African economic muscles. Our ideals are power-sharing in this country, leading to a new South Africa and a new Southern Africa.

The new chapter of South African history which we are about to commence writing in this country will be a chapter in which the final alignment of forces for and against apartheid will be recorded. Let us for a moment review the development of pro and anti-apartheid forces.

The roots of both the forces developing and sustaining apartheid and the forces opposing apartheid have been evolving ever since the White man first set foot in this country. Whites came here as settlers and from the very first day that they put their foot on our soil, they commenced on the construction of a society based on White privilege and Black subjugation. Apartheid as we know it

today is the elaboration of the White political barbarism which was committed in the early history of this country. From the very first Whites showed no inclination whatsoever of establishing a democratic society. They first went out on sprints of grabbing by conquest and retaining what they grabbed by subjugation. Whites then formed themselves into four governments - colonial governments in the Cape and in Natal and Boer Republics in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. And we had two strains of apartheid in the English-dominated Cape and Natal, and two strains of apartheid in the Free State and the Transvaal.

From the very beginning of the history of White conquest, we have the history of Black resistance. Our forefathers defended the territorial integrity of their kingdoms with their very lives. They resisted the rape of their land with their lives. Conquest and the resistance to conquest escalated until finally Whites in using their vast superiority of arms pushed the levels of conflict to the point of being responsible for genocide. Vast tracts of land were cleared of indigenous people and the White man took whatever he desired to take.

Black resistance, however, remained intact and the two English-speaking colonial governments and the two Boer Republican governments eventually had to join forces in the Act of Union to enable them to contain Black resistance. It was what was then called the Native question which finally led Whites to sink their political differences and to join hands under the motto: "Unity is strength." The forces for apartheid and the forces against apartheid are the historical forces of this country which have shaped our history and which will continue to shape our history. After 1910 Black South Africa saw the futility of the armed conflict and began to evolve strategies and tactics based on democratic opposition and negotiation. Political history between 1910 and 1948 is the history of the consolidation of White power and the development of an oppressive society. It is the history of White defences against evolving Black opposition to a government based on racial discrimination. Black opposition to apartheid grew steadily and became more and more effective as time passed. The effectiveness of Black opposition, its virulence, and its political astuteness is measured in this country by the enactment of one Draconian law after another and each more reprehensible than the other. White politics has for two generations been harnessing the full powers of the White controlled state in opposition to Black resistance to oppression. White political history is plainly and simply the history of the growth of oppression. By 1973 it became apparent to Whites that their techniques of oppression and the forces of oppression had to be regrouped. The adoption of the new constitution was motivated by

nothing other than a desperate attempt by Whites to recast the politics of the country in a mould in which White control would be perpetuated. The new constitution attempts to establish a new battle ground. It denationalises 22 million South African citizens; it gives them no role in parliament, both in practice and in principle. It eliminates the legitimacy of Black political opposition in so-called White South Africa, and it is attempting to cast a mould in which Black/White relationships will be relationships between First World and Third World countries. Whites having conquered the country and Whites having taken the best of the country as their exclusive White domain, in 1983 Whites opted for the fragmentation of the country into so-called White South Africa and into so-called homelands, with a view to making the homelands the political equivalents of the impoverished Third World states around South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members this is the position in a nut shell. The new chapter of South African political history will record whether or not Whites were able to make the new constitution stick, or whether Blacks were able to mount the kind of forces which once and for all eradicated apartheid and established an open and democratic society.

We must all accept that there has been a fundamental political shift in the politics of this country. After the National Party had come into power and battered Black hopes of entry into the Westminster type parliament through democratic means, and after the National Party followed up its reign of political terror against Black opposition by banishing the ANC and PAC, many Blacks began turning their back on democracy and the politics of negotiation. Their doing so was as understandable as it was mistaken.

The 1960's saw many African states gaining independence, either through the use of violence or the threatened use of violence. Many Black South Africans saw the continent as one in which the forces of liberation were sweeping to the south. They saw Black political determination on the continent being heightened and they saw political liberation as great African waves running southwards and sweeping colonial and neo-colonial oppression away before them. Thousands of Black South Africans fled the country to seek military training in anticipation that the armed struggle would sweep southwards and eventually arrive at our borders to sweep apartheid away before it. They dreamed of the day in which apartheid South Africa would be held under siege by a vast force of armed South Africans entrenched in neighbouring states. As the tidal front of African political freedom swept southwards, hopes were sustained and plans were laid for a final assault on the bastions of White

South African strength.

After the people's victories in Mocambique and Zimbabwe, optimism on the part of those committed to the armed struggle reached new heights. The External Mission of the African National Congress began stepping up its armed incursions into the country and believed that the beginning of the end had come. During this whole saga, Black South Africans here at home became divided. There were those standing here on our South African soil looking northwards in hope, and there were those, Mr. Speaker like yourself, and there were those Honourable Members like yourselves, and there were those like myself, who just did not believe the myth that this country could be liberated by armed incursions from across our borders.

Black South Africa was clearly divided. There were those who adopted political strategies and tactics assuming that internal disruption would hasten the day of the violent overthrow of the government. They employed the model of liberation which had been successful in other parts of this continent, and particularly in Mocambique, Angola and Zimbabwe. Their cry was that White South Africa would not change unless they were first conquered, but there were also those who could clearly see that the employment of this model was political foolishness indeed. They saw clearly that the South African situation could not be equated with the situations of Mocambique, Angola and Zimbabwe. They saw clearly that the liberation of this country would have to be achieved by strategies and tactics evolved in this country which were telling strategies and tactics in our circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I think we must pause for a moment to consider the terrible plight in which so many of our brothers and sisters now find themselves. We must at this time remember what it must be like to have been so enraged by apartheid and so low in hope about the effectiveness of democratic opposition, and so determined in soul and mind to bring about a just society, to have fled the borders to seek military training. We must pause to imagine what it must be like to have fled the borders of South Africa to go into foreign lands and to suffer untold miseries and hardships in search of military training. And then to have undergone training and waited in eager anticipation to be employed in military operations, now only to find that it is all a myth; that there will be no military operations; and that the real struggle is in fact taking place inside South Africa. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, many who fled this country to find themselves in this terrible situation were sincere souls. We must pause also to think of the terrible disillusionment which the senior leadership of the Mission in Exile must now be suffering.

In 1984 the realities of Africa tell this leadership that for nearly a quarter of a century they have been wrong; that for nearly a quarter of a century, they have been driving up an arduous road that leads nowhere. The elimination of operating bases, particularly in Mocambique, but also in other Southern African States, has put paid to any hopes that an armed struggle could ever succeed here.

I and Black South Africa acknowledge that the threat of violence from across our borders has played a positive role in the ongoing struggle here. There can be little doubt that no matter how self-assured White South Africa has appeared to be about its ability to meet violence with violence, a deep concern evolved during this last decade about the security of the country's future. The liberation of Mocambique, Zimbabwe and Angola through the armed struggle did have a significant impact on White political thinking. Many Whites who were confident about their ability to hold their own in an armed struggle, nonetheless recognised that considerable costs would be involved. White parents do not like to send their sons to the borders to die there even if they believe that they would die in fighting a just cause. And White tax payers do not like to meet the kind of multi-million rand expenditure that has been recurring annually in Namibia and Angola. There is no doubt that the threat of violence has coloured White political thinking. But there is also no doubt that the threat of a violent confrontation in this country which could escalate to very considerable proportions has influenced international feeling towards South Africa. This, however, is about as far as it goes. The threat of violence against South Africa has influenced international diplomacy even though we have all recognised that South Africa could not be seriously threatened by the armed struggle, as far as we have been able to see forward. In our circumstances a political victory could be achieved in time-scales far shorter than the time-scales needed for the successful development of the armed struggle against the South African Government. It is tragic that the expectations of some Black South Africans have been unrealistic. I sincerely hope that following the signing of the Nkomati Accord, Black South Africa will now abandon unrealistic expectations and get on with the job that can only be done here by people-inside the country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, from this House I would like to convey to President Machel that Black South Africa deeply understands his decision to sign the Nkomati Accord. I would like to convey Black South Africa's sympathies to President Machel. We know him as a man of immense courage who fought valiantly for ten years to achieve the independence of Mocambique. We know him as a man who valiantly sought the best for Mocambique for another ten

years after he assumed power. His stature as a son of Africa has not been diminished by the recent turn of events. President Machel became increasingly aware that the Mission in Exile was powerless to bring about a change of government in this country. This is no judgement on the External Mission of the ANC. It is simply a matter of fact that they could not do so. All the Heads of Frontline States were aware of this fact and we understand the statesmanship which led to President Machel refusing to sanction the terrible price that the people of Mocambique would have to pay in order to perpetuate the myth that the armed struggle could succeed in this country. The Frontline Presidents who know Central and Southern Africa stand behind President Machel, and Black South Africa stands behind President Machel.

We want to assure President Machel that the future of South Africa is in fact in Black South African hands, no matter how strident apartheid appears to be right now. We want to assure President Machel that we are committed as Black South Africans to the liberation of this country, and that we are committed to the liberation of this country in a manner which will not turn the victory of the people of Mocambique into ashes.

It is in this context that we should see the promises which Mr. Neil Kinnock made very recently to Mr. Oliver Tambo, the President of the External Mission of ANC. Mr. Kinnock is reported to have made a promise that when the Labour Party returns to power, it will reverse the policy of the Conservatives "which has been to protect, encourage and co-operate with South Africa." During a 50 minute meeting at the House of Commons with Mr. Tambo, Mr. Kinnock also said that the Labour Party's approach would be to "isolate apartheid South Africa and to promote effective action to hasten liberation."

In a statement distributed by the Anti-Apartheid Movement after the meeting, Mr. Kinnock said he was delighted to have met Mr. Tambo, and to have been able to express "the solidarity of the Labour Party with the South African Liberation Movement" in person. He said "We are agreed that while apartheid remained, nobody in Southern Africa can be truly free. For the people of neighbouring countries, there will be no lasting peace and the freedom gained after many years of struggle will be incomplete and precarious."

I have great respect for the Labour Party and for the forthright manner in which they have expressed themselves on the abhorrence of apartheid over the years. I have prominent friends amongst them both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords. They

include important personalities such as Mr. Dennis Healey, who visited me at KwaPhindangene, accompanied by Steve Biko, Dr. Rick Turner, and Mrs. Fatima Meer, during a visit to South Africa when he was in here to address students on the subject of academic freedom. I have visited him more than once on my trips to Great Britain. I also number such great politicians as Dr. David Owen, the Leader of the Social Democrats among my friends. I first met him when he was a Cabinet Minister in the Labour Government. I have as friends such strong opponents of apartheid in the Labour Party as Miss Joan Lester. I also met her when she was a Minister in the Labour Government. I have also such friends as Lady Irene in the House of Lords. There are many other outstanding Labour politicians too numerous to mention here who are my friends.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, you should be aware that this is the background against which I put the promises which Mr. Neil Kinnock has made to Mr. Tambo in perspective.

I think we in this House need to remind Great Britain and Mr. Kinnock that it was not the Boers who destroyed the Zulu Kingdom. It was Britain acting on the advice of her representatives "to destroy Zulu power once and for all" who waged a full-scale war against us in 1879. It was Britain who first betrayed us by succumbing to the Natal Colonial Government's pressures to take away KwaZulu's protectorate status. It was Britain who annexed KwaZulu and included us as part of Colonial Natal. Had this not been done we would today probably be in the same the position as Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana.

I wish to remind Mr. Kinnock that Britain again betrayed us after having included us in Colonial Natal. British agreement to our inclusion in what was to become the Union of South Africa was also a betrayal. This she did without trying to gauge Black views on our incorporation into the Union of South Africa.

What Afrikaners are now attempting to do by trying to incorporate a big chunk of our territory, Ingwavuma, into Swaziland with no regard to our feelings about the matter is something which as former subjects of Britain they learnt from Britain. We were betrayed yet again when Britain gave South Africa autonomy through the Statute of Westminster, unconcerned about whether or not we had a vote in the Union of South Africa. This was a monumental betrayal of us by Great Britain. We were not conquered by the Afrikaners here. Britain handed us over to the Afrikaners on a silver platter.

It was not as though Britain was acting in ignorance. Our own King Cetschwayo travelled to Britain and informed the British Government about the state of affairs here, and the various delegations which the African National Congress sent to Britain also informed the British Government of our views at the time of the Act of Union. Britain simply ignored our pleas and abandoned us to the fate we have suffered ever since.

I respect the Labour Party's stand against apartheid but Mr. Kinnock must understand that we see his promises to Mr. Tambo in the context of Britain's past performance over many generations in this part of Southern Africa. The South African apartheid regime has been at the helm for the last 36 years. During that time various Labour Governments were in power from time to time. Mr. Kinnock must understand our scepticism born out of our experience. He must understand that we are sceptical of British promises and what they are worth to the oppressed people in South Africa. We are sick and tired of pie-in-the-sky promises by British politicians. We are not impressed when they promise us something while they sit on opposition benches but which they cannot deliver once they become the ruling Party.

We were not impressed by the performances of consecutive British Governments, including the labour Government's performances, when

200,000 white settlers in Zimbabwe held our people to ransom for so many years. Mr. Kinnock needs to be reminded of this. He needs to be asked what Great Britain did to implement sanctions against Zimbabwe? He needs to be reminded of what the Bingham report tells us. He needs to be asked what reason we have to believe that a Kinnock Government will impose sanctions on South Africa? We are aware of how poor Britain has become after the loss of her possessions in faraway lands as a result of the decolonisation process.

At present British investment in South Africa is estimated to be in the order of five to six thousand million rand, and Britain's export trade to South Africa is worth about two thousand million rand per annum to her. Does Mr. Kinnock in all sincerity believe that he will have the support of British voters if he takes action that makes Britain poorer than she already is? Could Britain bring South Africa to its knees by the use of sanctions if the Wilson Government could not discipline Ian Smith after he made his unilateral declaration of independence? The British Government then did not have the guts to send the army into Zimbabwe to deal with Ian Smith. I believe a great many lives were lost because

Britain had cold feet at the time. Rhodesia was in fact a British colony at the time and had legitimate sovereign rights to deal with Ian Smith and to call a halt to what he was doing. Ironically, it was the Conservative Thatcher Government which finally had the guts to sort out Zimbabwe's political problems.

Zimbabwe withstood the use of sanctions against her (on which even Britain cheated) for so long because she was propped up by South Africa because of her economic muscle. South Africa, as Mr. Kinnock is aware, is not a Banana Republic, despite her iniquitous and abhorrent racist policies. I would like to suggest that Mr. Kinnock visits South Africa to see the situation here for himself before he makes ex-cathedra statements on what a Labour Government should or should not do if and when he takes over the British reigns. We Blacks of South Africa are no longer impressed by mere words, words and words. We know from experience, particularly after Zimbabwe, that the British people are human beings like us. They are no angels and are heirs to all human failings. No amount of unrealistic pontifications will satisfy us longer.

Britain has her own economic problems. Would the British voters allow Mr. Kinnock to compound them for our sakes when he takes over? Does Mr. Kinnock love us so much that he expects us to believe him when he says that he will be able to make British voters sacrifice their interests for our interests? Where does this newly-found love come from in view of the history I have just recalled. Has Britain at last discovered her morality?

We here appreciate that expressions of abhorrence of apartheid must be made here and abroad at all times. But we have learned the hard way during the more than 30 years of apartheid rule that verbal condemnation alone does not do much to alter our situation. We have always appreciated what the British Government has been doing through the British Council. We wish that it would do more for our students. We wish that it did more for our development in general, whether it be in the area of agriculture, health or education. We do not under-estimate what has been done, and continues to be done, but we do need less radical-rhetoric and more action on the ground.

I am pleased to notice that Mr. Kinnock has at last grasped the truth of what I have been stating over many years. This is that the true liberation of Southern Africa will only take place when South Africa is liberated. I have always rejected the domino theory which the international community adopted about the liberation struggle in Southern Africa. Mr. Kinnock must ask himself to what extent his proposed actions to isolate South Africa

will also harm the people of Mocambique, Botswana, Swaziland and Lesotho. He must do so in the context of the Nkomati Accord and in the context of his own statement that while apartheid remained nobody in Southern Africa can be truly free. Is it not a fact that the precarious position of a country such as Lesotho necessitates the budgetary grants which Great Britain even now gives them? Is Mr. Kinnock not satisfied that the monster of apartheid has sharp and dangerous teeth which it bared only a few months ago when the borders of Lesotho were closed by South Africa? Can Britain afford to take Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland on to her lap if South Africa again slams her doors in the faces of our brothers and sisters in these countries?

What Mr. Kinnock offered our brothers in the External Mission of ANC is no more than yet another pie-in-the-sky promise. The international community, including Great Britain, has offered us these pies in the sky for generations. Mr. Kinnock's undertaking to our brother, Mr. Tambo, is no more than something which is meant to cushion the effect of the Nkomati Accord on the operations of the External Mission of the ANC from Mocambique and other neighbouring States. It is no more and no less than that. If Mr. Kinnock were to promise the External Mission of the ANC the kind of military hardware which the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries give to them, then and then only will we take him seriously.

We are not impressed when we hear that Mr. Kinnock is reported to have stated that the Labour Party would give financial and material assistance to the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia. We are not impressed when he says: "And by extending and tightening the arms embargoes and actively supporting the imposition of United Nations comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions, we will work to end the military collaboration which is so essential to the apartheid regime." Are we expected to believe that Mr. Kinnock is not aware of just how self-sufficient South Africa is as far as armaments are concerned? Are we expected to believe that Mr. Kinnock is unaware that South Africa is today the largest manufacturer of arms in the whole of the Southern hemisphere?

I do not say that South Africa is invincible. All I am saying is that South Africa is not made vulnerable by pie-in-the-sky promises which never materialise. It is clear that we have to mount a more serious opposition than we have in the past within the country itself. While we are not opposed to any help that the Labour Party or anyone else gives to the External Mission of the ANC, we ask for more sincerity than has been evident in statements such as those made by Mr. Kinnock. The External Mission of the ANC wants military

hardware. Let Mr. Kinnock give our brothers who are committed to the armed struggle what they need to carry out that armed struggle and that is arms. But if they accept that the struggle must be waged more seriously and vehemently within South Africa itself, let them not confine assistance to the external forces of change. Let them help the forces of change such as Inkatha and other Black political organisations that operate within South Africa itself. They must assist internal forces if they are serious in their determination to help the Black people of South Africa to achieve their freedom. Too many people in the West posture for their own constituencies at home when it comes to the South African question. We have had enough of this posturing and I think it is my duty to point out that mere posturing is not good enough for us.

The true struggle for liberation in South Africa has always been an internal struggle by the people here at home. There can now be no doubt whatsoever that the centre of gravity of the struggle is in South Africa itself and that the leadership which will continue to direct that struggle is here in this country. It may be some time yet before Black forces are re-aligned and regrouped in the context of this reality, but re-aligned and regrouped they will be. Black South Africa must now forever cease looking over its shoulder in search of liberation from without. It will be some time yet before the harsh realities of our political situation really sink home for many people.

Ever since the 1970's we have had one crop of celebrity Black leaders after another who sought acclaim and political credibility in the kind of protest politics which has relied extensively on the aura of the armed conflict around us. It became more and more fashionable in recent years to posture as though your role or your organisation was part of the fabric of liberation which would ultimately come about through the employment of violence. It became more and more fashionable amongst those who did not have the guts to seek military training to posture as though they were part of or were in tune with a vast force poised to turn South Africa upside down.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, Inkatha has always done the honourable thing. We so abhor apartheid that we understand why some of our brothers and sisters so lost hope that they abandoned the struggle and fled into exile. We so abhor apartheid that we understand why some who had lost hope turned to espouse violence, and because we so abhor apartheid we understand that it would be wrong for us to disown our blood kith and kin who are driven to these extremes. It is a matter of history that Inkatha sought always to establish rapport with our brothers in exile. We sought

always to join in common cause with them where we were bound together by common commitments and saw our way clear to co-operate in fields where co-operation was possible. We have never abandoned our brothers in exile, and we do not do so now. My doors and Inkatha's doors are open to all who find themselves in this terrible plight of having suffered in exile for nothing. No doubt the Mission in Exile will redouble its efforts to instil in those who suffer isolation in alien lands that they have a vital role to play and that in due course things will change. No doubt they will present their terrible set-backs in Southern Africa as but a passing phase which must be endured by those who are truly patriotic. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the time must come when this is shown to be hollow talk and empty promises. The time must come when Black unity is shaped by the realities of our situation, and when that time comes it will be seen by more and more of our brothers and sisters in their terrible plight that Inkatha is central to the struggle and that our tactics and strategies provide a political home for every Black South African.

It is we, the Black people in South Africa, who will be writing the new chapter of political history in this country. It is Black South Africans here at home who are the custodians of the future. The wheel of history has in one sense made a full turn and we now stand where our forefathers stood in 1912. Black South Africa is again faced with a constitution which rejects them and Black South Africa is again faced with a White determination to exclude them from the democratic process in this country. And Black South Africa is again faced with having to adopt tactics and strategies which are dictated by the realities around us.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, every Member of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly is here because he or she has a role to play in the liberation of this country. This House is an instrument of liberation and we play a role here which nobody else could possibly play for us. We are part of a Black South African multi-strategy. There are others doing things we cannot do and we do things which others cannot do. Ours is a central role and when we talk about Black South African strategies and tactics in the new political dispensation, we must be clear in our own minds about the fundamental things we strive for.

In emerging political realities a high premium is going to be placed on constituency politics and the ability of Black South Africans to make it impossible for the South African Government to achieve the White final aim of entrenching White control over 87 per cent of the land and relegating Black South Africans to Third World circumstances. Protest politics did not stop the National

Party from succeeding in foisting on the Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei the pseudo kind of independence which has in fact been foisted on them. The armed struggle did not stop them from doing—so. Protest politics did not stop the South African Government from introducing this despicable new constitution, and the armed struggle did not stop them from doing so. The kind of politics which will stop the National Party in its tracks is not the politics of verbosity and the politics of indignant protestations. I am not saying that protest has no value. Protest has always dramatised the despicable nature of apartheid. Protest has mobilised opinion both here and abroad, and protest properly used preserves eternal values and sustains belief in things of value. Protest, however, is a rear guard action which consolidates political gains. The attitudes of those who protest should be a reflection of the attitudes of those who blaze the trail ahead. Protest can never be the mainspring of political action, nor can it be the main vehicle for the liberation of this country. Protest as such does not mobilise people into working constituencies. In fact, protest is so often accompanied by the price we have to pay as those who protest think they have done their share. To get up and vehemently protest is so often no more than cathartic. It is often no more than action to diffuse political vitality. Ranting and raving, screaming and bellowing, shouting and cajoling, blaming and condemning, so often depletes real political drive. Protest does not generate political activity, other than more protest. Protest does not set goals and devise strategies to achieve those goals. Too much protest and too little political action is a prescription on which apartheid flourishes. Protest politicians have always failed when they have turned to mobilising people. There has been a great deal of Black protest in this country, but protest leadership has yet to organise, for example, even one successful national strike. Protest leadership has yet to organise even one really successful national boycott action. Protest leadership has yet to organise even one viable achievement-orientated Black political constituency. We must vehemently object to apartheid. We must voice those objections in protest, but it is the instruments of liberation, Mr. Speaker, Sir, like this House which have to get on with the job of organising people and utilising organised people in the achievement of real things.

Protest on its own does not develop Black power; protest can generate disruptive tactics, but disruption in itself is a dubious tactic which gives rise only to ephemeral political gains. The massive protest which was triggered off by the tragic massacres in 1976 produced no real gains. A leadership which exploits anger, and calls forth the people to be cannon fodder has no real political utility. Protest which provides the South African police and the South African army with the kind of practice which keeps them on top mettle has no political utility. At the height of the

1976/78 disturbances, neither the army nor the police were ever really extended in their efforts to maintain control. The protest arenas were simply practising grounds in which dog handlers practised the handling of their dogs; and the effectiveness of tear gas was experimented with. Mock war manoeuvres cost as much money as practice exercises cost the army and the police force as they curbed the disturbances which arose in the 1976/78 period. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the harsh realities of that period were that Whites continued playing their games of tennis; they continued pottering in their gardens; they continued going on picnics; they continued in a great variety of affluent White behaviour as though nothing at all was happening. In the 1976/78 period, while Whites were pursuing their affluent pursuits, Black mauled Black and the police mauled Blacks, and the army mauled Blacks. To what avail, Mr. Speaker? Every one of us here understands the great depths of feelings which were expressed in Black protests in the 1976/78 period. We know how noble values welling up in Black human breasts demanded human expression. We know how deeply felt the need was to protest and to protest again, and even to throw yourself before the enemy as cannon fodder to die if necessary. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the yet deeper yearning in the Black breast is the yearning to be organised; the yearning to be involved in the political machinery of liberation.

The 1976/78 protest scene had in this respect a huge spin-off for Inkatha. Inkatha doubled and re-doubled its membership during those years of protest, and those years of protest gave impetus to the growth of Inkatha which has continued to operate even until today. When people are turned into cannon fodder; when masses are turned into the practising grounds for the South African police and the army; and when all the leaders of protest movements have been jailed or have fled the country, there is only mass disillusionment left.

Where are the leaders of that period? Where are the organisations which were built on the foundations of protest? Where are the real political gains for the country? Mr. Speaker, Sir, they are lost to South Africa; they are lost to the struggle.

When we look at the new political dispensation we must understand in this House that while we must defend our political integrity, our prime preoccupation must not become that of competition with the External Mission of the ANC, Black Consciousness groups, UDF, AZASO, AZAPO and factions of the trade union movement. The real truth of the matter is that we compete with White powers which control the country. We are pitted against the National Party and we are pitted against White opposition to the National Party which

strives to introduce alternative forms of White privilege in this country. As an opposition party we compete with other opposition parties. We are in political competition with the Progressive Federal Party. We may from time to time see the wisdom in joint ventures with other forces which oppose apartheid for their own purposes and in accordance with the demands of their own agendas; but ultimately we must recognise that our agendas differ from theirs, and that we are in competition with them, believing as we do in the merits of our own agendas. Politics is about power-sharing, and Black opposition to apartheid must be able to stand the pace amongst those who actually wield the power and amongst those who are in a real position to seek power.

White South Africa has given overwhelming endorsement to the new constitution, but we must always remember two things. Firstly that political support is often fickle, and secondly that the support the Prime Minister received in the referendum for the new constitution does not necessarily mean a permanent political gain for the National Party. We must also remember that political support is demanding. The Prime Minister will yet experience that a great many of those who supported him are going to turn to demand that which he simply cannot give within the four corners of National Party policy, and within the framework of the new constitution. The new constitution simply cannot be established unless there is Black political acquiescence in the country. The new constitution will not diffuse the political scene, but will instead fire Black determination. The new constitution will be productive of an upsurge of Black opposition to apartheid. It will gain nothing and cost the country a great deal and when many of those who voted in favour of the new constitution realise these facts, they will turn to make the kind of demands which the Prime Minister will not be able to satisfy. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the alternatives to the new constitution must be produced by Black South Africa.

In a very real sense this House is one of the most important custodians of those alternatives. Each and every one of us here must understand that the Prime Minister will not succeed in implementing his ideological dreams to their logical conclusion if we do no more than sit here with folded arms and say: No, Sir. Our adamant refusal to accept independence in itself will prove an insurmountable obstacle for the Prime Minister. The Zulu population of South Africa on its own outnumbers all Whites put together. Powerful forces will yet be deployed against us to break our solidarity on the question of independence, so-called. Our resolve and determination will be tested. We must be aware that an increasingly determined assault will be made on our determination to hold our KwaZulu position for the sake of every Black South

African, and indeed, for the sake of every White South African. We in this House have already thwarted the Prime Minister. We refused to participate in our own subjugation. It was because of our stand that the Black Advisory Council had to be abandoned. We led the protest against the new constitution last year, and our refusal to sanction Inkatha's entry into the Soweto elections was a severe blow to the Prime Minister. For him we have thus far been an unmanageable force. We have thwarted the Prime Minister in his moves to include Ingwavuma into Swaziland, and we will continue to do so. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we are indirect competition with the Prime Minister and the South African Government, and we are the true and telling Black opposition in a great many areas where others are merely vociferously impotent.

As the new constitution is introduced, and as its deficiencies become increasingly apparent to the White electorate, they will have to think in terms of working in partnerships with Blacks to exploit the weaknesses in the Government's programmes. Real White opposition in constituency politics will yet emerge only amongst those who recognise the futility of Whites-only politics. This House is a bastion of Black strength which can be aligned to White opposition to apartheid. We constitute the kind of Black political force which true White opposition to apartheid will sooner than later desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the whole process of challenging Government policy at the parliamentary level, the provincial council level, and the city and town council levels, will yet emphasise the value of Natal as a multi-racial constituency. We play a very crucial role in Natal and there are no manoeuvres that the South African Government can conceive of capable of disentangling Black and White political interests in this province. We have adopted a political position which makes us an irradicable Black presence in White politics here. We are part of the White political fight and the fortunes of the PFP and the NRP, and the fortunes of the National Party itself, are partly in our hands. Some things may take a little more time than others, but in the end the approach we have endorsed of the Buthelezi Commission is an approach which has in it the ring of reality for medium and long term politics. The Government can sweep the report under the carpet, but it cannot sweep this House, Sir, under the carpet. The Government can refuse to look at the text of the Report, but it cannot go on ignoring the realities in politics which produced the report.

The External Mission of the ANC, AZASO, AZAPO and the UDF are not factors which can be permanently integrated into the politics of

Natal. Like the HNP and the CP, they may have a nuisance value, but they will never be determinants of major political developments in this province.

Because we occupy a position of real political power, we are the envy of every Black group which aspires to power, and we must look at our vulnerability to Black political action which detracts from our primary role of opposing apartheid and ensuring that the Government will never succeed in finally entrenching White vested interests in the new constitution. We have to ensure that the constitution when it is introduced this year is but a parliamentary paper victory without real medium and long-term political bite. There will be those who will attempt to detract us from this our central task in the years to come, and we must be aware of any vulnerability we may have to those attacks. As a Legislative Assembly, we have a dual responsibility. We have a responsibility to lead in the political field and to blaze new trails into the future, and we have an administrative responsibility which keeps what we do relevant to the lives of Black people. We are unassailable in our political stand. It is founded on sound politics, and it is founded on the kind of realities which will continue to ensure our importance and our relevance in the changing political scene. On the administrative level, we do have vulnerabilities.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, each one of us knows just how vulnerable we are on the administrative level. Each one of us knows that we have to discharge our administrative responsibilities in circumstances of desperate poverty. We know that we are faced with immense tasks in the administration of the well-being and in the administration of the development of the people. And we also know that we do not have sufficient funds; we do not have sufficient personnel; and we do not have the required infrastructure with which to discharge our responsibilities adequately. We all know that our enemies use the plight of Black poverty as a stick with which to beat us. We are blamed for that which we have not done because we cannot do it. We are blamed because as Blacks we suffer deeply at the hand of a Government which treats us as a donor agency would treat an impoverished Third World region. When we are not given the funds to pay pensioners, our political enemies blame us for the desperate positions of our aged and our infirm. When we do not have money to build houses, our enemies blame us for the terrible family circumstances of millions of homeless people. When we are not given funds to build additional hospitals and employ additional doctors and nurses and to run additional clinics and ambulances, we are blamed for the

plight of the desperately sick. When we do not have the money to build additional schools and to train and employ additional teaching staff, we are blamed for the consequences in our educational programmes.

Apartheid has created absurd circumstances in which solutions are impossible within them. Apartheid has created vast squatter areas for which we, nor anybody else, has the solution to hand. Apartheid has created a huge commuting problem for Black workers, for which there is no real solution. Apartheid has created impoverished rural areas for which there are no real solutions at present. Apartheid has ensured that meaningful industrial development takes place in White areas and in the immediate future, there is nothing we can do to alter this. Apartheid has created for us a yoke which we must bear and as we do so, our detractors try to climb on our backs to make the already impossible burden yet more impossible.

People who live under the circumstances which apartheid has created must necessarily become angry as their dissatisfactions remain unattended to. Feelings must inevitably rise and they will inevitably be expressed. They are expressed as people join Inkatha and strive with us to change the lot of the poor and the suffering. However, our political enemies can afford to exploit people's anger by drumming up issues and creating insoluble problems.

Let us think for a moment of the rent issue. We are not a nation of beggars; we are committed to self-help and we strive to create homes for ourselves in terribly adverse circumstances. The KwaZulu Government cannot run housing schemes on thin air; they cannot provide essential services with no money and people are prepared to pay rent and to meet the costs of unavoidable increases in expenditure on essential services. Our enemies can, however, drum up the fact that influx control forces people to live in Black townships and they can argue that if the Government forces the people to live in Black townships, the Government must foot the bill. Our enemies can turn this into an emotive issue because they do not sit in the hot seat where we sit endeavouring to do the best we can with the little we are given. Our enemies can exploit the transportation issue. They can and have exploited these things and they have exploited the provision of water as an issue. They will yet exploit the Inanda dam issue. They will lay all the miseries of life under apartheid at our feet.

They can incite school children to be angry against KwaZulu, when the real problem is the South African Government. They can incite

the homeless to vent their feelings against KwaZulu, when the real problem lies at the feet of the South African Government. Our political enemies can exploit the commuter problem, they can exploit the unemployment problem, they can exploit the health problem, and the housing problem at our expense. No matter how despicable it is for some self-acclaimed Black leaders to ride on the backs of suffering Black peasants and workers; no matter how despicable it is for them to use the desperate circumstances of the people to create Black/Black conflicts, they do so.

Our vulnerability to these attacks against us blaming us for things which are beyond our control will be increased if we are unable to communicate with the people and rally them behind us to do the most we can with the little that we have. If we fail to do this and if the people are really brought to believe that we are responsible for their plight, we are going to be in for a very rough ride. Our people must be brought ever increasingly to be involved in participatory democratic opposition to apartheid. They must tackle real issues with us, and we must be far more conscious of the need there is to get large-scale public commitments to start fighting for the future from where they are. Our political enemies reject the realities on which the struggle rests; they talk Utopian language and they talk as though liberation falls from the sky like manna from heaven when the people shout hard enough.

In facing false accusations levelled against us by divisive Black forces, we have to recognise that our problems are compounded by the country's White liberal establishment. White liberals in South Africa have never been able to put together a viable political constituency. White liberalism is more operative in the field of debate and the proffering of advice to those who are in the struggle. Any society is enriched by moral statements coming from men and women of conscience. In South Africa, however, all too frequently Whites with consciences, unable to survive in the harsh political climate of the country when they attempt to establish their own constituencies, try to establish political identities by taking sides in the Black struggle. Such groups as Diakonia, Black Sash and NUSAS do precisely this. They each at times have played a very valuable role in the evolution of White thinking. They have each in their own way been a pressure group which has played a legitimate role in politics. However in recent years they have abandoned this real value to South African society and have sought to back what they regard as winning Black political horses. It is as though they smart under their inability to be effective White political animals in White society and seek to be the alter egos of Black politicians. When moralists take sides, they cease to be moralists. They then become partisan forces. We understand how impotent White political moralists must feel in White apartheid

society, and we understand how difficult it must be to be no more than a voice crying in the White wilderness. Our understanding, however, is not a kind of indulgent understanding which smiles at Whites because they are White as they fling political mud in our face. White liberal political lost souls tend to wander around the terrain of Black politics until they can find one or another Black hand to hold so that they can be consoled about the difficulties they have in White society. White liberals in South Africa have always sought to justify their unpopular political stances in White society by seeking Black allies who can prop them up. The credibility of NUSAS, or the Black Sash or Diakonia both here and abroad depends upon the Black political testimonials which they carry around in their hip pockets. Only politically impoverished Black groups in turn need to be propped up by White liberals. I remember, for example, that in the 1950's the Liberal Party set about establishing a White led political constituency. South Africa's Black leadership valued what they were doing, but when the Liberal Party tried to prop up its failure in White society by seeking to become part of the Congress Alliance Movement, Chief Albert Luthuli wisely declined to respond to their overtures. Those who were really involved in the Black struggle have always been aware how important it is for White liberals to seek high profile political eminence for themselves. Chief Luthuli and other leaders quite rightly gently told the Liberal Party that it must live or die as a White political force in White society. He saw the need for White political constituencies to root themselves in White politics and somehow to survive there. We in this House value White liberals for the same reason, but when White liberals fail to make their mark in White society, they must not run around looking for Black political crutches.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this is not a racist statement, and it is not a statement that expresses the view that Whites have no role to play in Black politics. We in this House are committed to non-racialism as a fundamental principle, but when ailing White liberalism resorts to taking doses of holier-than-thou Black medicine, we raise our eyebrows. And when the taking of that holier-than-thou Black medicine amounts to seeping up the poison of Black divisive forces, then more than our eyebrows are raised.

We remember how NUSAS failed to accommodate the aspirations of Black students in the sixties, and how desperately they attempted to establish a united student body with SASO after it had formed. Black students told NUSAS to go to the White campuses and to do their White thing there. NUSAS has been smarting under their rejection by Black students, and they have been smarting from their inability to incorporate Blacks in a multi-racial student body. The climate in White society became ever more harsh for NUSAS and

as opposition to NUSAS in White society grew, so they sought to take sides in the Black/Black conflict and to present themselves as White freedom fighters.

The Black Sash walked the same NUSAS road, the same Liberal Party road and they too ever increasingly resorted to working alliances with selected Black groups to establish the authenticity of what they were attempting to do. NUSAS and the Black Sash should have the courage to do some soul-searching, and to ask themselves some fundamental questions. We who are truly involved in the struggle are now tired of Alfa Romeo driving White students and White cocktail circuit ladies telling us how to conduct our affairs.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it saddens me deeply to have to make these observations, and I am even more saddened when I have to go to talk about White liberal Christians in the same vein. I have always deeply appreciated the fellowship which I have found in the Church, and in the Church in more than any other place, the colour of one's skin is no more than an accident of birth. The frailty of man, however, is such that White Christians who embrace me as their brother in Christ so often experience crisis of identity in their own White congregation. White Christian groups like White liberal groups come under pressure from their families, their neighbours and their colleagues when they express race-free Christian brotherhood in action. They too eventually seek Black crutches. Whites in the South African Council of Churches adopt stances and form alliances with Blacks which they would never dare adopt or form in their own local White Churches. We refused to give evidence to the Eloff Commission because we did not want to be party to a SACC/Government confrontation. Black South Africa will eventually sort out the SACC and we do not require the might of the State to enable us to do so. However, some of the evidence the Eloff Commission collected has not gone unnoticed. The dependence of the SACC on affluent White liberal groups in Europe is clearly documented. The massive support that they have managed to solicit has in part been solicited at our expense. It has become fashionable in some Western donor agency circles to indulge in the denigration of Inkatha in the company of groups such as the SACC, Diakonia, NUSAS and Black Sash. Anti-Inkatha slogans are so often worth a great deal of cash abroad. Anti-KwaZulu attitudes are sometimes even more lucrative. We are entitled to ask how much of this financial support can be counted as thirty pieces of political silver.

Diakonia in a very real sense is the liberal religious equivalent of the Black Sash and NUSAS. Diakonia is White-led and it survives against the background of White congregational activity. It too

has resorted to becoming partisan in its approach to Black politics. It canvasses for the same kind of Black support amongst Black groups which rely on hocus pocus White political support. Ironically it is the Black Consciousness groups of South Africa which are most propped up by White Western European donor agencies, and they get their support from the same donor agencies which support NUSAS, Black Sash and Diakonia. There is a kind of liberal incest, a kind of in-breeding amongst White liberals, a kind of making political love in small circumscribed White circles.

Western pressure groups themselves are so often made up of deeply committed men and women with a genuine concern about the struggle for liberation here. Unfortunately the contagious disease of pseudo liberalism is sometimes spread by the contact these pressure groups have with the kind of South African liberals we are discussing. The virus of this disease takes root so easily in European societies, where pressure groups are fringe groups of European societies. By and large they are societies with colonial pasts which continue in the neo-colonial exploitation of the Third World. They are not over-concerned about the hapless circumstances of Third World citizens. Western pressure groups fail to establish real constituencies in their own societies and seek credibility by propping themselves up with South African Black political connections. The way they gain these connections is by buying partisan shares in the Black struggle here with the cash they dispense with such largesse.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, in what I am saying I am revealing political truths as sad as they are deep. I am putting my finger on one of the deep maladies of the South African struggle for liberation. We all understand how the frailty of man can dilute the kind of noble White liberalism which so many eminent White sons and daughters of South Africa have promoted. But it is time, however, that we call into question pseudo White liberalism which has no real political utility, either in White society or in Black society.

As we begin to write this new chapter of South African political history, we must be aware that the real nature of Black politics, that the real forces in Black politics which can be mobilised, are rooted in the situations where people are today. Black politics which will survive to win in South Africa will not divide people into freedom fighters and the masses which have to be liberated. It is the masses themselves which have to do the liberating, and in our multi-strategy approach, this House must give each section of our population, each class of Black South African, each community and each group, something to do which will advance the Black cause,

improve people's lots and enable them to penetrate ever more deeply into what were previously exclusive White domains. It is in this way that participatory opposition to apartheid will bear the fruits we so long for.

I see the very real need to make far more effective use of the Bureau for Communication than we have ever done in the past. We represent ordinary people and it is the confidence of the ordinary people in us which sustains us here in this House. We simply must find ways and means of sustaining the people's belief in this House and in Inkatha. We must find ways and means of communicating with the ordinary people far more effectively. And in particular, we must find ways and means of handling conflict situations when they arise. If we fail to stand with the people in such a way that they believe we are standing with them, and we fail to take sides with the people in the issues which confront them, we are going to lose the confidence of the people.

The United Democratic Front has set itself the task of mobilising the people against us and to create no-go areas for us here in Natal. They have set themselves the task of convincing the people that the KwaZulu Government and Inkatha have got nothing to offer them in their dire circumstances. While I believe that the United Democratic Front could possibly become a force in the struggle for liberation if they begin now to learn the lesson that the history of the struggle can teach us, on their behaviour in recent months, however, I have not been encouraged in this hope. They are attempting to discredit us and they are attempting to sow Black/Black discord. They want to prosper politically out of the plight of the people. We have had the courage to stand with the people in attempts to do whatever can be done for them in their circumstances, and this 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.

If we reject empty protest as a useless political strategy, we are bound in all political honour to replace it with that which is effective. We are in a very real sense participants in the whole process of change, and I think our role can be summed up in the concept "participatory democratic opposition to apartheid." You do not fight a fire by talking at it from a distance. You come into direct conflict with it. You beat it out while your eyebrows are scorching and while you are getting blistered by the close

proximity to the danger. There is no safe way of opposing apartheid; you cannot oppose apartheid by sniping at the victims of apartheid. 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 in our role here in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, and we have to continue in the programmes which emanate from this House. It is as though we are on the receiving end of a cruel history which demands that we participate in society to bring about change and which also demands that we bear the brunt of misplaced Black anger as we attempt to do that which has to be done.

I said earlier in this policy statement that Black mistakes are made in the wake of White mistakes which went before them, and I said that the more dire circumstances are, the more terrible the consequences of mistakes will be. We in this House pursue the kind of objectives we do pursue because White politicians have blundered before us, and when we make mistakes here we are bound to reap the whirlwind which White mistakes have created. We must be aware of the fact that every issue we mishandle will have lasting adverse repercussions for us. There is perhaps the need for a far more concerted effort on our part to think and plan more carefully. There is perhaps the need for us to make a far more concerted effort to take every issue which arises amongst the people, far more seriously. And perhaps above all, there is the need for us to be even more astute and far-sighted than we have been in the past.

The struggle for liberation can gather momentum in one of two directions. Whichever way things go, we must be prepared. The struggle could begin moving rapidly into the area of confrontationist politics, or it could begin moving towards the politics of negotiation. History does not move along uni-dimensional lines. The pendulum of history in this country has been swinging between the politics of confrontation and the politics of negotiation for a long time, and when we talk about the direction of the struggle, we are talking about the veering of the pendulum more to one side than to another side. Even in the politics of negotiation there will be a degree of confrontation, and if the pendulum veers hard towards the politics of confrontation, there will also be some negotiation. When I talk about the direction which politics may take, I am talking about the dominance of either confrontation or negotiation. I see the politics of negotiation as the politics salvaging this country from the politics of confrontation reaching unmanageable proportions. If confrontation does reach unmanageable proportions, then so be it and we will survive in those circumstances. But those

circumstances are not the circumstances of our choice. We are committed to further the struggle through non-violent and democratic means and to thrash out a future for all of us through the politics of negotiation. If others drive towards confrontation willy nilly, we remain committed to the politics of negotiation until the masses demand something else from us. Our mandate from the masses is to negotiate a better future and to bring it about by non-violent, democratic means.

I come back to the notion of participatory democratic opposition to apartheid. If the politics of negotiation is in the end going to be the politics which achieves real results, we must consolidate our negotiation advantages, and we must begin setting about developing strong negotiating positions. To do this, we as a political force must remain integrated in the process whereby change is taking place. Let us look briefly at the kind of changes which will occur if the employment of violence in the struggle does not reduce everything to unmanageable proportions.

The soft under-belly of the National Party's apartheid philosophy has always been that it flies against the reality that Whites are utterly dependent on Blacks. Whites cannot run their gold mines without us; they cannot run their civil service without us; they cannot run their police force without us; they cannot run their cities without us; they cannot pave the roads without us; they cannot run their industries without us and the vast majority of Whites cannot even run their homes without us. Apartheid must in the end be confounded by this beautiful reality. The history of this country since 1948 has been the history of the National Party abandoning one attempt after another to freeze the process of change and to curb the upward mobility of Blacks in South African society. They have failed to do so. The Apprenticeship Act had to be scrapped; job reservation fell by the wayside. The Physical Planning Act had to be abandoned. The notion that Blacks were transitory migrants in a white man's land had to give way to the recognition of a permanent population of Blacks in so-called white South Africa. Black South Africa now commands something like 50 per cent of the consumer spending in the formal economy. Blacks are now vital customers in banks and building societies. Every artisan trade is now dominated by Black workers. Black workers are being promoted to foremen, and Black foremen are being promoted to managers.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there is something invincible about the advancing Black vertical mobility in South African society. It is these very advances which have driven the present Government to try and immunise themselves and White South Africa

from their implications. The new constitution is a White step more far reaching and far more desperate than any that has gone before it. I believe that time is on our side and the new constitution too will crumble beneath the weight of advancing reality.

There is liberational politics involved in the upward vertical mobility of Blacks in South African society. The advancement of Black people has taken place in defiance of statutory obstacles and in defiance of apartheid practices. South Africa's oppressive laws and oppressive apartheid practices were erected to confound Black development. They have slowed Black development down, but they certainly have failed to destroy the foundations on which Black development continues to be built.

Black advancement in the economy has been the development of Black political power. And when we look to the future, we can only see the power advantages of Black society being advanced by an escalating Black political mobility in society. It is misguided analysis which sees the free enterprise system as an obstacle to progress in the Black struggle for liberation. We must either throw bombs to kill Whites and to destroy their power, or we must hurl ourselves into their industries and commerce to appropriate them as ours. This is precisely what we have been doing ever since the Act of Union. It has taken a long time, but I believe we are now passing through a threshold beyond which Black economic advancement will ever increasingly fire Black political power.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, part of this Assembly's responsibility to the nation is to put our weight behind Black advancement. We have the instruments with which to do so; we have the KwaZulu Development Corporation; we have Inkatha Central Committee; we have the Bureau for Community Development, and we have the Inkatha Development Office, and we have Emandleni-Matleng Camp; and we also have the Inkatha Institute. Some of these instruments may perhaps be making humble beginnings to the great task which lays before us. We must assist them. We must shape them, and we must direct them to play the role they should be playing in the struggle for liberation.

We must as a Legislative Assembly be innovators in the whole process of Black advancement. We have perhaps been too blind to the scope that there is for us to be innovators. This Assembly must go beyond being concerned with the Black middle class and the small Black businessmen already in business. White politics is bent upon establishing a Black middle class who have too much to lose to really throw their weight behind the struggle for

liberation. The Black middle class must advance, but it must not advance to an isolated position away from the Black workers and peasants. This Assembly must be enlivened with the driving genius of the free enterprise system through which peasants become workers and through which workers become managers and through which managers become entrepreneurs. I believe that we should study more carefully the process by which small businesses develop in squatter areas, in rural areas and in settled urban areas. We must ask ourselves to what extent our approach to business licencing and our approach to trading needs to be revitalised.

There are practices which curb the emergence of small-scale grass root entrepreneurs. In many rural societies there are community jealousies about who can make money out of whom. In rural societies strangers are not generally welcome and when an astute stranger comes with entrepreneurial ability and the skills to give that entrepreneurial ability a practical context, he is not welcomed. Many of our smaller scale societies protect unscrupulous businessmen who are permitted to continue operating in a protected environment. Every man or woman should be freer than he or she is to start trading and conducting small service businesses in any way they see fit. Is it perhaps not true that licencing laws we apply in our areas of jurisdiction are the kind of licencing laws which evolve after a free enterprise system has developed. What licencing laws were there in operation in the frontier life of the great trading nations of the world while they were still developing their trading prowess. How many White business interests in this country trace their roots back to times when licencing laws were virtually non-existent? Do we believe in a socialist system which regulates commerce, trade and industry, or do we believe in a free enterprise system in which unscrupulous operators are weeded out by the people themselves when their exploitation becomes intolerable?

Have we as a government really done everything we could have done to facilitate small-scale grass roots entrepreneurial development? Or do we still talk about pirate taxis and illegal traders and unlicensed manufacturers? Should we not bounce more balls yet in the direction of the KwaZulu Development Corporation? Should we not bounce more balls yet in the direction of the Inkatha Institute? Should we not bounce more balls yet in the direction of the Bureau for Community Development? Should we not bounce more balls yet in the direction of the Inkatha Development Office? And should we not aim to utilise Emandleni-Matleng Camp to stimulate the development of very small-scale grass root economic ventures?

In this Legislative Assembly we have the opportunities of tackling the kind of questions I am raising and in tackling them astutely we

have the opportunity of doing something for the people which groups like the UDF, AZASO, AZAPO and others cannot do. We have a role to play in participatory democratic opposition to apartheid which others cannot play. We can be innovative in our educational programmes; we can be innovative in our health service programmes, and we can be innovative in a wide range of administrative programmes.

KwaZulu and Inkatha face these challenges and we can ask these questions because we have done a great deal to further the struggle for liberation in this country. We have a track record of deep commitments to the ideals of the struggle, and we have been unwavering as we have again and again confronted White society in general and the National Party in particular with the real issues they should face up to. We have established the largest political constituency this country has ever seen in all its turbulent history. We have mobilised the people and created local, regional, provincial and national structures and we have evolved the kind of leadership capable of pursuing real strategies and capable of utilising tactics which bring real gains to the people. We have enshrined in our constitution and in our organisational structures and practices the Black political wisdom which has evolved in this country ever since Whites first came here to dispossess us. We have arisen as a massive force to fill the vacuum which was created by the banning of the ANC and PAC on the part of the Government and by the lack of political reality by the ANC's and PAC's External Missions. We have rallied the people into new political consciousness, and we have blazed the way for Black South Africa to once more emerge from the kind of Black fear syndromes which were created in the late fifties and early sixties. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, when Black South Africa in the early seventies was still whispering about important national issues, it was I who resurrected Black political boldness by fearlessly quoting from our banned brothers and sisters.

When the Black national front had been destroyed by harsh government action when they banned the PAC and ANC, people only dared talk in secret about the politics of the past. For more than a decade, Black South Africa existed in a political vacuum. In the early seventies, it was I who boldly opened up discussions between Black South Africans and the ANC and PAC's missions in exile. When others dared not talk about these Missions in Exile, both here and abroad I publicly proclaimed them as our brothers and held out the hand of friendship to them in the full glare of media publicity. It was I and Inkatha who revived the political debate in this country and showed White South Africa that Black politics had not been obliterated by Draconian laws and police brutality. It was I and Inkatha who boldly flew the symbols of the Black

struggle as we hoisted the hallowed black, green and gold of the people. It was I and Inkatha who again mobilised the mass support of the people which had begun to emerge so strongly in the 1950's. It was I who had to go out to proclaim boldly Black South Africa's commitment to the principles of the founding fathers of the African National Congress. It was I and Inkatha who once again confronted Prime Ministers, Cabinet Ministers and other government officials in eyeball to eyeball confrontations about the oppression of Black people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I went out to do these things from amongst your midst. I went there as your leader and while the whole world was attempting to stigmatize with the terms "Bantustans" and derogatory terms such as "stooges" you supported me and you supported Inkatha in the boldness of what we were doing. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly are two facets of the same vibrant Black opposition to apartheid which we have evidenced so consistently for so long. We are a brand of freedom fighters called forth to do battle with apartheid by the history of the struggle itself.

And in everything we have done, we have obeyed the people in the doing of it. Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly are democratic organisations in which the will of the people is formulated by representatives of the people which they themselves have chosen. Thus when we ask questions about what more we can do, we ask those questions in the kind of boldness which only our track record justifies. We stand tall in our deep convictions to eternal values. We stand tall as the sons and daughters of South Africa and of Africa, and we can analyse Black politics with a clearness of conscience which few others have. As we face the task before us as one of the very important guiding hands that writes the new chapters of the developing political history of the country, we do so with certainty and conviction.

Inkatha and this House are participants in the people's struggle and to me it is so deeply tragic that political competitiveness and political jealousies on the part of so many of our detractors leads them to recognise some of the eternal truths on which the struggle is founded, but to distort these truths in self-righteous campaigns against us. Take, for example, the recent report of the South African Council of Churches on the whole question of removals. Their booklet entitled "Relocations: the Church's report on forced removals" supports us in so many of the things we have been saying far more often and far better than they have ever said it before. The report says that the homeland policy is a means of preventing power-sharing, ostensibly by giving Africans 'political rights'.

They trace homeland policy to White racism and White greed, just as we do. They lament the role of unscrupulous capitalism in the development of apartheid, just as we do. They see Afrikaner nationalism as an ideology which has taken over the injustices of racism, economic and political injustice inherited from the British colonial period. Just like us they see the horrors of pass laws and influx control measures as the government so often treats Blacks like some kind of human cattle who can be driven from one camp to another camp to suit the White man's vested interests. They correctly see the ever increasing harshness with which influx control has been applied, and they lament the fact that despite the South African Government's statements, arrests and prosecutions in the application of the pass laws and influx control measures are on the increase. And they lament the fact that fines which can be imposed on Whites who aid and abet those Blacks who defy these control measures have been increased dramatically. They correctly condemn the fact that the people forced to move are so often not consulted, are not allowed to choose where they wish to go, are not moved to sites close to the infrastructure on which economic development depends and are often moved to distant parts of one or another homeland where they have no ties. They see the terrible situation of some land owners who are forced to evict Black squatters if they want to avoid stiff fines. They see that the programme of enforced removals uproot Black families and destroy Black homes and they condemn the fact that Blacks are often moved into areas where there are inadequate or polluted water supplies, a shortage of productive land, an inhospitable climate and a lack of suitable housing. They recognise that they are moved to rural areas which are already grossly over-populated and where the productivity of the soil minimises their chances of growing food for themselves.

The report correctly sees that rural under-development in homeland areas can be traced to the fact that the decentralisation policy of the Government has failed and that there is little chance of real industrial development in them. They quite correctly see that the whole programme of removing so-called Black spots in so-called White South Africa, and the whole of the homeland policy is designed by Whites who fear urban unrest and who shirk the responsibility of caring for the unemployed. They correctly see the poverty in rural areas where we have high death rates, and high incidences of malnutrition diseases.

Together with us they lament the terrible disparity that exists between Black and White old age and disability pensions. Together with us they see that Whites want their cake and they want to eat it. They want segregation of communities but they want to enjoy the fruits of Black labour so they develop Black dormitory towns

around industrial areas and make Black workers commute between these dormitory townships and their places of employment. Together with us they condemn the Government's base plan of dividing South Africa into a dominant White State and ten mini-States, which they hope to bring into a constellation of Southern African states. They condemn White intentions of surrounding an affluent White State with ten docile and economically dependent so-called independent states. Together with us they are deeply concerned about the loss of South African citizenship for Blacks which is built into the whole homeland policy. Together with us they see the whole homeland policy as a policy which violates international law and internationally accepted standards of behaviour. Together with us they condemn the Government's homeland policy because it denies the right of Blacks to decide on their political future within one territorial unit, and instead attempts to compel them to seek self-determination in small territories carved out of South Africa by the South African Government itself. They correctly see as we do that the homeland policy destroys the territorial integrity of South Africa itself, and like us they believe that it is questionable whether even those Blacks living in so-called independent homelands support the Government's homeland policy. They stand with us to condemn the Government's determination to use so-called homeland independence to rid White South Africa of its Black citizens to achieve the final goal of apartheid.

They see the absurdity of the homeland policy and recognise that purely ethnic divisions fly against realities. Like us they recognise that there are countless thousands of Black South Africans who are mixed in ethnic origin and are arbitrarily allocated to one or another of the so-called homelands. They see the homeland policy just as we do as a policy designed to increasingly deprive Black people of their share in the economic prosperity and to exclude them from meaningful participation in the economic system.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, in going through this SACC booklet, we find these major points of agreement between themselves and ourselves, and I could have detailed the areas of agreement and common concern to a far greater extent if time permitted. One would have thought that this agreement across such a broad basis between Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly on the one hand and the SACC on the other hand, would draw us together as comrades are drawn together who share so many fundamental beliefs and perceptions.

The report unfortunately and sadly to say does not set out to build bridges between those who have got common cause, but seeks rather

to alienate themselves from ourselves. The whole report is written as though the SACC have discovered these truths for the first time and they are presenting them to the world as the gems of their perceptions. The self-righteousness of the document and the lack of Christian humility in it reduces it to the kind of stuff which should be used for toilet paper. They never once mention the noble struggle that Inkatha and this House has waged on these very issues which I briefly outlined above. Instead these evils of apartheid society are laid at our feet, and we as a homeland administration are accused of being party to the horrible apartheid designs of the Nationalist Party led White South Africa. The booklet as a whole is poisonous in its divisiveness and to set the record straight, I need to analyse what is written in some detail.

Throughout this miserable little dissertation, the authors refer to so-called homelands as 'Bantustans.' We object to that term most strenuously, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members. We reject it because it is thrown around like a swear word. It contains the notion that a place such as KwaZulu where our forefathers resisted the devastation by colonialism with their lives, and where our Zulu Kings ranked amongst the most illustrious of the first freedom fighters is a construct of the National Party. It also contains the notion that Blacks cannot love the soil itself where their forefathers were buried, and they cannot be deeply moved by the valleys and rolling hills of their ancestral land. The word itself incorporates the Boer's political use of 'Bantu' as a descriptive word for we Africans. The word 'Bantustan' should be bitter in the mouth of every Black South Africa. Those who use it regard us as the kind of Bantu whom Whites would have as subservient political lackeys.

The word 'Bantustan' is used only by those who themselves have fallen foul to White propaganda and have succumbed to White influences which treat regions traditionally inhabited by Black people as places where there is political leprosy and dangerous primitive influences. Those who bandy the word 'Bantustan' around fail to understand that the most vehement opposition that there exists to the Government's homeland policy is to be found amongst people who reap and sow where their ancestors walked, and whose culture is enriched by traditions and history itself. Those who bandy the word 'Bantustan' around are normally the uncultured political morons of our society. The literature of mankind abounds in descriptions of a people's love of the soil from which they sprang. Poetry and lyrics, operas and songs, treat as sacred the love man has for the place of his birth and the love a man has for his family, his friends, his society and his culture. Apartheid ideology has bastardised this love of man for the place of his birth. Apartheid has defiled the deep feelings that well up in the

human breast as man perceives his identity in terms of his culture and his history. And an American who is proud of being a Texan, or an American who is proud of being of Irish ancestry; a Britisher who is proud of his Welsh culture or his Scottish history and walks the Glens of Scotland joyously breathing Scottish air, are no different from Zulus, Xhosas, Vendas, Sothos and others, whose sense of identity and whose sense of purpose in the struggle for liberation are enhanced by their historical and cultural tap roots. It is only debasing apartheid ideology which identifies man's love for the soil of his ancestors with the horrors of degrading racism. Racism has got nothing to do with culture. White races are heterogeneous in their culture and freedom fighters are heterogeneous in their culture. There is no reason whatsoever why a racist Jew steeped in Jewish culture does not stand shoulder to shoulder with a racist Afrikaner, a racist Greek and a racist Englishman steeped in their culture. There is also no reason why a proud Zulu steeped in Zulu culture cannot stand side by side with a proud Xhosa, or a proud Tswana or a proud Sotho in vehement opposition to the horrors of White racism. White unity does not depend upon each ethnic component of the White race denigrating his past and being ashamed of his history. Apartheid has attempted to divide and rule and the SACC's miserable little booklet is little more than a monument to the success with which this divide and rule tactic of White politics has been achieved.

Throughout liberated Africa traditional institutions of social control are utilized by free and independent African governments in local and regional administration. Traditional administration is deeply democratic and is as amenable as Western institutions of administration to the expression of human values and the dispensing of real justice. Those who bandy the word 'Bantustan' around participate in the divide and rule tactics of the Government. They use the word to separate urban people from rural people and make them different kinds of people. When every Black who uses the word 'Bantustan' tries to hide the fact that he or she lives in apartheid society, they try to hide the fact that the Government's homeland policy is a policy which applies to every Black man, woman and child in the country. The homeland policy is imposed on all Blacks, wherever they eat, live, sleep and die. When we live, eat, sleep and die in KwaZulu, we are no different from somebody who lives, eats, sleeps and dies in Soweto. Soweto is just as much a creation of the homeland policy as so-called homelands. Every Black township is the creation of White apartheid ideology. Apartheid laws apply uniformly across the whole of Black South Africa. Some of the so-called homelands such as KwaZulu are creations of history and culture which existed long before Whites came to South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, terrible political discord is sown by some Blacks who live in privileged urban situations who regard themselves as superior to those who live in rural areas. There are countless thousands of urban Blacks who see themselves as the salvation of their backward Black rural brethren. The use of the term 'Bantustan' to despise us here in this Assembly, and millions of others, is no more than hurling the White man's political muck in our faces. Those who use it pretend that they are not as defiled by apartheid as those of us who live in rural areas of our land.

The report talks about homelands as ruled by Pretoria controlled Bantustan leaders propped up by their own bureaucracy, army and police force. They talk about Bantustan civil servant salaries being relatively high, and of these civil servants receiving numerous perks, such as shares in Development Corporation industries, preferential access to trading licences, large houses at subsidised costs and expensive cars. And the report says that as a result a class of people is emerging who are loyal to Bantustan leaders and can be relied on to support the status quo and repress local populations if necessary. This is the kind of poison which those who bandy the word 'Bantustan' around feed to the people. Heaven knows we struggle to get qualified and experienced people to work in the KwaZulu civil service, and we struggle because our salaries are so low, and our work conditions are sometimes so arduous, and we struggle because we cannot provide the housing that people need. The tarring of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly with the apartheid brush is despicable; and when this kind of denigration flows from the lips that pray in pulpits on Sundays with the people, then Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it becomes profanity.

We are accused in this report of being co-oppressors with the National Party and the South African Government. In talking about Black townships in urban areas, the report says that what they call Bantustan authorities impose restrictions similar to the restrictions imposed in White areas to prevent people from more remote areas moving to the commuter dormitory towns. They make us party to the horrors of apartheid society and they paint a picture of one in which we sanction so-called homelands being used as dumping grounds for the unemployed, the aged, and the sick. And they make us party to White political control over impoverished rural populations. The report paints a picture of homelands having no legitimacy; it paints a picture of unprecedented levels of rural dissidence by the people and the people's support for guerillas passing through, and it paints a picture of places like KwaZulu being rejected by the people. And the report paints a picture in which we in places like this Assembly accentuate differences

between people and erect barriers and close avenues of communication so that people become suspicious and antagonistic towards one another on a group basis. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in heavens name, how can those who in this booklet have been doing this very vile thing, turn to blame us for doing it?

In this whole miserable epistle of faulty thinking and vile accusations, there is no recognition whatsoever that we in this Assembly do such noble battle against the forces of apartheid that we do so 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and 52 weeks a year. There is no recognition for the fact that in almost countless thousands of words written and spoken, I have proclaimed that the homeland policy can be traced to White racism and White greed. There is no recognition in this miserable little booklet that I confront each and every year the captains of industry with the need to move away from unscrupulous capitalism. There is no recognition that I have again and again pointed out to capitalists that they have been part and parcel of the development of apartheid and that they must become instead part and parcel of the struggle for liberation if they are going to survive into the future. Again and again I have said to South African audiences, to the South African Government, to foreign ambassadors and to foreign ministers of the countries I visit, that apartheid has its roots in colonial history and that the international community in part bears the responsibility for what is happening in South Africa. There is no recognition that I have waged a relentless war against the horrors of the pass laws and against influx control measures. There is no recognition for the fact that I have vehemently opposed mass removals and the so-called cleaning up of Black spots for political purposes. There is no recognition for the fact that I confronted Dr. Koornhof with the dangers of continuing to apply influx control measures and pass laws. There is no mention of the fact that I have confronted South African Prime Ministers in eyeball to eyeball meetings on influx control and pass law issues. There is no recognition for the fact that I have slammed apartheid as a system in which there is no consultation with the people before measures are adopted which deeply affect the people. There is no recognition for the fact that I have slammed White South Africa for profiting from apartheid which establishes such disparities in the distribution of the country's wealth and which establishes vast throngs of oppressed Black people who are precluded from participating in the economic development of the country. There is no recognition for the fact that I have slammed the Government for trying to treat Black South African citizens in so-called homelands as a Western donor government treats Third World countries. There is no recognition for the fact that I have again and again proclaimed rural poverty and the prevalence of disease in rural areas as the price we Blacks pay as Whites enjoy their privileged positions. There is no recognition for the fact that I have again and again slammed the

Government for the disparity that exists between White and Black old age and disability pensions. I have slammed the Government's divide and rule policy, and I have sworn before the people in the hearing of the Government that we in KwaZulu will never ever take the kind of independence which has successfully been offered to Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there is no recognition for the fact that we here in this House wage a relentless war on apartheid and use this House as a political base from which we strive to establish a race free, open and democratic society in this country. There is no mention of the fact that I have repeatedly said that even if the people in Transkei and other places who have accepted so-called independence desired the kind of independence Pretoria has given them, they have no right to decide unilaterally to hive themselves off from the rest of their Black brothers and sisters in the country. I have again and again said that South Africa is one country, with one destiny and will eventually have one people with one government. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the report specifically mentions the Ingwavuma debacle, but there is not one word or one letter in this miserable little epistle of polluted clergy thinking that it was this House which led the struggle of the people to thwart the Government in its intentions. There is no word in the report that it was this House which fought the Government through to the Appellate Division and won on the Ingwavuma issue.

We must accept the harshness of the fact that this kind of slanderous attack on us is going to continue and will in fact become even more poisonous and virulent as time passes. This is the kind of poison which some of our clergy are dishing out to the people. Mr. Speaker, Sir, and Honourable Members, I have taken the time to look at this pamphlet rather than putting it next to the toilet bowl where it belongs because it illustrates what I have been saying earlier about our vulnerability to attacks if we do not step up our efficiency in communicating with the masses. Ordinary folk can be confused by these kind of attacks if we do not convey the truth to them ourselves. The mass media of this country is ever increasingly becoming the hand-maiden to those who dole out this kind of political poison.

The press continues to paint a distorted picture of what we are doing in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and in Inkatha. The terrible distortions which were printed about the tragic events on 29th October 1983 at the University of Zululand have never been corrected. And the press continues to give credibility to those who made such unfounded and wild accusations against Inkatha.

While the whole subject of the disturbances which did take place on the 29th October are still sub judice because a Commission of Enquiry has been appointed to investigate what actually happened, this House needs to be informed on developments at the University which affect our interests. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, you will remember that after the disturbances, we immediately called for a Commission of Enquiry into the whole affair. We requested the University Council to call for a judicial enquiry, and we appealed directly to the Minister of Education and Training to appoint such a Commission. The Honourable Dr. O.D. Dhlomo, the Minister of Education and Culture, the Honourable Dr. D.R.B. Madide, the Minister of Interior, and the Honourable Mr. H.T. Madonsela, Minister of Finance, held discussions with the Minister of Education and Training, the Hon. Mr. D.W. Steyn in Johannesburg on the 8th November. They presented a Memorandum to him. I believe it will serve a suitable purpose for me to read this Memorandum to the Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker, Sir, so that their memories are refreshed on some of the details. The Memorandum reads as follows.

"We declared 1983 to be the year of King Cetshwayo who is one of the most respected and revered Zulu Kings, and commemorative functions were held throughout KwaZulu at the national, regional and local levels. These functions were cultural functions of great value to us, and it was therefore natural that students at the University of Zululand should also want the opportunity of commemorating this great King. I was invited to address the students on this occasion and as is befitting for a University hosting a function like this, the public were invited to attend. The function was originally scheduled for November 5th, but in order to accommodate the needs of students who were due to write examinations on the 5th November, the date was changed to Saturday, 29th October.

Negotiations for this function commenced in April this year. It was widely known that the meeting was going to be held and detailed planning for it proceeded without a hint that a faction of the students would oppose it vehemently. By the beginning of the week of 24th October all preparations had been completed, communities throughout the length and breadth of KwaZulu and beyond had been invited to attend, and by mid week final plans for the transportation of the people who would attend the meeting had been completed. Opposition to the meeting by a faction of the students at the University were kept secret until after all arrangements had been made so that their opposition to the event would have the maximum possible disruptive value and the cancellation of the meeting which they planned for would have the greatest possible

embarrassing consequences for myself and Inkatha.

On Thursday, 27th October a faction of the students organised a boycott of lectures and demanded the cancellation of the function. On Friday those who opposed the function organised a student meeting, became rowdy and unmanageable, attempted to burn the office of Mr. Maphalala, a lecturer at the University because he is pro-Inkatha and police had to intervene to bring the situation under control. The small group of students who opposed my coming to the University and to the holding of a function, when they realised the University authorities would not ban the meeting, on Friday, 28th October sought a Supreme Court injunction to have the meeting cancelled.

On Saturday, the 29th October Inkatha youth who would be forming the guard of honour for my entry on to the campus began congregating in the University hall to practice their singing and to prepare for the formation of the guard of honour. When a sufficient number of Inkatha youth had arrived, they left the hall and began forming themselves into columns to practice the singing and the marching which they would be doing to honour myself and the King of the Zulus when we arrived. As is traditional in Zulu culture, boys and young men always have with them sticks which are part of the essential paraphernalia for traditional dancing. Most of the Inkatha youth who congregated came empty-handed and the only sticks they had were saplings and thin branches which they had plucked from the trees while on the way to the campus that morning. It would be culturally offensive for the youth to have been carrying spears and knobkerries, or any other lethal weapons, such as knives and pangas. The columns of youth, with their ceremonial sticks, began practicing their marching and their singing. It was at this point that the first hint of trouble arose. The student action on Thursday and Friday having failed, and the application for a Supreme Court injunction not having succeeded, the Inkatha youth who congregated on Saturday morning did not arrive prepared for the kind of onslaught which was to follow. As they began forming lines and marching, a faction of the students in the hostels began abusing them with vile language. At this stage, the youth had not yet formed themselves into solid lines and a scattering of Inkatha youth further away from the main body than most suddenly found themselves pelted with stones. This resulted in Inkatha youth consolidating their ranks but under instructions from their leaders they ignored the abuse and continued with their preparations. After they had formed up, they began marching and were then confronted by a group of students who had emerged from the hostels and who set about

hurling stones at the marching column. Inkatha youth broke ranks and retreated, and were pursued by students throwing stones; but when the hostile students had depleted their supply of stones, Inkatha youth turned and drove them back into the hostel. They then reformed to commence the preparations for this cultural event, only to find they were being pelted with stones and other missiles, such as plates and bottles, from the windows of the hostel. This attack on the Inkatha youth was far more serious because stones, missiles and bottles hurled down from a height amount to lethal attacks. Once more the Inkatha youth retreated, to be pursued yet again by students who once more emerged from the hostels. Understandably at this juncture, Inkatha youth were thoroughly angry and turned upon the students who had emerged from the hostel and defended themselves with the sticks they had to hand for ceremonial purposes. Having chased the youth into their hostel once already only to find themselves in a more precarious situation, Inkatha youth naturally pursued the students into the hostel and up the stairs.

In this violent confrontation, there was a tragic loss of life, for which I and Inkatha have been roundly condemned. Two questions are of crucial importance. The one question is the question of whether Inkatha youth in responding to attacks on their lives and attacks on their honour used more violence than was necessary to secure their persons and honour; and the second question is who was to blame for the violence confrontation.

The degree of violence used by Inkatha youth

Inkatha were not carrying lethal weapons and in the melee which followed the second student attack on them, they set about beating whoever was in front of them until the student concerned fled out of reach or fell down to the ground. Mr. Minister, Sir, a student thus vanquished was not tagged so all could see and when a student who had been beaten once and had fallen down arose again, and was seen by another Inkatha youth as a dangerous adversary he may have been beaten again. Or a student who had fled may have met another Inkatha youth and also beaten again. In the circumstances which prevailed, no Inkatha youth could possibly know how many times any particular student had been beaten, and the accumulated assaults on many students therefore did greater damage than any one single Inkatha youth intended inflicting on a student. And it is also natural, Sir, having experienced the damaging attack from students at hostel windows, Inkatha youth who pursued the students into their hostels and along the

corridors and into their rooms were aware that if they did not rout the students, they would again reform for a third attack. In these circumstances, Mr. Minister, the damage to life and limb which did in fact occur must be seen as tragic, but by no stretch of the imagination can they be seen as the wilful employment of force beyond reasonable bounds. I would like also to argue, Sir, that the evidence of violence is commensurate with what actually happened and commensurate with the chronicle of the events in this Memorandum. The students who fled into the hostels turned all the water taps and showers in the building on; there was a great deal of water everywhere and what blood was spilt was swept far and wide by the water and blood-stained water was obviously splashed by running feet and falling bodies. The damage to furniture and fittings is also commensurate with the events as described here. The extent to which casualties were inflicted on students and the extent to which Inkatha youth got off fairly lightly, even though one of our number actually died in the events, is due to the fact that strategically sticks are more effective than stones because sticks can be used in a running battle where stones can only be used from stationary entrenched positions. The fact that the students suffered greater damage is therefore explained without having to resort to vile accusations that the students were attacked by trained Inkatha imps carrying spears, axes, bush knives and knobkerries.

Mr. Minister, Sir, I hold a responsible position in society, and knowing that a Commission of Inquiry is going to investigate the whole tragic affair, it would be more than my reputation is worth to distort the facts to you. The facts hopefully will come out and I am giving you this brief summary of the events and the degree of violence which was used, so that you may better understand our point of view.

A faction of the student body was responsible for the events

Any University has a dual responsibility of high education and the serving of community and national needs. The University of Zululand by its very name should serve the needs of the Zulu people and the function which was held on Saturday, 29th was a cultural commemoration of King Cetshwayo. For us it was a Zulu national and cultural event; it was non party political and it is most fitting that the University of Zululand should participate in Zulu cultural events. Those who opposed the function in the manner in which they did so, violated the integrity of the University and violated the rights of the Zulu people to pursue cultural objectives at

the University. Not only were the faction of the students who opposed the function responsible for the violence because they had no right to oppose it in the way they did in the first place, but they were also responsible for the kind of violence and the degree of violence which eventually materialised when they initiated the use of force in an attempt to drive Inkatha youth off the campus. The whole tragic event must thus in the first place be laid at the door of that faction of students who were the prime actors in the events which initiated the aggression and the defensive and pre-emptive action which followed.

Wider responsibility

I believe Mr. Minister, Sir, that the behaviour of a faction of students at the University must be put into perspective in the wider context of the history of the University and of the society in which we live. We live through difficult times and I sympathise with authorities at the University of Zululand who have to both maintain order on the campus and pursue the ideals of a relatively new and emerging University.

The University of Zululand has produced clearly the most violent University campus in South Africa, and I believe that University authorities have been driven by unruly element to follow policies of student appeasement which is enabling a veritable tradition of student violence to be established on the campus. The kind of freedom which university students are entitled to should be a freedom which is both afforded to them and earned by them. University freedom ceases to be freedom when it is abused to the extent that it has been abused at the University of Zululand. There has been a long history of violence and destruction of property more than any other University in South Africa. Violence on this campus has become a pattern and a tradition, e.g.:-

- (a) When Dr. D.R.B. Madide, now the Minister of Interior in my Cabinet, was a student at the University of Natal in 1963, he recalls that the bus was stoned and one student very seriously injured when he visited the University of Zululand for sports.
- (b) Last year two students died of violence at the University of Zululand following inter-student fights. This had nothing to do with politics.
- (c) In 1976 it is known that when I went to the University of Zululand to receive an honorary degree, I and my

entourage were severely maltreated. Later the same year, the University was put to flames and attempts to murder White staff members were made.

- (d) In 1977 Dr. Madide was a guest speaker at a nurses' function held at the University of Zululand and after the function, he was violently confronted by a group of students, numbering about a dozen, who implied that he had no business to set foot on the campus.
- (e) In 1981, Dr. B.S. Ngubane, who is a member of the University Council and who holds a clinic within the campus, had his car severely damaged by stoning and barely escaped with his life, again for no rhyme or reason.
- (f) Earlier this year a public meeting in which Dr. O.D. Dhlomo, the Minister of Education and Culture in my Cabinet was taking part was violently disrupted by students.
- (g) On the 16th June the Diocesan Bishop of Zululand, the Rt. Reverend L.B. Zulu, was invited to conduct a service at the University Chapel and was abused and left without officiating. ANC songs were sung. The same happened with Mr. J.K. Ngubane, who is in my Bureau of Communication, and was in exile for many years.
- (h) I cannot recount all episodes of serious fighting and destruction of buildings on the campus. Stonings, arson, assaults and even alleged rapes from this University are reported with monotonous regularity.

I respect Professor Nkabinde as a man and a scholar, but quite clearly he has not been able to come to grips with some of the real needs of the University. I believe the University Council should already have taken the kind of steps which would have obviated events of Saturday, the 29th October, and I believe that the lecturers at the University have also been intimidated by the students and some of them actively contribute towards student militancy. In broad context a faction of the student body is attempting to make the University of Zululand a no-go area for myself and Inkatha, and in this endeavour there has been a long history of Black student organisation and Black political organisation involvement in assisting a faction of the students to turn the University into a fortress of vibrant opposition to me and KwaZulu.

It is tragic that staff and University pressure is building up to secure the dismissal of Mr. Maphalala as a lecturer and to entrench the positions of Mr. Ndlovu and Professor Ernest Mchunu. It would appear to me that Mr. Daphne and Mr. Gilbert also employ their positions at the University to further their political activism which is directed against me. Also, the Assistant Registrar, Mr. Joshua Ntuli and the chief Warden, Mr. John Mchunu. The violence which is emerging as a tradition at the University of Zululand, is therefore emerging against the background of the inability of the University authorities to control affairs there and against the background of staff members who actively oppose me politically.

The events on Saturday, the 29th October indicate the truth of what I am saying but they do more than this, they also indicate the extent to which the University is moving into a position of confrontation with the very communities which it should be serving. I would, Mr. Minister, like to convey to you the deep sense of indignation which is now emerging in KwaZulu society. There is emerging among the ordinary people attitudes of disgust and intolerance for the University of Zululand, and unfortunately if matters are not set aright, the University will find itself under siege by the community itself. I, Mr. Minister, face a very difficult situation. On no single occasion have I or Inkatha attempted to dictate to the student body what students should think or believe. I command the kind of massive power in KwaZulu which I could quite easily have employed to disrupt University meetings attended and addressed by people who are not only opposed to me but who oppose me with a fervour characterised by hate and vitriol. I have respected the role of the University in the midst, and I have done everything in my power to encourage academic freedom on the campus to allow our young men and women to form their own opinions about life and politics. I am a democratic leader, and Mr. Minister, Sir, I would find it extremely difficult to take active steps against the community in which the University serves, should their intolerance of the violence at the University lead them to demand what amounts to only normal access to a university and the freedom to participate in its life. I cannot tell my people to observe the University campus as a no-go area for them and I can only back community demands on the University which are no more than normal.

The KwaZulu Legislative Assembly debated the issue and adopted the following motion:

"As a direct consequence of the tragic events of the last weekend at the University of Zululand where lives were lost and serious injuries sustained and also:

Having regard to repeated episodes of violence directed against KwaZulu leaders and citizens,

This Legislative Assembly moves that the advisability be considered that the Central Government Minister of Education and Training be approached as a matter of the utmost urgency with a request that a commission of enquiry led by a judge be instituted to, among other things:-

Inquire into and report on and make recommendations on:-

1. The causes and course of the violence that took place on the campus of the University of Zululand on Saturday 29th October 1983.
2. The predilection for violence on the part of the students of the University of Zululand.
3. The ability or lack of same on the part of the authorities of the University of Zululand to establish and maintain discipline and security at the University.
4. The need or otherwise of determining and fixing a well-defined catchment area for the University of Zululand and accepting only a fixed and limited number of students from outside this catchment area.

The House agreed.

We would obviously welcome the most exhaustive enquiry possible and have written to both Professor Wiehahn and Professor Nkabinde requesting a full Inquiry into the affairs of the University of Zululand and I attach copies of this correspondence for your convenience.

This motion was unanimously adopted and the very strong support for it in the debate indicated the seriousness of the

problem.

My difficulties are compounded when we look at the political situation. The University of Zululand exists in the midst of my people, and politically I would have no option but to participate in its complete isolation should all else fail. Politically I cannot tolerate the University being developed as a no-go area for me and the people of KwaZulu and our ultimate tactic which God forbid should ever be necessary, will be to demarcate a border area right round the University as a no-go area for the University and to put the University under total siege. While the University is in KwaZulu, it remains under the control of the Department of Education and Training, and I believe, Mr. Minister, that you and I have a joint responsibility in looking at the problems we face, and I plead for the maximum degree of co-operation between us to put an end to what is clearly an intolerable situation for KwaZulu.

There has been a call on me to resign as Chancellor and Mr. Minister I would resign gladly and voluntarily if this would contribute towards an improvement in the situation. If, however, I believe as I do that I can play a vital role in the emergence of a great university in our midst, it would be irresponsible of me to shirk my duty and to resign because some want to compromise the very ideals a University should stand for. Should I be forced to resign by you, Sir, there will be an overwhelming reaction on the part of KwaZulu society and it would be better then for you to remove the University entirely from KwaZulu.

I am aware, Sir, that a Commission of Inquiry has been called for by the Council of the University of Zululand, and that you will be awaiting its findings with interest. I must, however, impress on you Sir that the violent factions amongst the student body and politically inspired action amongst them are not going to wait the outcome of the Inquiry. I have received threats of reprisals in the form of the death of my own children and I believe that the students at the University are even now working in collaboration with a number of political organisations, and the External Mission of the African National Congress, to secure retribution for the death of students and the political defeat they suffered when they failed to disrupt the King Cetshwayo celebrations. And yet there was also the death of two Inkatha youth. I more than you, Sir, am faced with an ongoing situation. I will not presume to tell the proposed Commissioners of the Inquiry how

to behave, but wide ramifications of the events on the 29th October, and an intricate political background in which they take place, cannot successfully be disposed of in time to ensure a new start in the 1984 academic year. I believe it highly desirable for the University authorities, for you Sir, and myself now actively to co-operate to bring about the circumstances which will enable us to make a new start next year. We have to review the advisability of conducting examinations for students in January and we may have to review the proposed opening dates for the new academic year.

I believe one of the things which should be attended to in preparation for the opening of the 1984 academic year is the question of security on the campus. I, as the Chancellor of the University, believe that in the current circumstances we have to think in terms of introducing effective security measures at the University. The University's security personnel should be considerably strengthened and only bona fide students should enjoy free and open access to the University hostels after hours and that the admission of students next year should be the admission of students only and not of the so-called professional students who have a history of failing which proves that they are not at the University to further their education. Students who fail their semesters and should go, continue to live within the University. They are planted youth who pose as students, but who represent political organisations on the campus.

The use of police to maintain University discipline is obviously highly undesirable and the University should have its own internal security system strong enough to ensure order on the campus. The police should be called only if the security officers at the University feel they are needed.

There is a spirit of challenge to the University in the KwaZulu air and there is amongst a faction of the students and a range of black political bodies a determination to regroup and to come forward with action which will further establish the tradition of violence at the University aimed at controlling it for political purposes."

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI
CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA
CHAIRMAN THE SOUTH AFRICAN
BLACK ALLIANCE

ULUNDI
7TH NOVEMBER 1983

A one man Commission of Enquiry was appointed and Mr. Justice Neville James was nominated by the South African Government to establish what actually had transpired on October 29th 1983. Before the Commission got off the ground, however, it was reported in the daily press on the 29th March that the Commission had been called off. I see it as ominous that the South African Government no longer intends to enquire into the causes of the continuing disturbances at the University of Zululand. I think it is also ominous for us that the South African Government has decided that a routine police enquiry leading to an inquest, is all that is required. The South African police force is just not equipped with the kind of skills which a judicial commission of enquiry has. If ever there was a need for a judicial enquiry into an ongoing problem of national magnitude, it is the need to enquire into the affairs of the University of Zululand.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourble Members, this House must debate the issue and we must decide what representations to make to the South African Government. It is in the interests of national reconciliation and the avoidance of escalating Black/Black conflict that we once and for all diffuse the situation at the University of Zululand. I look forward to hearing what the wisdom of the Members is, Mr. Speaker, when the issue is debated after I have delivered my Policy Speech.

This House must be made aware of the fact that those elements of Black disunity who tried to drive us off the Campus on the 29th October last year are still hard at work trying to sow discord on the Campus. A faction of the student body under the influence of AZASO, AZAPO and the UDF, and in the background under the influence of the ANC's Mission in Exile, are working assiduously to denigrate us on the Campus and to swing student opinion against us. They continue issuing derogatory pamphlets such as the following:

BOYCOTT-THE GRADUATION CEREMONY
A CALL TO THE GRADUANTS AND OUR PARENTS FROM
THE STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

The hand of Chief Gatsha Buthelezi who is still the Chancellor of this university are still red with blood of our four brothers who were brutally and mercilessly killed by his warriors. Chief Buthelezi marvelled at the trauma as he claimed that it was done in defence of his honour and that of the king.

Brothers and sisters, sons and daughters of the soil, our parents and respected members of the community, the purpose for the graduation ceremony is to congratulate our brothers and sisters who have climbed up the balcony to success, to encourage undergraduates and to thank our sponsors.

NOT TO HAVE THE CAMPUS SWARMING WITH INKATHA IMPIS

Staff members of the varsity, our parents and innumerable members of the community in a number of organisations have called for the immediate resignation of the Chancellor Gatsha Buthelezi. But have been doomed to disappointment because he still holds office.

Inkatha is all out to demonstrate its senseless brutality to all those who differ with it except the whites. So no student is safe and will be safe during the graduation ceremony. Even some of our lecturers feel the same. Let us be united more than ever and in unity sound the clarion of AWAY with racist gestapo regime and its puppets Gatsha Sebe Matanzima Mphephu Mangope and others.

BOYCOTT THE GATSHA GRADUATION CEREMONY - FOR YOUR SAFETY

YOU ARE URGED TO BOYCOTT THIS GRADUATION CEREMONY

We are still faced with the fundamental problem of having a University in our midst which should serve the community in which it exists but which is used as a breeding ground for Black dissent and is used as a place from which forces of disunity emanate.

I have raised certain matters which arise in this circular letter with Professor Nkabinde. I believe it is only in ongoing dialogue between ourselves and the University authorities that the fundamental maladies at the University will ever be rectified. We must pursue this dialogue. It is no use letting sleeping dogs lie when you know that they can leap up at any time to snarl and snap at your heels.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it is intolerable that a faction of dissident students at a University in our midst should go on carrying political vendettas against us from within a situation of anarchy which they are maintaining on the University Campus. At this stage we will reserve our right to take whatever action we feel is in the interests of KwaZulu, but we will as far as possible refrain from reacting to the situation on the Campus

until the appointed Commission makes its findings known.

The problems of the University are just symptomatic of the kind of discord which is sown in Black society by our Black political enemies. This House will remember that towards the close of the last session, we invited Mr. Archie Gumede and the Executive of the United Democratic Front to come here to Ulundi to discuss the whole question of Black unity with us. Mr. Gumede replied in a Telex addressed to me as follows:

UNITED DEMOCRATIC FRONT, PO BOX 48060, QUALBERT, DURBAN 4078,
TO CHIEF M.G. BUTHELEZI, PRESIDENT OF INKATHA

Dear Sirs

The extremely serious consequences of the wave of violence and death which has swept through the Black community in the preceding weeks compel me to write to you in your capacity as President of Inkatha.

If this aggression is allowed to remain unchecked the people of this province and possibly the country as a whole may be engulfed in internecine strife which will have disastrous effects in the struggle of freedom from racial injustice and exploitation.

It is quite clear from the sequence of events during the past three weeks that senior officials and affiliate organisations of the United Democratic Front (UDF) have been singled out as targets for intimidation and physical attacks by persons associated with your organisation.

Prominent among these are the loss of life at the University of Zululand, the intimidation at KwaNzimela and the unbridled show of force and violence at Mpumalanga. This is particularly abhorrent because of the peaceful and solemn and religious nature of these occasions.

The UDF condemns in the strongest and most unequivocal terms violent confrontations among the oppressed. These strengthen the cause of the ruling class and dilute the energies of the downtrodden masses.

The primary objective of the UDF is to mobilise opposition to the implementation of the Constitution Act and Koornhof Bills which entrench apartheid and militate against the attainment of democracy in our country. These events divert our resources away from the main thrust against racism and lead to

undesirable Black on Black confrontation. As the leader of your organisation it is your duty to condemn openly and publicly such violence. It is especially so because of your avowed rejection of violent methods.

There is a clear contradiction between the simultaneous escalation of violence and your attempts to open negotiations with the UDF.

At this point in time your letter to us is being circulated among our different constituent organisations for discussions. This atmosphere of tension created by recent events results in furthering the existing suspicion and distrust. The immediate cessation of hostile acts against our members and affiliates will result in a diminution of this suspicion and distrust.

Yours sincerely

SIGNED

A. GUMEDE, PRESIDENT OF UDF

I in turn replied in the following words:

"I wish to thank you most sincerely for your telex dated the 28th of November. I am extremely impressed Sir, by the sense of responsibility which has motivated you to write to me on such an important issue, which threatens to embroil us in a black civil war.

I and Inkatha are quite prepared to co-operate with you and the United Democratic Front in diffusing the present explosive situation.

I and Inkatha are committed to peaceful change and we remain committed to the peaceful strategy in spite of the tragic events which involved violence which have occurred at Lamontville and at the University of Zululand.

I do not think that this is the time of apportion blame. The correct way of looking at the scenario we face, is to start with events at Lamontville. At Lamontville several of our people have lost their lives. People have been injured, maimed and murdered and this has been going on for more than a year. More people have lost their lives at Lamontville than those who lost their lives at the University of Zululand. A

prominent member of the United Democratic Front, the Revd. Mcebisi Xundu has been involved in activities which have resulted in violence, including the burning down of vehicles and buildings. During the course of these very activities my name and Inkatha's name have been abused and I have been villified. These activities included a meeting at Lamontville which was held in the Revd. Xundu's church, after which my effigy was burned. When people in Lamontville tried to hold a meeting to resolve their problems, the Lamontville Youth attacked them, assaulted them with stones, burned down cars and houses. Lives were also lost. These are young people who accept the leadership of the Revd. Xundu. Certain members of Inkatha were attacked and were amongst those whose vehicles and houses were burned down.

The events of the 29th of October have merely added more fuel to the fire. It was UDF students who objected to my visit to the University of Zululand to attend a cultural function, at which my great grandfather King Cetshwayo was being commemorated. His Majesty the King of the Zulus was also attending and this was known to all and this was no constraint to those who orchestrated opposition to the holding of King Cetshwayo's memorial function in my presence.

It was UDF students who authored scurrilous attacks in hand-written posters on me for some days before the 29th of October. It was the same UDF students who tried to burn down the office of Mr. J.S. Maphalala a lecturer, who is also a member of Inkatha Central Committee. It was a demonstration against my visit on the 28th October organised by UDF students which forced members of the South African Police to use tear gas at the University to quell these disturbances. It was the same COSAS students and other affiliates of UDF who went to "The City Press" to issue a statement to the effect that I must "keep off the campus" and who threatened that there would be violence if I came. Neither Inkatha nor I had done anything to provoke all that. Violence in fact did erupt on the 29th of October in which some students including Inkatha members were injured and also lost their lives.

It was the UDF students who threw stones at members of Inkatha Youth Brigade who were innocently singing and marching towards the Bhhekuzulu Hall for the function to commemorate King Cetshwayo on the 29th of October. The UDF students called me by my pet name "Gatsha" and called me "a dog" and "shit."

The KwaNzimela incident is also being deliberately distorted by ABRESA also prompted by the Revd. Mcebisi Xundu, a member of UDF. This was meant to give credibility to the lies that are being spread that Inkatha as a movement has now become

violent, which is just not true at all.

As far as events at Mpumalanga are concerned it is a fact that while you Mr. Gumede and Mrs. Mxenge were speaking, no one interfered at all. It was because my name was again introduced and abused by the Lamontville youth, who were bussed to Mpumalanga for your political meeting, that members of the audience objected. But in order to again to give credibility to the lie about Inkatha now resorting to violence, the events at Mpumalanga are being deliberately twisted to present us both here and abroad as aggressive and violent. Again Revd. Xundu was involved in the organising of the meeting at Mpumalanga.

I mention all these things because of the paragraph in your telex to the effect that "It is quite clear from the sequence of events during the past three weeks that Senior Officials and Affiliate organisations of the United Democratic Front (UDF) have been singled out as targets for intimidation and physical attacks by persons associated with your organisation."

No amount of exaggeration will convert the lies that are being peddled around about us into truth. If we decided to indulge in acts of violence as your telex alleges Sir, you know very well at your age and having been brought up in this Province, that if I unleashed violence through my organisation or through the Zulu people as Chief Minister, all that has happened so far would be like a Sunday School children's picnic. This is just a fact you know well in your heart of hearts.

I am as pained as you are by Black on Black confrontation. But we are not aggressors and no acts of violence took place at KwaNzimela and these allegations about KwaNzimela and Mpumalanga we throw back at the authors of these allegations with the contempt they deserve.

We however accept that there was conflict and I do agree that you and I have a responsibility to diffuse what is happening.

But even as I write this it is still fresh in my mind that on the 11th of November, when I went up to Pietermaritzburg to perform the official opening of the Edendale Bakery UDF members held meetings at the Ecumenical Centre to plan disrupting the function. Plans were discussed to include 5 coffins in the demonstration in an oblique way to depict me as being responsible for the deaths that took place at the University of Zululand. I thank God that they abandoned these plans because I feel certain that if they had done so more

lives would have been lost on that day as these insults are extremely provocative.

I and Inkatha reject apartheid as much as you and UDF do. We reject the new constitution just as you and UDF do. I campaigned against this single-handed as everyone knows during the recent referendum. This is now history.

I condemn black on black confrontation whenever and wherever it occurs. It was I alone, no one went up with me to Mzimhlophe in Soweto in 1976 to stop a blood-bath caused by such black on black confrontation. This is now history.

We reject violence unreservedly. But we reserve the right to defend ourselves, our families, our members and our honour from whoever attacks us. As I write this message to you I am informed that certain members of UDF are collecting a hit list and marking houses of members of Inkatha which they intend bombing with bombs before Christmas. This necessitates us meeting specifically to discuss the matters you raise if you are as genuinely concerned as I think you are about these black on black confrontations.

In the meantime I would be grateful if you warned members of UDF affiliate organisations against abusing my name and insulting me by using my pet name 'GATSHA' which Zulus, not just Inkatha members, find to be extremely insulting and provocative and calling me all sorts of names.

Furthermore members of UDF should be made to understand that there is just no way in which they can establish "no-go areas" for me as President of Inkatha and as Chief Minister of KwaZulu particularly here in Natal and KwaZulu. Any efforts to do so will inevitably cause bloodshed and as I and Inkatha do not prevent UDF members from going about as they please, I expect them to give me the same liberty to move freely. It is sufficient that the White man has already restricted my movements through pass laws as a black man. But there is no way in which other blacks whoever they may be are going to tell me not to move freely in this land and to speak where I am asked to speak. This is an infringement of my democratic right. Any such efforts may cause loss of life and this is something we must understand between ourselves as black leaders and as black organisations.

I regret to learn from your telegram that you view us with distrust and suspicion. It is your democratic right to do so. But when all these things are hurled at me, it must be remembered that they are hurled at every member of Inkatha and against every members of the South African Black Alliance and

against the Zulu people who elected me as their Chief Minister. In spite of that suspicion and distrust I still believe that if we are true patriots we must meet and talk about our differences. We cannot sort these out through correspondence and by shouting at each other from various platforms.

I would be grateful if we held a special meeting to discuss the matters you raise in your telex.

Again I thank you for your initiative.

Yours sincerely in the struggle for liberation."

To date Mr. Gumede has not informed us of whether or not he has in fact laid the matter before the different constituent organisations of the UDF, or what the UDF's final response to our invitation is.

We do know that the UDF is working day and night to discredit Inkatha and the KwaZulu Government, and are doing whatever they can to persuade churches and donor organisations both here and abroad that we are sell-outs who are betraying the cause of liberation in this country.

We are again facing the same kind of cacophony of voices ranting and railing at us which we experienced in the 1976/78 period. The UDF represents a realignment of the kind of forces which were operative then and which so failed the Black people of South Africa. The same forces will fail again if the UDF continues along the vein which has characterised its activities since its inception. In their denigration of us and in their divisive politics, they have allies in AZASO, AZAPO and elements in the South African Council of Churches. The mass media is painting the kind of picture of us which is leading such groups as NUSAS and the Black Sash to climb on the little rickety UDF bandwagon.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I bring these facts to the attention of the House because we must be aware to what extent some Black individuals and some Black organisations are doing the Government's dirty work for them, as they act as divisive elements in the Black struggle.

I must say that at this stage there appears to be little hope that the United Democratic Front will respond positively towards our insistence that Black unity in the struggle is of paramount importance. It would appear to me that the UDF is bent upon trying

to establish its pre-eminence by indulging in that sordid Black political past time of denigrating me and Inkatha. Despite the fact that we took the initiative to approach Mr. Archie Gumede on the question of Black unity, the UDF published a pamphlet which amounts to a typical Black consciousness type scathing attack on us. They have disseminated this pamphlet widely, and it is even doing the rounds in Europe. This House should be aware of what the UDF is saying, and I will therefore read the contents of this pamphlet.

WHAT IS INKATHA UP TO?

Buthelezi's Inkatha claims to be a 'national cultural liberation movement' working within the system 'for the ultimate and complete liberation of our country.'

This is how Inkatha justifies its taking part in KwaZulu bantustan politics. But despite the fancy talk, by taking part in bantustan government, Inkatha also takes part in:

- Administrating migrant labour and labour bureaus, i.e. cheap labour in South Africa.
- Accepting - and in some cases even collaborating in - the forced resettlement of thousands of people into Kwazulu.
- The policing of KwaZulu.

By controlling the KwaZulu government, Inkatha controls:

- Pensions, grants and passes.
- Land allocation in rural areas.

(This is why Inkatha is stronger in the rural areas than it is in the towns).

- Education.

(Inkatha's own syllabus indoctrinates students and this is why one third of Inkatha's members are youth).

- Jobs and promotion.

(In KwaZulu all teachers and civil servants have to be members of Inkatha).

Inkatha says it will not take part in the new community

council elections. Its reason is that the Government says these elections are a substitute for Africans voting in the central government.

But in fact, the Government also often says that bantustans are the political solution for Africans. So Inkatha has double standards. It does not take part in community councils, but it certainly does take part in bantustans.

By making propaganda about its boycott of community councils, Inkatha is hiding its collaboration with the wider apartheid system.

Why does Inkatha take part in bantustans but not community councils? The answer is because Inkatha has seen that the community councils are totally powerless bodies.

But the KwaZulu government on the other hand does give Inkatha some real power. Not great power, but enough for Inkatha to boost its membership.

Buthelezi says that Inkatha is working for unity in the liberation struggle. But Inkatha's actions against people opposing apartheid speak louder than words:

- 1973: Buthelezi expelled a cabinet minister who supported the unions involved in the Durban strikes.
- 1976: Inkatha members said that bantu education was better than no education, when students around the country were resisting bantu education.
- 1980: Buthelezi refused to join the Free Mandela Campaign and at the same time said that Inkatha would contest and win an open election in this country.
- 1980: When 36 schools in KwaZulu went on boycott against bantu education, Inkatha impis beat up students and forced them back to school. Buthelezi said 'we need to create well-disciplined-and regimented impis.'
- 1983 May: several students injured by Inkatha members when they protested Buthelezi's presence on campus.
- 1983 September: Inkatha impis attacked Lamontville residents who rejected the incorporation of their town into KwaZulu.
- 1983 October: Inkatha members brutally assault a Zulu

chief who refuses to join Inkatha.

- 1983 October: Inkatha impis kill five students at Ngoye University and 15 others are hospitalised. The students were again opposing Buthelezi's presence on the campus.

Inkatha says that it shares the same aims as the ANC, and it has indeed taken over ANC colours, songs, symbols and uniforms. But Buthelezi has also publicly accused the ANC of 'betraying the trust that people had in them.'

He accused them of being 'the political tail that wags the dog of the African struggle.' And the Inkatha Youth Brigade has recently noted 'with utter disgust and repugnance the divisive role the external mission the ANC plays by arrogantly posing as the sole and authentic representative of black people and the government in exile.'

It also called the ANC 'a consortium of political miscreants thriving on sheer political pipe-dreams.'

Inkatha members have also given evidence for the state in security trials as in the recent case of Isaac Genu. In 1980 Buthelezi publicly named an individual as recruiting for the ANC.

Inkatha calls for unity, but up till 1979 only Zulus could be members of its central committee. Buthelezi speaks about the superiority of Zulus. Inkatha members have described the late Griffiths Mxenge as a 'Xhosa speaking Transkeian scavenger.'

Finally Inkatha has called the UDF arrogant and divisive.

All these actions have made Buthelezi and Inkatha unpopular and discredited. As a result Gatsha has had to look for new friends.

Most of these friends are conservative.

The Inkatha Youth speak at the Afrikaner Studente Bond conference. Inkatha is a member of the South African Black Alliance with the conservative Kangwane bantustan government and Indian Reform Party.

Buthelezi has also recently been having close talks with bantustan misleaders like Matanzima, and with the PFP.

Buthelezi himself has become more conservative as part of his wooing of his conservative friends. He has changed his position on disinvestment in South Africa, and now calls on

big business to help itself to 'problem-free labour resources' in KwaZulu.

Big business was also closely involved in the Buthelezi Commission. This commission rejected one-person-one-vote solution for South Africa and suggested a federal structure with protection for 'minorities' instead.

UDF, fourth floor, Khotso House, De Villiers Street, Johannesburg.

For the sake of posterity, I think we should also put on record in this House my reply to the vile charges in the pamphlet which I dealt with in an address on King Dingane's Day, 16th December 1983, which I delivered to an Inkatha meeting in Imbali, Pietermaritzburg.

"The very opening paragraph is vicious in its distortion of reality. The pamphlet says that by taking part in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, INKATHA also takes part in "administering migrant labour and labour bureaus, i.e. cheap labour in South Africa. Accepting - and in some cases even collaborating in - the forced resettlement of thousands of people in KwaZulu. The policing of KwaZulu." Every observer of the South African scene should know that every African, whether he is in Guguletu, Soweto, Gazankulu, KwaZulu or wherever, exist in the system of so-called homelands and so-called Black townships all created by apartheid. What they call the Bantustans are Pretoria creations and they add to the reality of these creations by their attack against me. For millions of people who live in KwaZulu, they live only in the land of their birth and in that part of South Africa into which their ancestors and their forefathers died. KwaZulu is our beloved soil, enriched with the blood of those who died for freedom and justice. I am unashamed of my heritage; I am unashamed of my culture, and in this place where my forefathers were born on the insistence of people like Chief Albert Luthuli, and by mass popular demand, I stepped into the arena where the battles of apartheid have been fought to erect there a final stumbling block to the fulfilment of the South African Government's homeland dream.

It is a lie to say I take part in providing South Africa with cheap labour. Every Sowetan who works for the meagre pittance many are offered could be said to be taking part in cheap labour. Every worker who has his reference book stamped could be said to participate voluntarily in apartheid

by anyone who wants to spread the poison of malicious distortion. KwaZulu has never forcefully resettled people; we have responded to the desperate pleas of thousands forced by South African laws off White farmland where their forefathers were born. They pleaded with us to give them somewhere to live and we have settled nobody anywhere against their will. We are not ashamed of doing the very best we can for people in terrible circumstances. Black South Africans have at times suffered terribly at the hands of the South African police enforcing the most heinous aspects of apartheid. We are not ashamed of having established a KwaZulu police force, operating in KwaZulu, assisting the people, fighting crime with them and becoming the friendly force of justice which every police force in the world should be.

The second paragraph of this scurrilous document continues the poison. It is a lie to say that KwaZulu controls passes; it is a distortion to say that the KwaZulu Government allocates land in rural areas. The land continues to be allocated along traditional lines the way it was done before apartheid came and the way in which it will have to continue to be distributed long after apartheid goes. It is a lie to say that INKATHA is stronger in the rural areas than in towns. It is a lie to state that education in KwaZulu indoctrinates students, and it is a lie to say that all teachers and civil servants have to be members of INKATHA. But lies repeated often enough become believed as truth. To me it is so tragic that those who attack me mislead the people by attempting to make them believe these lies.

My brothers and sisters, you know and I know that these lies are not anything other than dastardly lies. They are not only an insult to me; they are an insult to millions who support me. INKATHA is a mass movement of people marching towards victory in the struggle for liberation, supporting the time-honoured aims and objectives of the struggle. Those who write these scurrilous pamphlets insult each and every one of you for having joined INKATHA. They are more an attack against you than they are an attack against me. They attack you for being incredulous fools, and spread malicious lies about you across the whole world.

It is a pernicious political distortion to equate my involvement in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly with the involvement Blacks can now have in Black Community Councils. I am a hereditary chief in a long line of succession of those who have filled the position of Prime Minister to Zulu Kings. It is in response to this demand of my ancestry and in response to popular mass demand that I do not abandon the

people that I took up my political role in KwaZulu. That role was preordained for me long before apartheid emerged in this country. I was a Chief in my own right before the National Party ever dreamt of the current homeland policy objectives. I more than any other fought the introduction of homeland machinery designed by Pretoria. I stomped the length and breadth of KwaZulu leading the fight against the introduction of the Bantu Authorities Act, until in the end Pretoria told us we had no option and enforced their administrative machinery on us in the same way as they enforce township administration on people living in Black urban areas. It is a lie to say that INKATHA has got double standards because we will not take part in Community Councils but it participates in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. We occupy places in the Assembly because we will have no puppets foisted on us. We take part in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly to bind the people together in a massive throng of those who thwart the designs of apartheid.

It is a lie to say that we participate in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and not in the Councils because the KwaZulu Government gives us the real power to boost the membership of INKATHA, whereas the Councils are not a power base we can use to this end. INKATHA is born in the hearts and the minds of the people; it follows the noble traditions of the struggle which Black South Africa has pursued since the inception of the African National Congress in 1912. When we have triumphed over apartheid; when the pernicious homeland policy of the South African Government has been destroyed, INKATHA will remain on as an organisation of the people. INKATHA members join the Movement because they are true South Africans committed to the struggle and both because they support INKATHA's aims and objectives and because they support my leadership.

The pamphlet goes on to spread the lie that INKATHA undertakes actions against the people; it is a pernicious lie to say that I expelled a Cabinet Minister who supported the Unions involved in the Durban strikes. Mr. Dladla himself when he last spoke the truth refuted this allegation. It is a lie to say that we in INKATHA said that Bantu Education is better than no education; it is a terrible distortion so to misquote anything I have ever said. Every day of the year KwaZulu does whatever it can humanly do to improve education. One of the very first acts in the field of education that we undertook was to change the medium of instruction to English. This is the very antithesis of Bantu Education. I have repeatedly said, and the people themselves repeatedly say, that education for our children is one of our prime concerns. To learn to read and write is an essential

requirement in the struggle, in the same way as to eat is an essential requirement by those incarcerated in jail. Does a prisoner who eats the only food available to him become part and parcel of the forces which keep him in prison? We believe in the supremacy of the forces of justice in the human spirit; we believe that mankind was created with something indomitable in him, and we see this indomitable something emerge in all our great leaders. Chief Albert Luthuli, Nelson Mandela and Oliver Tambo are men who survived the inadequate educational facilities available to Black South Africans. My message to Black South Africa has always been that we must change schools; we must improve our educational system and we must not destroy the base from which we can do so. That base is the schools themselves. It is a malicious lie to distort this into saying that I accept Bantu Education. In KwaZulu, by controlling our education, we have in fact been able to move away from Bantu Education.

It is an absolute lie to say that in 1980 I refused to join the Free Mandela Campaign. I was never asked to do so, and everyone knows the simple truth of the matter. That truth is that the Free Mandela Campaign was a political gimmick devoid of any real intentions and that it was used in an attempt to get a demonstration of political support away from me. It is a terrible lie to say that INKATHA impis beat up students and forced them back to school. Everybody knows that the parents and residents of KwaMashu got sick and tired of being intimidated by physical violence and the burning of houses and the destroying of property by that small minority who were using the educational issue to further their political purposes. Community after community reacted against this intimidation. At no stage whatsoever have I ever sent any so-called impis against any children. The word 'impi' itself means war or warring factions. Inkatha has no such warring cohorts.

It is a lie to say that in September of this year, INKATHA impis attacked Lamontville. Residents who rejected the incorporation of their town into KwaZulu. Everyone knows that the Lamontville community approached the KwaZulu Government with the request that Lamontville be incorporated into KwaZulu, as far back as 1978. Everyone knows that the anger which erupted when rent hikes were forced on the people by the Port Natal Administration Board was used by a small clique in Lamontville to their own political advantages which has nothing to do with the people of Lamontville. Everybody knows that it was this clique, led by a man of the cloth, who incited the people to spread violent discord around them. Everybody knows that this clique hurled abuses at me until residents in Lamontville and INKATHA members in adjacent

hostels choked with indignation and everybody knows that even now in Lamontville there is a rising tide of indignation amongst the residents of Lamontville, determined to banish the scourge of divisiveness from amongst their midst.

It is a lie to state that in October 1983 INKATHA members brutally assaulted a Zulu Chief who refused to join INKATHA. Everybody knows that Chief Maphumulo has a long history of conniving with alien forces to embarrass me. Everybody knows of his involvement in the formation of the King Shaka Spear Party which was brought into being in connivance with what was then the Bureau of State Security. Everybody knows that Chief Maphumulo incurred the wrath of the people when he used money from Pretoria to fund the establishment of this party. Whatever happened to Chief Maphumulo in October 1983 has its roots in public indignation and not in INKATHA. It was Chief Maphumulo who used violence two months ago against certain members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. Membership of Inkatha was never an issue with us.

It is a blatant and pernicious lie to state that INKATHA imps killed five students at Ngoye University. Everybody knows that yet once again a faction of the students at the University goaded INKATHA youth into indignation and pushed them beyond the frontiers of their human endurance and initiated violence by following the hurling of abuse, with the hurling of stones, bottles and other missiles at INKATHA youth preoccupied at the University with a cultural event. Everybody knows that it was the goading of our youth to points beyond the limits of human endurance which gave rise to the youth reacting, and everybody knows that two INKATHA youth died there as a result of events instigated by a small group unrepresentative of the student body. It is a malicious and blatant lie to talk about those tragic events as events in which INKATHA imps killed five students. It is even idiotic to make these pronouncements after the Government has appointed a judge to hold an inquiry. Why prejudice the issue?

Everybody knows that I repeatedly crossed new frontiers and that I repeatedly broke new ground in establishing the credibility of the external mission of the African National Congress. In the early 70's when matters pertaining to the ANC were only whispered about in secret places, I went forth taking my future and my life in my hands to proclaim the fact that the mission was sent into exile as a response to inhuman treatment by the South African Government. Everybody knows that for years when all were mute on the subject I boldly and publicly sought support for the ANC's mission in exile from Western Governments. Everybody knows that in public speeches

both here and abroad I refused to condemn the ANC's choice of violence as a method in the struggle because it was foisted on them by the violence on the part of the South African Government. Everybody knows that at public meeting after public meeting I risked my political future and my liberty by boldly quoting passages from books and publications written by the ANC's leadership in South Africa while it was still illegal. Everybody knows that in the early 70's the great Black political vacuum drew into it opponents of the ANC from various so-called Black Consciousness organisations who were seeking to establish an independent third force in the country. Everybody knows how this contrasts with my and INKATHA's proclamation of the validity and the legitimacy of the aims and objectives of the founding fathers of the ANC. Everybody knows how for year after year I sent emissaries abroad and sought to establish working relations with the ANC's mission in exile in those matters where our aims and objectives were the same in programmes which could be legally executed in this country. The whole world, my brothers and sisters, was witness to these events, and the whole world was also witness to the fact that while I risked everything in these bold moves, one spokesman after another of the mission in exile attacked me and denigrated me. The whole world knows that in a desperate attempt to establish unity I took virtually the whole of INKATHA's leadership to London with me to formalise an understanding between INKATHA and the mission abroad. Everybody knows how Oliver Tambo himself and his acolytes used this bold and courageous attempt at unity as an opportunity to further reject me publicly and to escalate their attack on me.

I have repeatedly said in the past and I have no hesitation in saying again today that the ANC's mission abroad was sent out into the world as the servant of the people of South Africa. It is now an unfortunate truth that the mission abroad does not act as the servant of the people. INKATHA, which is now so dominantly supported by the very sentiment which established the international pre-eminence of Chief Albert Luthuli, is again and again attacked by the mission abroad. We are attacked because we are getting on with the job here where it matters most. It is unfortunately true that the mission in exile is the tail that wants to wag the dog.

It is a lie to say that I speak about the superiority of the Zulus. I certainly speak about the worthwhileness of the Zulus, as I speak about the worthwhileness of any true cultural group. That is part of the malicious lying by those who have nothing to offer themselves to stigmatize INKATHA as a Zulu tribalistic organisation.

The analysis of the South African political situation will be defective as long as the concept of tribalism is given such a loose and often derogatory connotation. By no stretch of the theoretical imagination can the Zulu nation be described as a tribe. In the first place the word 'tribe' is a European concept and is alien to our thinking. When White settlers penetrated into KwaZulu, KwaZulu was a vast kingdom comprising a great many communities and clans welded together into an independent state. The Zulu-speaking people of today have heterogeneous origins. One does not talk about Whites in the Free State as being a tribe. The origins of the people of KwaZulu are in fact as diverse as the origins of the White people of the Orange Free State. The underlying Nguni background of the people of KwaZulu does not distinguish them as a tribe. By far the vast majority of all Africans in South Africa are of Nguni origin. It is part of the poverty of White analytical thinking about South African politics to make racialistic distinctions in the classification of White people and Black people. KwaZulu was a kingdom in South Africa and what is now known as KwaZulu is no more than the bits and pieces of land which the White political system has allocated to people who speak Zulu.

Language does not prescribe what are known as tribalistic boundaries. Again, it would be an absurdity to call Afrikaners a tribe simply because they speak Afrikaans. The truth of the matter is that the word 'tribalism' is a swear word, borrowed by some spokesmen from the condescending and derogatory connotation in English and degraded by them to make it a word of abuse. It appals me that Black political thinking is so often contaminated by Blacks themselves by the adoption of distorting concepts used by Whites in the description of their apartheid South Africa. In a free and liberated South Africa, we will one day realise the immense value of indigenous cultures, but we will realise the value within the broader truth that culture, like the arts and knowledge, is a universal property and that the various indigenous cultures of the country shade one into the other across the spectrum of a common South Africanism. Cultures and ethnic origins should never be used by Black theorists to create the kind of artificial political entities which are in fact the product of apartheid.

It is also a terrible lie to talk about INKATHA and myself as being unpopular and discredited and now having to seek conservative friends. I have again and again said that I will speak to the devil himself if it will aid the struggle. I again and again have made the point that in South Africa we must either kill each other or talk to each other; and I make

it now again today that if we are going to have constructive change brought about by non-violent means, Blacks and Whites will have to negotiate a future. That negotiated future will never come as the result of all of us rushing off to some venue to sit around the table for the first time. I make no apologies on behalf of our youth for speaking to Afrikaner students. I have spoken to South African Prime Ministers; I have spoken to South African Cabinet Ministers; I have spoken to Afrikaner leaders of commerce and industry; I have addressed Afrikaner cultural organisations; I have addressed Afrikaans Universities and in whatever speech I make, or address I deliver, I speak publicly and unashamedly about the need to eradicate apartheid from our midst and to establish an open and just society. I will continue to talk to those who foist apartheid on us and I will continue to talk to people like Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima, and I will continue having discussions with the PFP, the NRP and the National Party itself. Those who are too frail to confront the Prime Minister on an eye to eye basis, and those who are too frail and who have too meagre a stature to talk to Afrikaners and their organisations, are also too frail to add their deeds to their sentiments and join the armed struggle. They are neither political fish nor fowl; they are neither hot nor cold and I spew them from my mouth. I will unashamedly pursue the objectives of achieving a non-violent settlement in this country. I will continue working every day of my life for a just society brought about by negotiation.

My stand on investment in this country has been documented with thousands of words delivered in numerous addresses to widely diverse audiences. In this scurrilous pamphlet the UDF says that I have changed my "position on disinvestment in South Africa and now call on big business to help itself to problem-free labour resources in KwaZulu." The UDF is now sinking as low as some of the propaganda attempts of the South African Government have sunk. Everyone knows how I have repeatedly called for responsible investment to keep body and soul together of those struggling to change this country. Everybody knows that I more than any other leader have repeatedly addressed businessmen both here and abroad on the whole question of industrial responsibility in this country. Everybody knows that I have again and again rejected ribald capitalism and warned industrialists that unless they throw their weight behind the struggle for liberation they will be committing commercial and financial suicide. I have said bluntly that if capitalism does not put its house in order the workers will do so for them. Everybody knows that I have fought a long and arduous battle against exploitative capitalism. In dozens upon dozens of addresses and in

thousands upon thousands of words, I could not have made myself plainer than I have done. It is a horrible distortion of what I stand for to say that capitalists are free to "help themselves to problem-free labour resources in KwaZulu."

The United Democratic Front appears rapidly to be sinking into the abysmal politics which emerged in the 1976/78 period to achieve nothing. The UDF appears to be rapidly losing an historic opportunity of establishing unity. The UDF stands in real danger of becoming only a paper organisation, living on the labours of the office bearers of its affiliate organisations. INKATHA's membership is a real membership of mass individual commitment by those who put their hands in their pockets, take out hard cash to back up their application for membership. INKATHA is not a paper organisation living on the labours of others. The course that UDF leadership is adopting in the writing these kind of scurrilous pamphlets, can only lead to the downfall and to the setting back of the clocks in the struggle for liberation. I repeat what I have said before. The ANC's mission in exile must be more aware that the armed struggle can never succeed without INKATHA's support. The South African Government must be aware that all their plans will come to nought without INKATHA's support. The UDF must be aware that it too will come to nought without INKATHA support. INKATHA is the largest Black political constituency ever created in the history of this country. We have as INKATHA a vital role to play in the struggle, and we will continue to play it.

My brothers and sisters, it is so doubly tragic that so many of those who purport to be in the struggle see INKATHA as an easy option and vent their spleen against it. It is tragic firstly because it is divisive and it is tragic secondly because every act of denigration against INKATHA gives a new lease of life for apartheid.

My brothers and sisters this scurrilous pamphlet appears in print at the very time at which I have sought reconciliation with the UDF. Only last month I wrote to Mr. Archie Gumede, as the President of UDF, holding out the hand of INKATHA friendship. This is what I said to him:

'I am writing to you as the President of the UDF formally inviting you and your Executive to come to Ulundi to explore with us the extent to which the goals we have in common demand a synchronizing of Black strategies and tactics.

South Africa has just seen Whites adopt a new

constitution which denationalises every African in the country. The White political solidarity in support of apartheid which the massive 'Yes' vote represents is historically the most determined expression Whites have ever evidenced to put Blacks into permanent political subjugation. I believe African brotherhood is a vital component of the brotherhood of all freedom-loving people in the country. I believe this brotherhood needs to be expressed and translated into the kind of united Black common purpose which history now demands of us.

The tragic events at the University of Zululand on October 29th have been used by some Blacks to sow the seeds of Black/Black confrontation. Some of those who are attempting to do so have used the name of UDF in their endeavours.

I believe that a discussion between yourself and your Executive, and myself and my colleagues, is urgently needed. I am therefore inviting you to address the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, either in caucus where whatever is said will be said in committee, or in an open session where the public and press could be present, on any date which suits you.

We have no illusions that the task we face to establish a united Black response in our shared commitment to eradicate apartheid in every form in which it is expressed presents us with an enormous task. We believe we should face the challenge of burying some of our differences and co-operating in the substantial area of common cause between us. From our side, we believe it is urgent for us together to examine what prospects there are of doing so.

Disunity and Black/Black violent confrontations can only strengthen apartheid's hand to suppress us as we dissipate the political forces which should be harnessed in the struggle for liberation.

I sincerely hope that you will respond positively to this invitation. UDF may not feel the need for an alliance with Inkatha for its own sake, and Inkatha does not feel the need for an alliance with UDF for its own sake. Black South Africa, however, demands a unity in the struggle which we must do everything we can to make a reality.

Black South Africa must judge whether this pamphlet is warranted in the light of my sincere approach to Mr. Gumede on

the question of Black unity.

I am appalled by the fact that so many people snipe at me in the name of the external mission of the ANC which for decades until recently has never treated my name abroad as dirt, as I have already indicated. I strongly resent the stance which the UDF have adopted in their overseas campaign of villification against me and INKATHA which is exactly along these lines. For example, in their pamphlet discussed above, they accuse me of having publicly named an individual recruiting cadres for the external mission of the ANC. I challenge the UDF to name such a person or face the fact that they are inveterate liars. The Inkatha members who are supposed to have called Griffiths Mxenge 'a Xhosa-speaking Transkeian scavenger' are not named either. I challenge UDF to state the names of the Inkatha members who did this. At the same time, I am being called worse things by UDF members, such as a Zulu 'sell-out' or 'shit.' They can really take advantage of the ignorance of people overseas to spread blatant lies."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it is quite clear to us what the game is that UDF are playing. As an organisation itself, it has no constituency and no power. It relies on riding on the backs of other Black organisations and on any political event in which the UDF can indulge in the politics of self-importance. It was Dr. Allan Boesak and UDF influences, such as the Revd. Mcebisi Xundu who created the whole ABRECSA fiasco. Honourable Members will remember that towards the close of our last Session, we were informed that the ABRECSA Conference would be taking place here in our part of the world.

Members will recall that we decided that Zulu etiquette demanded that the Honourable Dr. Madide should go to KwaNzimela on the opening night of the ABRECSA Conference formally to welcome the delegates to our area. Because the opening ceremony of such a conference is always a public event, a number of Members of this House expressed the desire to attend, both to participate in the welcome of the delegates and to listen to the opening address by Dr. Boesak. Members will remember that they went there and what transpired. Many of you, however, will not have had the opportunity to see the statement that the ABRECSA delegates issued about this event. I will read it to you.

"ABRECSA planned to meet at KwaNzimela near Melmoth in Natal, from Wednesday 16th to Sunday 20th November in order to work out the practical implications of the Ottawa Statement that

declared Apartheid to be a sin and its theological justification a heresy. The theme of the Conference was 'Deliver us from evil' and Dr. Allan Boesak, President of WARC and ABRECSA, was to have given the opening address.

On the 16th Conference convened comprising members of ABRECSA, denominational representatives from other S.A. Churches, a number of consultants, and delegates from the Reformed/Presbyterian Churches in U.S.A., U.K., N.L., West Germany and Switzerland. due to illness Dr. Boesak was prevented from attending, and because of inclement weather many people were delayed in arriving. The programme for that evening was therefore cancelled.

The Zululand Council of Churches informed the Secretary of ABRECSA the Revd. J-Francois Bill, that on their own initiative they had notified the KwaZulu Government of ABRECSA's Conference. The KwaZulu Government's response was to tell them that a government official would come to welcome the delegates. The Secretary expressed his disapproval at this initiative and stated that the very presence of such an official would be problematic, to say the least, because of ABRECSA's stand against Apartheid and the Bantustans.

Later that evening the Secretary was informed that Dr. D. Madide, Minister of Interior had arrived, accompanied by 2 busloads of Inkatha members, many of whom were in uniform. He was requested to come and speak to Dr. Madide and some Inkatha persons. In the discussion that ensued the Secretary informed the Minister that the evening's programme had been cancelled and expressed the view that if he returned later his presence would not be appreciated. Dr. Madide took exception to this and finally asserted that he would definitely come, whether welcomed or not, and only requested to be informed of a suitable time. The Secretary undertook to put the matter to the Conference and inform the Minister thereafter.

A number of uninvited young people claiming to be employees of the KwaZulu government sat in the dining room and helped themselves to Conference food.

After the Minister and the Inkatha people had left and when all the Conference delegates had arrived the matter was considered by the Conference. It was unanimously decided that because

- (a) the presence of large numbers of Inkatha was considered not only intimidating but also an invasion;
- (b) the attitude displayed was hostile and at times

aggressive, and, apart from the Secretary's discussion with Dr. Madide and others, there was little or no communication between delegates and Inkatha members;

- (c) some delegates believed that they were in imminent danger, and the possibility of potential danger to other delegates, could not be discounted, particularly in view of recent events such as Chief Maphumulo's case and the Ongoye incident.

It was deemed wise and necessary to leave forthwith and find an alternative venue, notwithstanding that this meant the cancellation of the whole programme as originally planned."

This Statement by the ABRECSA Conference which finally met in Durban was supplemented by a further Statement adopted by the all the Overseas Delegates to the Conference. Their Statement reads as follows:

"We, representatives of partner Churches in the Reformed tradition, and visiting South Africa from Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States wish to put on record the following experience which has been ours.

We were attending the 3rd Annual Conference of ABRECSA (Alliance of Black Reformed Christians in Southern Africa) which followed the important Ottawa Conference of the WARC (World Alliance of Reformed Churches) last year at which ABRECSA's President Dr. Allan Boesak was elected President of the WARC.

We arrived at KwaNzimela Centre in KwaZulu to participate in the conference and it soon became clear to us that the normative exercise of attending such gatherings in a recognised Centre at the Church was to be far from normal.

On arrival we saw a substantial number of people accompanying a Minister of the KwaZulu Government in two buses, many of them were wearing Inkatha uniform and we realised that they were not participants in the conference.

We became aware of an atmosphere of tension and fear within those gathering for the conference and learnt some had already left, fearing for their safety. We were informed that a visit through the Churches to the people of the surround area - a normal exercise anywhere in the world - was totally impossible

since the local Church people had been threatened and intimidated because of our conference.

We were then presented with the choice of cancelling the conference due to the impossible atmosphere and the clear danger of continuing, or continuing with the full realisation of the threat to the lives of some there, based on previous experience.

We accepted the decision of our South African friends to cancel the conference. We left the Centre in the middle of the night in a convoy of vehicles for self-protection.

All these experiences have provided us with conclusive evidence that the majority of South Africans live in a continual state of fear and tension not just from the Republic Government but also from the Government of the 'homelands' such as KwaZulu. Far from the image of the KwaZulu Government as independent of Pretoria we experienced it as a participant in the daily oppression of the people.

We wish to stand in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in Christ who bear the burden of the system, to share something of the pain of their experience, and to communicate in our Churches and countries the reality of the South African situation."

Adopted unanimously by all the Overseas Delegates

Once again I had to set the record straight and I responded to the ABRECSA statement as follows:

"I was informed by the Secretary of the Zululand Council of Churches that ABRECSA were holding a Conference at KwaNzimela, and that he was of the opinion that as this was an important Church Conference, someone designated by myself should welcome the President of ABRECSA, Dr. Allan Boesak and delegates. This is a suggestion which he made when Bishop Desmond Tutu, the General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches visited KwaNzimela a few weeks ago. On that occasion I should have attended and expressed the welcome to Bishop Tutu myself, but as I had another engagement in Durban, I delegated Dr. F.T. Mdlalose, my then Minister of Interior, to read my speech of welcome to Bishop Tutu. In addition, the Zulu King Zwelithini Goodwill ka Bhhekuzulu also attended as we as Christians and as members of Churches affiliated to the

South African Council of Churches, regard Bishop Tutu as an important Church dignitary. I quote Bishop Tutu's letter dated the 24th October written to the Development Officer of Inkatha Development Office:

'Thank you very much for your letter dated 03 October 1983 and your kind remarks about my talk. I much enjoyed my visit and was touched by the warm welcome I received first from His Majesty the King, secondly from His Excellency Prince Mangosuthu through the Hon. Minister of Interior and finally from everyone there. I am sorry that I could not stay on for lunch and the rest of the Annual General Meeting.'

It was in the same spirit that I delegated the Honourable Dr. D.R.B. Madide the newly appointed Minister of Interior, to go to the ABRECSA Conference to extend our welcome to important guests who were holding a Conference within our territory.

I cannot talk authoritatively on what happened at KwaNzimela. I rely completely on Dr. Madide's report and that of other members of the Assembly who accompanied him. Dr. Madide assured me that according to the Revd. J. Francois Bill the official opening at which Dr. Allan Boesak was to speak had been postponed because Dr. Boesak fell ill. That the Revd. J. Francois Bill said that he well understood my sending Dr. Madide to welcome Dr. Boesak and delegates as he (Revd J. Francois Bill) grew up amongst Tsonga-speaking Africans and understood the desire to welcome visitors as an important aspect of African culture. That the opening would be on Friday and Dr. Madide would be contacted by phone to be informed of the exact time when he may come. Revd. J. Francois Bill himself was quoted in the newspaper yesterday where he did not make allegations contained in the statements issued by the ABRESCA Conference and by the overseas delegates to the ABRESCA Conference.

Revd. J. Francois Bill corresponded with me when he was Principal of the Federal Seminary requesting me to assist them to get security of tenure for the Federal Seminary at Imbali. I had agreed to have the Seminary to settle down in KwaZulu after it was expelled from Alice by the South African Government and from the Transkei by the Transkeian Government. It was I who allowed the Federal Seminary to settle down where it is today. I therefore feel extremely offended by the statement that: 'Far from the image of KwaZulu Government as

independent of Pretoria we experienced as a participant in the daily oppression of the people.' Am I a fellow Christian when Whites such as the Revd. J. Francois Bill use me to help the Federal Seminary, and that when it suits them to denigrate me on behalf of their friends who are my political opponents get suddenly transformed to someone who is oppressing his own people? I throw this insult at the overseas delegation of ABRESCA with the contempt it deserved.

The White arrogance that they should adopt this holier-than-thou attitude towards the KwaZulu Government and myself is typical White hauteur as we Blacks have known it here since the last century up to now. They cannot claim to be better judges of us than our own son Bishop Tutu whose sentiment about being welcomed by us speaks for itself. He never felt it was a problem to be welcomed by me and His Majesty at the same venue only a few weeks ago. He did not feel contaminated by it. I also take strong exception to the insinuation contained in this statement as if the assault on Chief M. Maphumulo had my approval. I condemned it publicly. I take even stronger exception to their judgemental pronouncement about events that took place at the University of Zululand on the 29th October. Neither Inkatha nor I planned that violence. Inkatha youth defended themselves from attacks by certain anti-Inkatha students. Death occurred within both factions that clashed at the University. Pamphlets issued by students indicate that the planned violence on the 29th of October and it was not us who planned it. It again shows self-righteousness, arrogance and bias so typical of certain Church leaders to make a statement of this nature about something that has still to be investigated by a Judicial Commission.

This holier-than-thou attitude in certain circles of the Church both here and overseas must come to an end. All these things prolong Black oppression. We Africans were attacked through violence and were subjugated by Whites through violence. Our oppression is maintained by Whites and all Whites inside and outside the Churches through the South African Defence Force, to which all Whites up to the age of 60 are members, willy-nilly. We have never condemned Dr. Boesak for being Chaplain of the University of the Western Cape. We have never condemned Black people who break bread in the Dutch Reformed Churches with members of the Broederbond and the National Party which oppresses all of us. This holier-than-thou attitude is typical of White intellectual Colonisation by certain Churches. They now use the Church to colonise Black minds as the ABRESCA Conference showed. IDAMASA takes a

completely different attitude from that of ABRECSA on me, Inkatha and the KwaZulu Government. They are our people. They live with us in oppression. Our track record in opposition to apartheid speaks for itself. IDAMASA is in a better position to judge these matters than a bunch of self-righteous clergymen whose only qualification to passing judgment on us is that they control funds which are often used to promote anarchy and Black disunity rather than in promoting God's Kingdom on earth and goodwill towards all men. Church hypocrisy of this nature is sickening and it can only cause more and more damage in our Black society while Whites laugh all the way to the political bank."

My interpretation of the ABRECSA debacle is a correct interpretation. This was shown by the Statement which the Right Reverend Bishop L.B. Zulu, Anglican Bishop of Zululand, the Right Reverend Bishop L.E. Dlamini, Evangelical Lutheran Bishop of the South-Eastern Diocese, and the Right Reverend Bishop M.D. Biyase, Roman Catholic Bishop of Eshowe, signed jointly. It reads as follows:

"Events which led to the sudden change of venue of the ABRECSA conference last November and the statements and reports that flowed from that incident, are a matter of great concern to us as local church leaders. The fact that the group so affected never reported the incident to the Anglican Bishop of Zululand (to whose church the KwaNzimela Centre belongs) or in any way communicated their troubles, adds to our concern.

With regard to the presence of Dr. D.R.B. Madide to welcome the delegates to the conference, we feel it necessary to point out that this is a standard form of courtesy with the Honourable Chief M.G. Buthelezi. When the Right Reverend D.M.B. Tutu came to address the Annual General meeting of the Zululand Council of Churches last September, the Chief sent Dr. F.T. Mdaloase to welcome him to Zululand. No one present saw anything wrong with that. Since neither of us was present at the ABRECSA conference, we cannot comment on the peculiarities of that particular visit.

We are opposed to any form of violence, especially among Christians who profess Faith in Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. We see it as a self-defeating strategy which can only destroy and not replace.

Where many people, with different value systems and opinions are engaged in an enterprise such as national liberation, differences and disagreements are inevitable. We are,

nevertheless, saddened by the fact that in the course of this struggle, the people engaged in the same struggle have allowed themselves to become sworn enemies to one another. This saps the energies of those involved in this enterprise, and distracts them from their main objective.

We therefore appeal to all persons and organisations concerned with liberation to practise Christian charity and self-restraint in criticising and disagreeing with one another. The least we can do is to give one another the benefit of the doubt; and to appreciate one another's achievements even more than we condemn the failings. To do otherwise simply alienates us from one another, and weakens the overall struggle for liberation, without adding any benefit to our concern. In fact, it is an injustice to one another, which cannot result in any kind of justice to our society. We call on all who are involved in this worthy struggle to devise ways and means of overcoming the present prevalent prejudices, so that consultation and discussion (towards better understanding) can take place among them, so that they speak with one voice and act in concert. Africa's disease has been, up to now, this quality of speaking and acting with conflicting voices and methods and fighting to the death over those."

This whole sordid kind of debate which is conducted by UDF and their fellow travellers is, of course, not new. It is no more than a boring repetition of what has gone before. It is the same little inane political ditty played on broken down flutes by people who are tone deaf. We have, however, to continue responding with reason based on the factual situation. Because the UDF are political bedfellows with such a wide range of celebrity leaders and ineffective protest politicians, the kind of poison that exudes from their utterances is spread far and wide. The struggle for liberation in this country is a struggle by the people here on the ground, but the struggle is not one which is taking place in an international vacuum. What happens here is so often influenced by the external world.

Therefore when the ABRECSA statement appeared across the length and breadth of the world by the delegates from abroad who returned home, and when this campaign was bolstered by the UDF sending emissaries abroad to try and ride on the bandwagon of ill-informed media reporting on ABRECSA, the situation at Ngoye and situations such as they have engineered in Lamontville, I decided that we should send a delegation to Europe to put the facts before the international community. The Honourable Dr. Dhlomo therefore undertook a tour of Europe, together with the Honourable Dr. D.R.B.

Madide, the Honourable Mr. H.T. Madonsela and the Honourable Mr. M.M. September, the Honourable Member for Mahlabathini. From all accounts they did a magnificent job and all men of reason and genuine interest in South Africa heard them.

On the delegation's return, a press statement was issued which reads as follows:

"From the 10th to the 21st January 1984 we were sent by His Excellency the President of Inkatha, Prince M.G. Buthelezi, to Europe. It is customary for the President and/or senior officials of Inkatha to undertake routine trips abroad so as to acquaint the international community with current socio-political trends in this country, meet old friends and make new ones. This trip was therefore in accordance with this long established practice of Inkatha.

We met various church groups as well as government officials of various ranks in Europe.

Our mission took us to the following six European countries: Germany, England, Scotland, Holland, Switzerland, Norway and Sweden - all within ten days. In Germany our delegation split into two groups - one group covering Switzerland, Norway and Sweden and the other group covering England, Scotland and Holland.

We have a wide network of contact organisations and individuals in Europe, including a full time representative based in the Netherlands, who were instrumental in making arrangements for our meetings.

Appointments for all meetings were made well in advance and we are pleased to report that we met all the people and groups we were scheduled to meet with the sole exception of the committee members of the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism. A few hours before this meeting we learned from the officials of this Committee that our meeting with them had aborted because of what they described as press interference.

In view of their explanation above, we therefore concluded that the failure of this committee to meet us was not an

expression of any ideological conflict.

In Bensheim, Germany we had very fruitful discussions with:

- a. The German Institute for Youth and Society
- b. Hopeful Projects in Southern Africa (HOPSA)
- c. German Youth on the Offensive
- d. High ranking officials of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Germany. At this meeting with church officials, there was a clergyman who had attended the ABRESCA consultation at KwaNzimela, who had travelled about 500 kilometres to meet us.

In Heidelberg we met a former Director of the Department of Studies at the Lutheran World Federation who is also a leading theologian and author.

In Zurich, Switzerland we met:

- a. representatives of the Swiss Protestant Churches among whom there was a clergyman who had been to the ABRESCA consultation at KwaNzimela.
- b. a representative of the Anti-apartheid Movement.

In Berne we met:

- a. the President and representatives of the Swiss Federation of Churches.
- b. a local press report attached to the newspaper Der Bund.
- c. General Secretary of the French speaking Reformed Churches.
- d. a representative of the Swiss Federation of Trade Unions who had also attended the ABRESCA consultation at KwaNzimela.
- e. a representative of the Swiss Amnesty International.

In Geneva we met:

- a. representatives of the Lutheran World Federation.
- b. African delegates attending the Executive meeting of the Lutheran World Federation.
- c. an official in the Communication Department of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches.
- d. officials of the International Committee of the Red Cross.
- e. various public figures and renowned academics.

In Oslo, Norway we met:

- a. representatives of the Church of Norway Council on Foreign Relations.
- b. representatives of the Relief Organisation of the Church of Norway.
- c. officials in charge of the Southern African desk in the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Norway.
- d. a group of Norwegian Missionaries who were formerly stationed in Natal.

In Stockholm, Sweden we met:

- a. representatives of the Mission Covenant Church.
- b. the Chairman and a representative of the Isolate South Africa Committee.
- c. representatives of the Student Christian Movement.
- d. Foreign Affairs officials of the Government of Sweden.

In Uppsala, Sweden we met:

- a. representatives of the Swedish Mission Council
- b. representatives of the Africa Institute.
- c. representatives of the Swedish Ecumenical office.

- d. representatives of the Church and secular press.

In London we met:

- a. representatives of the British Council of Churches.
- b. officials in the British Foreign and Commonwealth office.

In Scotland we met:

- a. representatives of the Church of Scotland Council, amongst whom was a churchman who had attended the ABRESA consultation at KwaNzimela.
- b. the Dean of the School of Divinity at Edinburgh University.

In the Netherlands we met:

- a. representatives of all the churches in the Netherlands, including two people who had been delegates at the ABRESA conference.
- b. representatives of Employer Organisations.
- c. officials of the Netherlands Department of Foreign Affairs.
- d. officials of the Netherlands Department of Development and Co-operation.
- e. members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Dutch Parliament.

We were also interviewed by representatives of the press and radio.

Our final engagement was in Bonn, in Germany where we were guests of our international partners - the Konrad-Adenauer Foundation. Here we met:

- a. the Church Ambassador to Bonn of the German Lutheran Church and his senior staff.
- b. officials of the Department of Economic Co-operation of

the Federal Republic of Germany.

- c. a member of the Africa Committee in the German parliament, who is also Vice-President of the International Parliamentary Association.
- d. the Head of the Foreign Affairs Division of the C.D.U. which is a partner in the ruling coalition government of Germany.

We also had a lively press conference in Bonn which was arranged by the Konrad-Adenauer Foundation.

We left Germany for South Africa on the 21st January 1984 and arrived in South Africa on the 22nd January 1984.

Conclusion

On our arrival in South Africa, we were surprised, to say the least, to read newspaper reports alleging that our delegation had been snubbed by an organisation known as Kairos. The fact of the matter is that we had no appointment to meet with this organisation. Neither were we snubbed by all so-called human rights and Anti-apartheid organisations as the said newspaper reports alleged.

On the whole we found this trip very useful in that we were able to consolidate old friendship and make new ones.

We were, however, disturbed to observe that Inkatha's political standpoint had been completely misrepresented overseas by:

- a. a pamphlet, authored by the UDF which blamed Inkatha for the unfortunate events in Lamontville, Hammarsdale, Ngoye and the ABRESKA conference at KwaNzimela. We accordingly took the opportunity to put the record straight and we are satisfied that people and groups that had thus been dishonestly misinformed are now in a better position to appreciate our standpoint.
- b. a constant flow of distorted and scurrilous information about Inkatha which is fed to news bureaux of European churches by unknown South African sources. This information also attempts to misrepresent Inkatha in Europe

as a movement that employs violence against fellow Blacks, and a movement that is violently anti-christian, anti-church and anti clergy.

We have taken appropriate steps to attend to these unfortunate incidents which, in our minds, promote Black dissension in South Africa and prolong White domination."

Once again there are indications that reason and fact are not welcomed by those who are bent upon denigrating us. Drs. Reina Steenwijk is doing a sterling job in Europe in disseminating factual information about the South African situation but the extent to which we face the kind of biased and partisan views is just too appalling for words. Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. The Reverend Iain W. Whyte, Chaplain of the University of St. Andrews in Scotland received some of the literature which Dr. Steenwijk had posted to various people. He wrote her a letter which I think members should know about. The letter is as follows:

:Thank you for your letter of February 2nd. regarding the visit of Dr. Dhlomo and Dr. Madide to Edinburgh. We had a courteous meeting and explained and heard each other's viewpoints, raising certain questions about Inkatha. I am bound to say however that the interpretation of events and incidents given by the two gentlemen was very different from that given by our partner Church in South Africa and by the South African Council of Churches. When I discussed these matters with Bishop Desmond Tutu in Johannesburg he confirmed his agreement with the position of ABRECSA towards Inkatha and was somewhat dismayed at being quoted in support of Chief Buthelezi's reply to the statement of the Overseas Delegates at KwaNzimela.

I do appreciate your writing to me and enclosing the statement of the Bishops. I am rather curious about how you managed to find my complete address, since the Church of Scotland simply indicated that I was Chaplain at St. Andrews University."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there we have it. Nothing but collusion in the purveying of deeply biased views on Inkatha. I must once again emphasise the great need for us to continue painstakingly and meticulously and frequently laying the facts of the matter before the international community. The silent majority of honourable men and women in European countries simply must be reached. Governments have continually to be updated on what

actually transpired. Truth about the South African situation has constantly to be laid before both those who will hear and those who will not hear. It must never be said with any truth that people did not know what we were doing. Real politics is the hard labour of decency and honour. It is the pursuit, month after month and year after year of things that are of real value. We in this House paint pictures on a large canvass in broad strokes, and sooner or later the dividends will come. I also again and again have to emphasise the need for every Member of this House to be aware of the very real need to continue in our efforts to establish truth. At every opportunity, the real story of the struggle for liberation must be told and re-told.

There is the need for us to become much more aggressive and innovative in our dissemination of the truth about the South African situation. We can no longer tolerate libellous and slanderous attacks against us. If there are attacks which amounted to no more than denigrations of us, we could treat them with the contempt they deserve. When, however, people throw political mud in our faces, they throw mud in the faces of six million Zulus and millions of Inkatha supporters. We cannot change the nation by walking around with political mud dripping off our faces and off our clothes. We are in all honour and are bound in duty to wipe our faces clean before the people. Those who despise the masses, those who denigrate Inkatha and those who denigrate this House as the elected body of leadership chosen by the masses, to articulate their position and to execute their desires, must hear the truth about us. They must hear the people themselves speaking through us. When therefore biased reporting by partisan newspaper men and women reach the levels of being slanderous, we initiate legal action, and our lawyers are at this point in the process of suing the Rand Daily Mail, the Star and the Sowetan for damages. The media poison is not confined to South Africa, and there are those abroad, particularly in the anti-apartheid movements of Europe who think they can slander us with impunity. Take, for example, Sietse Bosgra who is the Chairman in the Netherlands of the South African Committee. This Committee is an anti-apartheid front dancing to the tunes of the ANC's Mission in Exile and to their cohorts here in this country. After our delegation toured Europe at the beginning of this year, -Mr. Bosgra wrote to the Volksrant in the Netherlands as follows, under a heading "Inkatha delegation." He said:

"Recently a delegation of the South African Movement Inkatha visited the Netherlands. In the Volksrant of January this visit is reported, but not its background. Moreover, it gives the unjust impression that Inkatha is a 'liberation movement' and that it stands for non-violence. The Inkatha delegation

visited the Netherlands because there is a growing aversion for the organisation, also here. The main point of criticism is the violence used by the impis of Inkatha leader Buthelezi.

This violence is not directed against the oppressive regime, but against unarmed Black victims of the regime who do not accept Buthelezi's leading role.

As recently as October last year, 8 people were killed through Inkatha violence and more than 100 injured. At the University of Zululand a real bloodbath was created because the students had dared to resist Buthelezi's visit to the University.

In Lamontville, people were killed and injured through Inkatha violence because the residents resisted incorporation into KwaZulu, the 'homeland' where Buthelezi reigns with the support of the apartheid regime. A conference of ABRECSA, an organisation which fights the apartheid regime, had to be cancelled prematurely under the pressure of Buthelezi's impis. Also representatives of the Netherlands' churches were present there.

Buthelezi has never condemned the terror of his organisation, but has defended it. In many speeches he has stated that he who turns against me turns against the people and will be dealt with by the people. 'If people want to stop us, then it is a life or death issue for us' says the Inkatha leader and that instruction is carried out literally.

The growing aversion of Inkatha is shown by the refusal of the World Council of Churches to receive the delegation. The growing aversion of Buthelezi by the Black people in South Africa is shown by figures from the most recent opinion poll in Soweto. 23 per cent favour Buthelezi, 56 per cent are against him. The poll shows the ANC leader, Nelson Mandela, is a much more popular and less controversial leader: 82 per cent admire him and only 3 per cent dislike him."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we owe it to Black South Africa to put a stop to this slander. We have therefore instructed lawyers in Amsterdam to take legal steps against Mr. Bosgra in terms of Dutch law. We just cannot tolerate people publishing criticisms that we go round killing our political opponents.

We must be under no illusions about the extent of this orchestrated campaign against KwaZulu and Inkatha. It takes place in the company of a wide range of people in Europe who in their own way are opinion makers. The image of KwaZulu abroad is important. Mr.

Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, if all the money and time that is spent by Inkatha's detractors is counted up, it will seem to be a considerable amount. It shows just how important it is to those who have little public backing amongst ordinary Black South Africans to try and evidence an aura of their relevance by locking themselves into conflicts with us, rather than in conflicts with the forces of apartheid. History and time are on our side. The politics of ineffectualness and tactics which are inappropriate will be exposed by reality for what they are. We must be part of the process in which misleading politics is exposed. For a long time we have pleaded and reasoned and we will continue to plead and to reason, but perhaps we must do it a bit more vigorously and we must realise the extent to which it is necessary for us to enter that arena which these forces have created. If part of the struggle is to keep it on the right tracks, what we are doing about anti-KwaZulu and anti-Inkatha propaganda must be seen as very essential activity.

Again and again we must stand steady in our perceptions of reality. We cannot afford to indulge in the politics of wishful thinking. Let me give you an example of just how distorted some people's pictures are of the South African situation. I take as my example the statement issued by the African National Congress' Mission in Exile in Lusaka on the 8th February. It was a statement in reaction to the Nkomati Accord which was signed by Mr. P.W. Botha and President Machel. It reads as follows:

"The National Executive Committee of the ANC met to consider the current situation in Southern Africa. The meeting resolved to issue the following statement.

Over the last few weeks, the racist and colonial regime of South Africa has been involved in a frantic diplomatic, political and propaganda counter-offensive in Southern Africa.

Some of the principle objectives of this offensive are:

- To isolate the ANC throughout Southern Africa and to compel the independent countries of our region to act as Pretoria's agents in emasculating the ANC, the vanguard movement of the South Africa struggle for national emancipation.
- To liquidate the armed struggle for the liberation of South Africa.
- To gain new bridgeheads for the Pretoria regime in its efforts to undermine the unity of the Frontline States,

destroy the SADCC and replace it with a so-called constellation of States and thus to transform the independent countries of Southern Africa into its client states and

- To use the prestige of the Frontline States in the campaign of the White minority regime to reduce the international isolation of apartheid South Africa and to lend legitimacy to itself and its colonial and fascist state.

In pursuit of these aims, the Botha regime has sought to reduce the independent countries of our region to the level of its Bantustan creations by forcing them to join the Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei Bantustans in entering into so-called non-aggression pacts with Pretoria.

Such accords, concluded as they are with a regime which has no moral or legal right to govern our country, cannot but help to perpetuate the illegitimate rule of the South African White settler minority. It is exactly for this reason that this minority has over the years sought to bind independent Africa to such agreements.

The ANC is profoundly conscious of the enormous political, economic and security problems that confront many of our peoples of our region. The blame for many of these problems must be laid squarely on the Pretoria regime which has sought to define the limit of independence of the countries of our region through a policy of aggression and destabilisation.

We are convinced that this regime, which is dripping from head to foot with the blood of thousands of people it has murdered throughout Southern Africa, cannot be an architect of justice and peace in our region.

Neither can the ally of this regime, the Reagan Administration of the United States with its pro-apartheid policy of 'constructive engagement' be an architect of justice and peace in this region, while it is an angel of war, reaction and repression in other regions of the world, including the United States itself.

A just and lasting peace in our region is not possible while the fountainhead of war and instability in this area, the apartheid regime and the oppressive system it maintains in SA and Namibia, continue to exist. The Botha regime knows that no peace has broken out. Rather, it has resorted to other means to continue its war for the domination of Southern Africa.

The situation in our region continues to point to the correctness of the decisions of the Maputo Frontline States Summit held in March 1982. That Summit observed that: 'Under the leadership of the ANC, the people, through strikes and armed action are vigorously rising against apartheid.' It went on to commit the Frontline States 'To intensify their material and diplomatic support for the liberation movements, SWAPO and ANC of SA, so that they can intensify the armed struggle for the attainment of the national independence of their people.'

That statement was made in full recognition of the fact that the destruction of the apartheid regime and the liberation of SA and Namibia constituted the fundamental prerequisites for peace, stability and uninterrupted progress in our area.

That commonly agreed position reaffirmed the obligation of the people of SA, under the leadership of the ANC, to escalate their offensive, using all means, including armed action, for the overthrow of the criminal apartheid regime and the transfer of power to the masses. We remain and shall remain loyal to this perspective.

The Pretoria regime is acting in the manner that it is to try to extricate itself out of the crisis that confronts its racist and colonial system of apartheid. It hopes that after it has 'pacified' our neighbours and driven the ANC out of our region, it will then have a free hand and suppress the mass democratic movement of our country and thus create the conditions for it to pin out its intricate web of measures for the refinement and entrenchment of the apartheid system.

Our principal task at this moment therefore is, and must be, to intensify our political and military offensive inside South Africa. This is the urgent call we make to the masses of our people, to all democratic formations and to all members and units of the ANC and Umkhonto we Sizwe. Relying on our own strength, through action, we will frustrate the schemes of the enemy of the peoples of Africa, and continue our forward march to the destruction of the system of White minority colonial domination in our country.

The central and immediate question of South African politics is the overthrow of the White minority regime, the seizure of power by the people and the uprooting by these victorious masses of the entire apartheid system of

colonial and racist domination, fascist tyranny, the super-exploitation of the Black majority and imperialist aggression and expansionism.

This question will be and is being settled, in struggle, within the borders of our country and nowhere else. We are entitled to expect that all those anywhere in the world, who count themselves among the anti-colonial and anti-racist forces, will join hands with us to bring about this noble outcome.

The peoples of Southern Africa know from their own experience that there can be no peaceful co-existence between freedom and independence on the one hand and colonialism on the other. We are confident that the masses, their parties and their governments which have over the years demonstrated their commitment to the cause of the total liberation of Africa, will themselves remain loyal to this cause and firm in resolve to stand with our people until victory is won.

We are equally certain that the rest of Africa and the world progressive community will continue to deny the Botha regime the legitimacy it craves so desperately, adopt new measures to isolate it and increase political, diplomatic, moral and material support to the ANC.

The struggle for the liberation of South Africa, under the leadership of the ANC, will continue and grow in scope and effectiveness, until we have won our victory. Forward to a people's government.

Signed: ALFRED NZO, Secretary-General for the National Executive Committee. March 16. 1984."

This little group of very lost and mistaken leaders of the Mission in Exile live in a dream world of their own. They possibly really think that they can accuse President Machel of being in cahoots with Pretoria to emasculate the ANC, to liquidate the armed struggle, to gain new bridge-heads for the Pretoria regime in its efforts to undermine the unity of the Frontline States; to destroy SADCC and to reduce the international forces working to isolate South Africa. When Black South Africans start talking about President Machel in this way, we have to realise just how poverty-stricken their political lives are. We do not mind people indulging in pipe dreams wiling their time away as they flit around the world, posturing as liberators, but Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, when their dreams and their make-believe worlds

are conveyed to South Africans, and particularly to our young folk, as representations of reality, then we have a duty to act. I thought Members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly should be updated on these things, and that we should read into our records the kind of documents I am laying before the Assembly.

I for one do not underestimate that poison is poison when it starts leading to political diseases and political death. When a doctor enters an isolation ward where there are contagious diseases, he takes protective steps to ensure that he too does not contract the diseases there. There is something contagious about this foul propaganda and Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I think it is prudent for us to stop and ask ourselves whether we too in some manner or another, are influenced in our own opinions by this kind of propaganda. Every now and again I detect a slackening off of commitment amongst some of the people around me. I find that sometimes some of us weaken and we either keep quiet when we should be protesting loudly at the distortions which are contained in the propaganda against us, and worse still sometimes, you will find that some amongst us begin to talk with two voices. One has only to remember the Mrs. Yengwas of this world to know what I am talking about. I behoves us every now and again to stop in our tracks and to take stock of ourselves lest we too become sanctimonious and think too that we are holier-than-thou. The struggle for liberation commenced, as I often say, when the first White man put his foot on this continent to take from us what was ours and to subjugate us in the land of our birth. Generations have passed and the struggle has continued. And Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the real struggle for liberation will continue yet for generations. Long after apartheid has been banished from this land, we will continue to struggle to establish the best possible form of government and the most honest and effective administration which the people of South Africa deserve. The struggle will yet unfold into two phases. The first phase will be the eradication of apartheid governments and the founding of a new society on internationally accepted democratic principles. Then the second phase of the struggle will commence. It will be the kind of phase in which people like President Kaunda, Prime Minister Mugabe, President Machel, President Nyerere and President dos Santos are waging a struggle against poverty, ignorance and disease and the institutionalisation of the people's will. We in this country will yet follow in those footsteps. There are many tactics along that same path and President Kaunda's tactics are not those of President Machel, and we in turn will have to evolve our own South African tactics when we walk that road one day, but that road we will walk.

Those of us who have only the courage to stand firm in our

commitment because we think it is going to be a shorter struggle than it will be, will fall by the wayside. For us there is no hope of quick victories and personal grandeur within the foreseeable future. We wage a struggle for liberation on fundamental human principles; we wage a struggle for the sake of justice and for the sake of humanity. We do not wage it for personal gain. Nothing makes my heart ache more than it does when I see the kind of frailty before me in which courage rests only on misconceptions of easy victories and personal eminence. In my own political life, I have had to put aside every personal ambition. I do not strive as I do strive and labour many hours a day seven days a week because I am buoyed up with the hope that I will be the country's next Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we have to labour for the sake of justice regardless of whether or not we ourselves will ever be eminent in a just society. Those who are the weaker ones amongst us are battered by the Anti-Apartheid Movement's propaganda; we are battered by the ANC's External Mission's propaganda; we are battered by the propaganda emanating from some foreign governments and international agencies; we are battered by the propaganda here in our own country from Black Consciousness groups, from some Church groups, from some Black political organisations, from White racists, from Black racists; we are battered by the propaganda emanating from the South African Government, and Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we are battered by propaganda emanating from within our own households and from our own children, from our relatives, from our friends and from our peers. And what makes it worse, is that it is a public battering in the media. It is a battering we get when we go to funerals; it is a battering we get when we attend weddings. I understand the net effect of this battering on those who are correct in their commitments, but misguided in their motivation.

In the end there will be those whose mettle is true, who are steadfast in their hearts and souls and who labour for justice out of their love for the nation. If I could carry more burdens on your behalf, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I would do so. If I could, I would carry all your shame in my breast. I would weather the storm for you; I would hold you closely and protect you, but politics is not like that. I do carry your shame and I do take the brunt of so much that comes our way. But I cannot take it all. I cannot carry the whole burden, not because I am weak, but because in the very nature of South African politics, you have to stand with me; you have to stand up and be counted in the marketplace and the world has to know you as true comrades standing with me in the thick of things, laughing as the missiles of poison are hurled at us. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in your great wisdom, you will know what I am talking about, and each of you Honourable Members will also know that I am putting my finger on a precious truth when I say that you must have the courage of love, that you must gird

your loins with fortitude, that you must seek to serve the nation in humility, and that you must stand with me while others flee to places where there are immediate rewards, more comfort and less honour.

I have had to deal with the forces which beset us as it is part of my role to survey the scene before us and examine the dangers in the path we tread. When one is engaged in a battle, discussions on strategies and tactics must necessarily deal primarily with the dangers which lie ahead and the means of overcoming them. When a General discusses the location of minefields in the path of an advancing army, he does not pause to deal with the freshness of the air in the glades which surround the road; he does not pause to survey the territory left behind already conquered. He concentrates on the dangers ahead. I think it is time for us to pause briefly and lift our eyes away from the multitude of dangers which we will have to contend with and overcome. As I indicated earlier, the vehemence of the attacks against us originate in jealousies of our strength, and the attacks themselves flow from the fact that we are vitally concerned with real politics. The vociferous elements in protest politics with no constituencies attempt to batter our constituencies and undermine our strength. In looking at the dangers ahead, we must not forget just how vitally we are integrated in the struggle, and how relevant we are to the whole process whereby radical change is being brought about in this country.

We are professionals at politics. It is our full time vocation. Politics is not something which we indulge in instead of playing football or marbles. Our location in the South African struggle enables us to do real things for the people, and our activity encompasses issues across a Black political spectrum wider than that of any other Black organisation. This realisation should inspire us to continue with fortitude and it should be one of the fires that burns in our breasts to make us achieve ever greater things. The people need us in what we are doing.

Let me illustrate what I-am saying by referring to the devastating floods which so ravaged our people. Cyclone Demoina swept in from the Indian Ocean and there was a deluge across the length and breadth of KwaZulu of a magnitude not yet recorded in our history. The torrents of water that ravaged our land, our livestock, our crops, and the homes of our people were so horrendous that Cyclone Demoina is now correctly talked about as having produced a 500-year flood. There has been no flood like it in living memory.

Our human habitat and the infrastructure so painfully being developed in KwaZulu did not anticipate such devastation. In planning our lifetime's activity, we simply cannot plan to accommodate the dangers of that which happens once or twice in a thousand years. The ravages which we suffered cannot be laid at the doors of inept planning and lack of foresight. People built their homes and tilled the fields where their forefathers had done so before them for two centuries, found that all their endeavours were swept away by violent waters. Vast areas of arable land were damaged or destroyed; the destruction of dry land fields amounted to a loss of R2 371,000, and the damage to dry fields not completely destroyed amounted to R4 505,500. Dry land worth R1 999,000 was badly silted up and dry land fields worth R1 514,000 were water-logged. Irrigated cane land was totally destroyed resulting in a R165,000 loss to us; and other irrigated land also destroyed resulted in a R2 508,000 loss. Further irrigated land was also damaged to the extent of R18,800. Irrigated land was also water-logged resulting in a further loss of R46,000. Damaged arable land alone amounted to R23 654,800. In all, 19,254 hectares of land so painfully developed and so arduously toiled was destroyed or damaged. Homesteads which had withstood violent storm after violent storm in the past were also ravaged by these floods. An estimated 6,933 homesteads were completely destroyed; and a further 13,731 homesteads were badly damaged, resulting in a loss of R897,915. The raging torrents destroyed 956 kilometres of fencing worth R1 477,200 and damaged a further 821 kilometres of fencing to the extent of R492,600. District roads worth R980,000 were completely destroyed and the damage done to 2,671 kilometres of road amounted to R2,671,000. 12 bridges were completely destroyed worth R600,000, and damage to a further 26 bridges amounted to R260,000. 3 dip tanks were destroyed worth R13,500 and another 41 dip tanks were damaged to the extent of R82,000. 24 dams were totally destroyed worth R1 680,000,—and another 84 dams were damaged to the extent of R840,000. 300 kilometres of contour banks were swept away worth R30,000, and 900 kilometres of contour banks were damaged to the extent of R27,000.

Our livestock were also swept away before the floods. 633 cattle, 2 976 goats, 413 sheep, 1 334 poultry and 22 pigs were lost, resulting in a loss to the people of R395,960. In all, these losses amount to R41 389,150.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this information has been compiled on the known facts. In every sub-division of the facts I have given you, there is necessarily an under-numeration of damage, and the figures I have quoted must therefore be provisional figures. We are still receiving additional information about further damage and I believe the final figures will be considerably

greater than the ones I have just given you. And Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the stark horror of Cyclone Demoina only begins with these figures. Hundreds of thousands of people lost personal possessions. Many homesteads lost all their furniture, clothes, household effects and agricultural implements. The sheer magnitude of the floods in terms of its impact on our people can hardly be stated. And then when we add to these financial losses the real cost of rehabilitating the nation, the amounts of money involved begin to boggle one's mind, and the amount of human fortitude needed by our people to re-possess themselves even of the meagre things they had before almost defies imagination. There are many thousands whose places were so destroyed that they can never be recreated. The human plight which follows on the destruction of the little the poor have will only one day be told in the form of an epic story of human tragedy. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it is in this situation that the reality of our politics and the realism of our location in the Black political spectrum is demonstrated. What has the United Democratic Front to offer the multitudes who have suffered so terribly? It is we in KwaZulu who immediately began to mobilise the forces the people so desperately needed in their hour of tragedy.

I want it recorded for all posterity that never before have we been so proud of the sterling qualities which both Black and White KwaZulu officials displayed. They laboured not as employees earning a salary, but as people possessed by a deep human concern for their fellow human beings. Mr. E.A. Johns, the Secretary of my Department, and the Secretaries of all other Departments, put everything else aside and laboured night and day to mobilise the forces of restoration.

Cyclone Demoina swept across KwaZulu from the Indian Ocean. It rained over the week-end of 28th/29th January and by Monday, the 30th it became apparent that we were in for a deluge. By Tuesday the 31st, vast areas were being devastated by raging floods. By Wednesday, the 1st February, the damage had been done. It was on Wednesday, the 1st February that KwaZulu officials met to establish the Co-ordinating Interdepartmental Committee. This Committee took stock of the situation, realised the magnitude of what we were facing, and set about chartering a survival course for us, and from then on laboured tirelessly to plan and co-ordinate the vast amount of work which had to be undertaken. I will return to the work that was done later during our Session to give the House more details of what was actually done to meet the terrible plight of the people and to re-establish essential services.

I want today, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, simply to put

on record my own deep appreciation and the appreciation of this House for what our officials accomplished. It is at times like these that the qualities of human beings are tested, and I think it is appropriate for me to convey the gratitude of this House to the South African Government for seconding White officials to the KwaZulu Government of such high calibre. Whatever political differences exist between KwaZulu and the South African Government, and there are deep differences between us, I must say that as Black and White officials rallied to meet the terrible circumstances of the people, we had a foretaste of what a united South Africa will one day be like. Race, colour and creed became totally irrelevant and humanity triumphed for a space of time to put things of eternal value above political differences.

The KwaZulu Administration became the focal point in the rallying of a national effort to aid the victims of the floods. Offers of assistance came pouring in to us. Ordinary people of all colours, numerous organisations, mining commerce and industry, the South African Government, the South African Defence Force, organisations and governments abroad, were rallied and responded positively to the devastated position of our people.

The response to our plight was heart-warming indeed and to single out individuals and specific organisations for special mention could imply a lack of real appreciation for those not mentioned. We received offers of help from individuals from places like Soweto and like the penny in the parable of our Lord, the small offering of a widow is more valued than the generosity of the rich. Our gratitude is not measured by the value of the assistance which was offered. I must nonetheless pay special tribute to the South African Red Cross Society and its National Chairman, Mrs. Inka Mars. We have in times past been made aware of the deep humanitarian commitment in the Red Cross. It as an organisation has always rallied to meet tragedy in South Africa. In our own areas, they have evidenced the kind of permanency of concern for humanity which is a tribute to the Red Cross throughout the world. They have rallied to meet the needs of the sick and the disabled. They have provided ambulance services and when there has been mass hunger and wide-spread starvation, they have rallied to meet the people's needs. They have played an invaluable role in mobilising drought relief for our people. We have become accustomed to the fact that they add a high degree of efficiency to their attitudes of benevolence and charity. As they rallied aid to the victims of the devastating floods which followed in the wake of Cyclone Demoina we saw yet again their sterling qualities come to the fore. I want to convey to Mrs. Inka Mars and to the South African Red Cross Society my personal thanks and the gratitude of this House and the whole nation for the sterling work that she has done in our

midst.

I would also like formally to thank the South African Government for the aid which they have given to KwaZulu to meet the desperate needs of our people. We thank the State President for declaring the Demoina Cyclone a disaster in terms of Section 26.1 of Act 107 of 1978, in the following districts: Babanango, Dannhauser, Dundee, Eshowe, Glencoe, Hlabisa, Ingwavuma, Lower Umfolosi (Empangeni), Mahlabathini, Masinga, Mthonjaneni (Melmoth), Mtunzini, Newcastle, Ngotshe, Nkandla, Nongoma, Nqutu, Paulpietersberg, Ubombo, Utrecht, Vryheid, Barberton, Carolina, Ermelo and Piet Retief.

I would also like to convey to the South African Defence Force our gratitude for what they did among us. We are particularly grateful for the way in which they used Defence Force helicopters to bring medicines, food and emergency supplies to the many communities which were completely isolated from the outside world, where they would have been a great many more deaths and a great deal more suffering had it not been for the army's airborne and overland assistance.

I wish to thank the South African mining industry for the R120,000 which was donated to KwaZulu and the R30,000 which was donated to the Red Cross for flood relief. I also convey our gratitude to the World Hunger Relief Agency for DM250,000; the West German Government for DM50,000, the United States Government for US\$175,000, and Unilever for R100,000. All these amounts were sent to the Red Cross in Natal specifically for food. In total, from these and other sources, the South African Red Cross Society in Natal has raised R650,000 for flood relief following Cyclone Demoina.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it is times like these which sort out the boys from the men in politics. Those who rant and rave against us for participating in procedures of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly are always empty-handed and flat-footed when it comes to the desperate needs of Black South Africa. Because we were here, we could ensure that the best was done for the most. When we are denigrated and the frailty of humanity which is in all of us undermines our fortitude, let us always remember just how vital our role in Black South African politics is, and how indispensable we are to the process of eradicating poverty, ignorance and disease in which Black South Africa will finally triumph.

As I look at the vast problems which confront us and the almost inhuman responsibilities which rest on our shoulders, I become saddened by the fact that we have at this point in time such a strained relationship between myself and the Prime Minister, the Honourable Mr. P.W. Botha. It is sad that the deeply rooted political differences between us have become personalised. As a South African I am entitled to fight vehemently for what I believe in, and I am entitled to wage that fight in the public political arena. Again and again, the South African Government and the Prime Minister have given us reason to believe that the legitimacy of Black democratic opposition to apartheid is not accepted by them. Their politics is designed for kaffir-like subservience. When we take our place amongst men and women of consequence and move in the company of those who have political stature, we are resented. We deny the basis of apartheid thinking and our political undermines the foundations of apartheid and the morale of hard-line apartheid practitioners.

Successive South African Prime Ministers have refused to discuss the future with me. Dialogue has been no more than conversations in which I have been talked at and told why the Government is doing what it is doing. They have not been give-and-take discussions. They have not been a searching together for the way forward. They have not been discussions in which my opinions are counted for anything, and in which I was consulted in any real sense of the word. I have increasingly found it difficult to be party to these kind of discussions which the Government subsequently presents to South Africa and to the international community as consultations. I opposed the new constitution with everything I had and I entered the public debate on the new constitution during the Referendum campaign. During this Referendum campaign the Government again and again reiterated their position that Blacks and Whites have different futures and that after the constitution for Whites, Indians and Coloureds had been finalised and introduced, attention would then be devoted to Black constitutional development.

When I was invited to a working lunch with other Black leaders by the Prime Minister in January, I found myself in a difficult position. I did not want to be party to a meeting where verbal and culinary niceties would be presented to the world as consultations with Blacks about the development of a Black constitution outside the national parliamentary framework. I thought that my next meeting with the Prime Minister should be a serious meeting in which we could discuss the challenges which face our country and not simply talk about National Party dictates about what should be done. I do not know when such a meeting will take place, and I must seek the wisdom of this House, Mr. Speaker, on the whole

question of how I should be relating to the Prime Minister. I feel strongly that we need an indication from the Prime Minister, not only that he is prepared to meet me, but that he is willing to enter into frank and open discussion when we do meet. In this country we simply have to talk about fundamental issues, and we simply have to talk about reconciling fundamental differences. These differences are totally irreconcilable within the Government's constitutional thinking. All indications are that the South African Government and the Prime Minister is not prepared to talk about the future outside the four corners of the new constitution. This is my difficulty. We cannot sit and discuss the price of eggs while Rome is burning around us. I have never lacked the courage to discuss the country's problems with our Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues. The lack of courage comes from their side. Cabinet Ministers customarily opened the Sessions of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, but they no longer have the courage to come here because when they do come here, we speak openly and boldly about the South African political scene.

If the Government has not got the courage to send Cabinet Ministers to open our Sessions, I must be excused if I think that the Prime Minister does not have the courage to talk about things that really matter with me in private conversation. I just have too much to do to afford myself the dubious luxury to travel all the way to Pretoria or Cape Town to meet the Prime Minister, if I am going to be treated like a political juvenile who has to be rapped over the knuckles and lectured to about Government policy. We all know what Government policy is. I certainly do not have to be informed on the Government's basic position. Why can the Prime Minister not share with me his thoughts about the untenable position the Government finds itself in? Why cannot he take me into his confidence to talk about the future which he very well knows will be radically different to the present? Why cannot the Prime Minister take me into his confidence on his innermost thoughts on future Black/White political relationships? The Prime Minister knows very well that the dream of White confederalism was formulated for White public consumption, but that it is an untenable political future in the reality of our situation.

The Prime Minister has found the courage to talk to President Machel because in those discussions he can blandly insist that South Africa's internal problems have nothing to do with President Machel, but he cannot say that to me.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I only know how to say these things simply. If the Prime Minister takes umbrage at me talking about his lacking courage, then I am sorry for the Prime Minister

and the whole country must suffer. My intentions are reconciliatory. I am a patriot and I put the good of South Africa above all else and I am entitled to do so in open and simple language. How does the South African Government think it is going to lead the country into the future if we are yet to have our first real discussion on fundamental issues in the 33 years which the Government has been in office? A generation of South Africans will one day arise to grasp the thorny nettle of Black/White reconciliation. Why cannot this generation of leaders be the generation that does so? None of us are under any illusion that reconciliation between Black and White in this country is not attended by deep and vexing problems. But few of us recognise how the bitterness of unreconciled attitudes in this country will grow more bitter for the keeping. There is in the air a kind of ripeness of time for real moves towards political reconciliation between Black and White, but there is a chilly autumn in the coming which will be followed by a politically blistering winter cold which will make it impossible for the seeds of national reconciliation to germinate and to grow into a huge tree under which the nation can shelter.

I can undertake to be reconciliatory, to be honest of heart and open in mind, and I can undertake to approach discussions with the Prime Minister as a reasonable and realistic man who does not expect miracles overnight, but I simply cannot undertake to meet the Prime Minister in fear and trembling and express a willingness before I meet him to carry his paltry party political apartheid bags for him. I would appreciate the wisdom of this House in this matter, and I sincerely hope that when we debate the issues I am raising in my policy speech, each and every one of you will approach this specific topic with a deep sense of how poignant the issue is and with an awareness of what is at stake in it. Inevitably in our circumstances, the refusal to talk to each other fires the need to confront each other. Confrontation is not our intention, and we seek the Prime Minister's assistance to enable us to avoid being drawn into confrontationist politics by the weight of history itself.

In the context of speaking about relationships between KwaZulu and the Government, I must say that some of the utterances of the Prime Minister's Cabinet colleagues are not helpful, to put it mildly. The South African Minister of Health, the Honourable Dr. Nak van der Merwe, in discussing the national campaign to control South Africa's escalating population growth, had the temerity to lay the problems of Zulu population growth at my feet. He said that if we did not succeed in curtailing the Zulu population growth, my own problems will be greater than his. I quote him: "If he does not do something about this, his problems will be greater because his

people will sit around him." And he said that I would have to realise that the population growth of the Zulu people would have to be controlled at some time or another. The Honourable Minister, in launching a national attempt to curb the population growth said: "It is very clear that if we do not succeed in bringing the population growth under control within a reasonable period, or at least to achieve a balance between population totals and sources of survival, we will shortly have problems with everyone's existence which will seriously threaten the stability and further development of Southern Africa."

There is in these kind of utterances clear evidence that I am just not heard when I speak on vital issues. I have informed the Government again and again, and I have again and again publicly reiterated, that it is a global truth that population growth is stemmed only by rising levels of prosperity. Throughout the world, the poor have larger population growths than the rich. Population growth is a socio economic phenomena and the population growth of KwaZulu will ultimately only be controlled by the Zulus themselves as they enter into the social and economic circumstances which inhibit large families. I have again and again pointed out that the apartheid policies of successive South African Governments have created a vast sea of dispossessed humans confined by Government policy to desperate poverty. The only real contribution to the KwaZulu population growth must come from the South African Government. Until such time as there is real freedom in this country; until such time as there is equality of opportunity; and until such time as Blacks enjoy their rightful share in the national economy, hungry mouths will be multiplied by the politics of inequality. I have never denied the need, even the urgent and desperate need there is, for parents to limit the size of their families to meet their social and economic circumstances. We in KwaZulu support family planning and at virtually every clinic and hospital, we assist people to plan their families. There is, however, just no point in committing ourselves to achieving the impossible. No forces on earth can be manipulated to change the demographic dimensions of poverty-ridden societies. In laying the blame for KwaZulu birth rates at my feet, Dr. van der Merwe is being politically sanctimonious and is shirking his responsibility as the country's Minister of Health. He might as well attack me for the country's rising death rates on our roads; he might as well lay at my feet the fluctuation in the price of gold.

The South African Government is these days talking about KwaZulu as some kind of distant Third World country where backwardness and ignorance is not the direct concern of the South African Government. This attitude is a hideous negation of governmental responsibility. KwaZulu is an integral part of South Africa and the

well-being of the citizens of KwaZulu is a regional responsibility of the South African Government. We will labour here night and day to do the most with the miserable little bit that we have got, but the KwaZulu Government is not some kind of Aladdin's lamp out of which endless goodness for the people can flow. The KwaZulu Government will strive with everything in its power to meet the people's needs, but in the final analysis, KwaZulu citizens are South African citizens and the South African Government itself must bear the full responsibility for the untold misery which apartheid policies heap on the heads of our people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this kind of language amounts to Zulu-bashing by the Government and I think this House must be informed that the view of us in the White Parliament, recorded in Hansard, is a view expressed in the vein of the Honourable Minister of Health. Whatever niceties creep into the language of Government spokesmen, however they lean over backwards to portray themselves as respecters of other nations, and however they base their defence of excluding Africans from the new constitution; and however they talk about separate but equal, the underlying White man's view of Blacks as inferior beings shines through every so often.

In the No Confidence debate, Mr. P.J. Clase spoke on behalf of the National Party. In talking about the new constitution he said, *inter alia*:

"The simple truth of the matter is that the Coloureds and Indians have developed to such an extent, and have made such a special contribution in various spheres of South Africa's national economy, that they can rightly insist upon deciding their own welfare and accepting joint responsibility for matters affecting everyone in this country. In brief, Mr. Speaker, these two groups were and are entitled to political rights, and they therefore had to be offered an opportunity to make a joint political contribution in one parliament."

This illustrates what I mean. Put in simpler language, it says Coloureds and Indians have developed and can knock on White doors and be allowed into the back room of White politics, but kaffirs have not developed enough to warrant even partial involvement in ruling in the country. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Vause Raw spoke in the same debate and reflected the NRP's view

which supports the same notion. He and other NRP spokesmen lambasted the PFP because of their joint involvement with Inkatha in our desperate attempt last year to make White voters see sense. He derisively talked about the PFP as "Inkatha's second team." In obvious reference to me, Mr. Raw said:

"I want to say to Black leaders themselves that negotiating is a two-way trade. There must be a willingness on their part to negotiate and, if they refuse negotiation, they must not afterwards complain that they have been excluded from political progress."

Mr. D.W. Watterson further elaborated the NRP's view of us when he said:

"The PFP has in my opinion contributed virtually nothing to the politics of South Africa, except to raise untimely expectations among our non-White South Africans. Furthermore - and this is more dangerous than anything else in so far as we in Natal are concerned - they have virtually destroyed the good relations that existed between the Zulus of KwaZulu and the people of Natal. This, I believe, is a thoroughly shameful action, and, as far as the people of Natal are concerned, these actions over the past few years will not be forgotten or forgiven. In some future election the people of Natal will show what they think of the PFP."

Mr. Watterson does not want us to drag our dirty Black political feet across his White political rug. He really does view the fact that Blacks who outnumber Whites in this Province to the extent of six to one have no right to express themselves on the country's constitutional development which affects them as South Africans as much as it affects Mr. Watterson as a South African. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this is how far we are away from power-sharing. We are regarded as politically contaminated and so backward that we have no contribution to make to the ongoing political process. We could not have leant over Backwards any further than we did in accepting the Buthelezi Commission's recommendations, but this is what Mr. Bartlett says about the Buthelezi Commission:

"...and we believe in a sharing of power on matters of common concern. That is why we could not sign the Buthelezi Commission's report. There was the political recommendation that political power should be transferred to the Black

majority in Natal. That happens to be the Progressive Federal Party's policy. We accept that there are differences in values between the Blacks of Natal, the Whites of Natal and the Indians of Natal. The PFP does not believe that there is a difference in the value systems of those people. If they recognise such a difference, they believe it is not important when it comes to making a constitution. We believe that mutual respect between Zulus, Whites, and Indians in Natal will not be achieved by the Progressive Federal Party's constitutional model.

... We know from our experience that the Prog-type constitution will lead to Zulu domination and we know that the Zulus do have a different value system to our own."

Mr. Bartlett then went on to quote the text of a letter that I had written to the Daily News. This was:

"Dear Sir,

In the correspondence columns of the Daily News of Tuesday, October 4th you published a letter written by Mr. K. Singh. Unlike Mr. Singh I cannot be amused by the tragic events through which South Africa is being dragged by the Prime Minister and the National Party.

Mr. Singh asks: "What do the Slabberts and the Buthelezis have as alternatives for us?" My answer is that the alternative to apartheid is not more apartheid, it is not constitutionalised apartheid, it is an open, democratic society. My alternative to the racial politics of fear is the democratic politics of hope.

Mr. Singh shows just how unqualified he is to form political judgments by asking why I accepted what he calls the "position of chief administrator of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly." Politically I owe nothing to the South African Government. My leadership is legitimised by history; I am a hereditary chief and I trace my descent to the founding fathers of the Zulu nation, both through my mother and my father. Through my father I trace my descent through a long line of Prime Ministers to successive Zulu Kings. My leadership is also legitimised by the mass support I have as President of INKATHA. With a card-carrying membership rising well above 750,000, my leadership is legitimised by the largest political

force that has ever emerged in the history of this country.

I and the people of KwaZulu never accepted the 'homeland' institutions which were foisted on us. I led the resistance to the introduction of homeland political machinery from its inception. I rejected the regional and territorial authorities imposed on us, and finally we were told we had no choice in the matter and these institutions were forced on us by law.

Participation by Indians and Coloureds in the tricameral parliament under the new constitution will be voluntary participation. It will be more than voluntary participation in the machinery of apartheid government; it will be voluntary participation by Indians and Coloureds in White mechanisms of oppression. By participating in the tricameral parliament, Indians and Coloureds will be endorsing the denationalisation of 72 per cent of the country's population. Involvement by them will be participation in oppressive institutionalised racism. By participating they will be slamming the doors on a negotiated settlement on which the very security of the Coloured's and Indian's future depends.

Africans through the long decades of our oppression since the Act of Union in 1910 have sought to gain political freedom for all the dispossessed people of the country, including Mr. Singh. We have sought to do so by democratic means, and have employed non-violent strategies and tactics. We have opposed apartheid as the policy of the Government in power and our opposition to apartheid has been non-racial. Those who do not oppose the new constitution with every means at their disposal reject their African brothers and sisters in the way that the National Party has always rejected us.

Those who vote 'Yes' in the referendum and those who support the White voters who say 'Yes' will destroy the goodwill on which the future of this country depends. A 'Yes' vote will lead to Black politics aiming to dismantle the constitution, rather than striving through non-violent means to gain entry into it. Voluntary acceptance of the new constitution is a voluntary rejection of Africans. Africans will experience this rejection with a deep sense of shock. A 'Yes' vote will legitimise political action against Whites, Indians and Coloureds in an era of radicalised African politics.

You have been dispossessed, Mr. Singh, for a long time. Your token presence in the halls of White baaskap power will leave you as dispossessed as you were before. I call on all Indians and Coloureds to stand shoulder to shoulder with their African brothers and sisters at this crucial time in the history of this country.

Yours faithfully,

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI
CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA
CHAIRMAN THE SOUTH AFRICAN
BLACK ALLIANCE

Mr. Bartlett's comment on this letter was as follows:

"I want to put it to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and to Honourable Members of the PFP: do they hear what Chief Gatsha Buthelezi is saying? He is saying he is a hereditary Prime Minister. He says he has the largest political force mobilised in the history of South Africa. We understand the Zulus."

He then goes on to quote a paragraph from an editorial column of the Natal Mercury. It is:

"The organisation's conduct has also been in question over an incident in which Chief Maphumulo, a KwaZulu MP opposed to Inkatha, was attacked by youths and knocked unconscious outside the Legislative Assembly. Chief Buthelezi's reported comment was that it was a reasonable consequence of the victim's behaviour."

Using this quotation, Mr. Bartlett went on to say:

"This is the party that took the platform with the PFP during the referendum. The PFP wants a constitutional plan for Natal which will hand the Government of Natal over to Inkatha. While we do not accept these things that Gatsha Buthelezi's Inkatha movement is doing - in fact, we wish to protect our people from their excesses - we at the same time do not demand of Zulus that they accept our value system. We now them too

well. Our fathers before us lived with them and we know them well. However, we grant them what we want for ourselves, and that is a large measure of self-determination which can only be obtained in a pluralistic constitution such as we propose. If the Zulus are able to see the merits of our case, if we can get back to the negotiating tables and the discussions we had before the PFP did such tremendous damage to Zulu and White relationships in Natal, and if we can reach consensus with them - and we believe they are reasonable people - then we in the NRP are only too pleased to walk hand in hand into the future with them for the sake of South Africa."

In this No Confidence debate Mr. R.W. Hardingham rallied to the cause of the NRP's Zulu-bashing. He said:

"... I would like to associate myself most strongly with the sentiments expressed by some of my colleagues regarding the despicable and contemptible manner in which the PFP, strongly supported by the MP for Berea and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, endeavoured to intimidate the White voters of Natal into voting 'No' by arousing feelings of other race groups. Great emphasis was laid last year on the destabilisation emanating from those benches. There was a deliberate attempt to destabilise the political system in South Africa. Happily, these tactics misfired and I hope that the Pinetown voters will bear that in mind when they go to the polls on the 15th February."

Mr. R.B. Miller of the NRP also rushed into the debate to do his share of Zulu-bashing. Speaking of the PFP he said:

"They are capable of many things, Mr. Speaker, including the abuse of institutions of the people of South Africa, for their own ends. They destroyed the relationship between the Whites of Natal and Chief Gatsha Buthelezi and the Zulus for their own ends.

They recruited Chief Gatsha Buthelezi to help them in their referendum campaign last year in order to try to whip up feelings between Blacks and Whites; to intimidate the people, especially the elder people of Natal and South Africa, by getting Chief Gatsha Buthelezi to help them spread terror in the hearts and minds of those people.

Then, Sir, what happened? After the referendum they dropped Chief Gatsha Buthelezi. They dropped him entirely, and they

left him high and dry. We have never heard another word from the PFP about Chief Gatsha Buthelezi and his problems. That is the kind of opportunistic people that we have in the PFP.

...We are not going to make the same mistakes the PFP have made. When they signed the report of the Buthelezi Commission they said it was a final blue-print and that they were going to transfer power from the White minority to the Black majority in Natal. A final blue-print! Unqualified transfer of power!"

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there we have it. Unbridled racism, sanctimonious White supremacy, the fear and trembling of White political knees in the face of the most reasonable Black political recommendations this country has ever seen. The Buthelezi Commission Report and the recommendations this House has accepted, are seen as Black terrorism unleashed in White society. This is how far we are away from power-sharing. Thank God the NRP is a dying White political viper in our midst, writhing in its death agonies, spitting racist venom at anything Black in sight. We know these White baases who say they know their kaffirs. We in Natal are particularly conversant with the Natal brand of White superiority.

I believe it is pertinent to observe that the kind of White racist sentiments which well up in these words make the breaths of those who utter them stink. At least among many of today's National Party Members there are those who have the same sentiments but wash their tongues with soap each day before they go forth into the political world, and leave the NRP to walk around with unsavoury political breaths. The NRP are doing the National Party's dirty kaffir-bashing for them. They are certainly beginning to earn their keep as the lackeys who carry the National Party's stinking White racism around for them.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we must not lambast Natal; White society as these expressions of anger arise on our lips. We know the NRP is a spent force in our midst, but even a writing viper has venom which can damage before it dies. This House must put on record our Black response to this kind of naked White racism. The people of Natal are one people. They are intertwined and inextricably bound up into a single provincial entity. Whatever the destiny of this Province is, it is a destiny which Blacks and Whites will share. We have, however, to recognise that in part Natal society has a Jeckyl and Hyde nature. Ultimately it is the kind of politics of reconciliation which are contained in the Buthelezi Commission Report which will emerge as political

sanity in this Province. I only hope that it is a sanity which will triumph and not one day be lamented as a lost cause.

This House needs also to be informed on what Members of the South African Cabinet said in the No Confidence debate. The Minister of Co-operation and Development said:

"The idea that Blacks have been left out in the cold has been deliberately fostered by radical elements in our society. I must sound an urgent note of caution that the consequences of this kind of action must be carefully weighted by the Official Opposition and the press in this country. I am very serious when I say this. The Government is clearly committed to a constructive policy of development on every front and is taking the initiative in this regard. If the irresponsible promotion of a spirit of disenchantment amongst Blacks is continued, and inadequate recognition is given to the many efforts undertaken by the Government and other agencies, polarisation will be facilitated and stability forfeited."

The Honourable Minister of Co-operation and Development is saying that Blacks must shut up when they are trampled upon by the new constitution. He is saying that when we are trampled upon and we groan in our agony, and he is saying that when we share our agony with each other, we are "radical elements" against which the country must be warned.

The Deputy Minister of Environment Affairs and Fisheries said:

"...In the referendum moderate South Africans voted 'Yes' although they were not traditionally supporters of the Government. In addition to the Prog-at-all-costs newspapers, Buthelezi and the ANC also made their contributions towards the huge 'Yes' vote that was achieved. We know that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition liaised with Chief Buthelezi and used him for his own political purposes. That we know. The ANC also made an appeal to the voters of South Africa to vote 'No.' I want to ask the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition whether there was the same liaison between him and the ANC as there was between him and Chief Buthelezi."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, Mr. Schwarz interjected to the insinuation that there was liaison between the Leader of the Opposition and the ANC and he ordered the Deputy Minister to

withdraw the remark in which the insinuation was made. There was no objection from anybody in the House about the insulting allusion to me as a spineless Black creature who can be picked up and dropped by the PFP in their White political game. I must say that I am deeply affronted and disturbed by this kind of debate in White politics. There was no one in the House who stood up to recognise that I had more right than any single South African to raise my voice of protest in the referendum. The new constitution not only disenfranchises me and my people; it not only disenfranchises you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and you Honourable Members, it makes us all non-South Africans. The new constitution purports to be a South African constitution and the whole burden of it is that Africans are not South Africans, and they have no constitutional rights whatsoever. This is how far we are away from power-sharing. It is this kind of debate and the expression of these kinds of sentiments which violate Black integrity and offends the humanity in Blacks. This is the kind of political talk which polarises the country and drives some Blacks to political desperation. The sentiments underlying these kind of statements are nineteenth century colonial sentiments which then led Whites to attempt to annihilate Black society and which now leads them to keep Blacks in a state of permanent political annihilation. For us there is only one country, South Africa. It is our country; we will die for it; we labour for it; we love the people in it; but we will never ever be banished from it. We will never ever disown our birth right and we will never ever turn our backs on future generations of South Africa. This House, I believe, must debate these White political attitudes. I believe we need to express ourselves very clearly and perhaps we ought to begin thinking about the extent to which we are willing to continue attempts to negotiate with White politicians. They regard even the simplest of our God-given rights as being the property of white racist politicians which they are entitled to discard on the rubbish heap of White political thinking. We are not prepared to scavage in stinking White political rubbish heaps for our rights which Whites think they can discard.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I must now begin to round up my remarks. I apologise that I could only touch so briefly on such a few issues with which we have to contend as a Government. In my Policy Speech, I can do no more than indicate priorities, outline the dangers which beset us, and to share with Members of the House the kind of things I and my Cabinet colleagues have to contend with on a day to day basis. Our responsibility as Members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly runs so much deeper than the responsibilities of the country's White Members of Parliament. It falls on our shoulders not only to run a vast administrative machine, but also to do so at the same time as shouldering the responsibility of directing this country to a sane future.

If I had to sum up the position in which we find ourselves in 1984, I would say that we carry the brunt of the burden to keep the Black politics of South Africa constructively engaged in using democratic and non-violent means to bring about radical changes for the benefit of the whole country. I would say that KwaZulu's contribution to national reconciliation is a vital contribution which none but ourselves can make. I would say that we set about our weighty responsibilities within a climate of growing polarisation and hardening Black attitudes which have been created by the new constitution. And I would go on to say that we do this in the context of international misconceptions about the South African situation.

The Zulu nation and every South African, regardless of race, colour or creed, will benefit or will suffer from the success or failure with which we attend to our business in this House. This is a KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and its first administrative responsibility is to the people of KwaZulu, but its political responsibility to the people of KwaZulu takes this House into the realms of national politics. We are placed by history where we are. We were made South Africans by history when we were taken into the Union of South Africa in 1910. We intend remaining there whatever cost we may be forced to pay to remain there. Our commitment to one South Africa and to one nation is here in KwaZulu where history has placed us. We live in the days when Zulu bashing has become fashionable on both sides of the colour line. I wish to read to you an article by a prominent African academic whom I respect very much, which will illustrate to you what I mean. Prof. Mphahlele's article in "The Sowetan."

LET'S STAY AFRICAN

BY ES'KIA MPHAHLELE

And so the language of colonization has come to stay. A curse upon us! As if we did not have enough problems with black solidarity! I mean words and phrases like "tribe", "tribal beads", "tribal lands", "homelands", "tribesmen", "Zulu", "Xhosa", "Sotho", "Tswana", "Venda", and so on.

The ghosts of Shepstone (the first English segregationist in Natal) and Verwoerd (out, out, damned black spot!), and the living SABRA wiseheads must be smiling upon the way colonized subjects keep the vocabulary alive.

The "homelands" are those areas that used to be called "rural

reserves." Urban Africans use "homelands" quite glibly. They have written off the 15 million or so because they identify those who with their chief ministers and presidents whom history has chosen to anoint as caretakers of the territories. Urbanites truly regard themselves as more "advanced" than our rural countrymen. Our urban writers don't even care to go "out there" to acquaint themselves intimately with rural culture. And they still don't realize how much the poorer they are because it doesn't tell a quarter of the story of black South Africa. Is Sol Plaatjie going to be the last writer to recognise rural displacement as one of the most poignant dramas of our history?

What's worse, we have unwittingly accepted the Progressive Federal Party's concern for "urban blacks", and the adoption of the same concern by the white controlled press and radio. The myth is that rural Africans are taking care of their problems! Makes my heart bleed.

Just too many Zulu-speaking people have acknowledged with pride the oft-repeated statement pressmen love to trot out on their copy that the Zulus are the "most populous tribe" in South Africa. I have heard just too many Zulu-speakers, in and outside "KwaZulu" official circles and the rural populace, say they are the Zulu nation." A sociologist who lectures in a New York university said at a conference in 1976 that whenever he's asked by whites what "tribe" he belongs to he answers, "I belong to no tribe, I belong to the Zulu nation!" Crazy mixed-up ironies, you'll observe.

On being interviewed by radio at the University of Texas in Austin (USA) - a writer replied to the same question "I'm Zulu." When my turn came I said "I'm South African, stuff the tribe nonsense." But your fellow countryman told us he's Zulu, was the radio journalist's implied surprise. "That's his Zulu business!" was my reply. "If you want to know what my mother tongue is, in a healthy context, I shall tell you."

If the territorial leaders want to convince us that they happen to be victims of history like the rest of us, and that they renounce the concept of "nation" used by the South African rulers to refer to their territories, then they must educate their constituencies to spurn such flattery. They must renounce the label "nation" or "nation states." Acceptance of a colonial term is acceptance of the thought carried by it; it is to approve of our colonial condition.

What an ironic turn the vocabulary often takes, as when a New York Times article referred to Chief Gatsha as "leader of the Zulu tribesmen!" It is not uncommon to hear a white man abroad ask "You are a South African? - I have met a number of Zulus." To him, as to say many others of the white world, Zulus are the only black reality in South Africa. It has something to do with the history of the Zulu speaking people. There's plenty of literature whipping about overseas that conjures up romantic images about Zulus. Even the anthropologists have come to speak of the Zulus as their "favourite pet tribe." I have heard whites who can speak Zulu declare themselves as Zulu. The Watutsi of Ruanda-Urundi, the Baganda of Uganda and others who are regarded as special once enjoyed this European-inspired pet role.

Not so long ago a writer of The Sowetan told us about a "dear Zulu friend" of his. Often without knowing it we carry on about the "dignity" or the "admirable customs" of the Zulu people. Just the way European and American missionaries, explorers and administrators of the 19th and early 20th centuries used to write. In that early context, the custom had a lot to do with the European's notion of the "noble savage" - an image too obnoxious to the progressive mind today. A "tribe" used to be a community with a common language that had its own political organization. It had a ruler, who could be the final authority or owe allegiance to the king of a whole territory containing several such rulers (colonial word: "chief"). Now Africa no longer has colonies governed from abroad, the word "tribe" no longer makes sense. Because such units now owe their allegiance to a central government in an independent state. "Ethnic group: is the closest to what the old tribe should be called, or for instance "the Gikuyu speaking", or "Lodzi-speaking" people.

In South African English language text-book being used extensively in high schools is a list of collective nouns. As if the author had not surprised us enough with "an audience of listeners", he was determined to rivet us to our seats with a "tribe of natives"! Whew!

"Tribesmen", ah, white press reporters simply love them - is naturally out, too.

A report in the Sowetan once wrote about "tribal dance and music." Why not "African" or "traditional" art or whatever? Are we ashamed to call ourselves Africans?

A reporter in another daily wrote recently that a lawyer in the West Rand had a Xhosa-speaking mother and a Tswana-speaking father. But then she is a white reporter. As Africans we should not even think of making such a distinction. Our own reporters have come up with phrases like a "Xhosa singer". Would we in all seriousness talk about John Kani and Winston Ntshona as Xhosa actors? Cursed be the sun that could dare rise to usher such a day!

Here we are trying desperately hard (or we desperate enough?) to instill the noble concept of Black Consciousness in the minds of our people, and yet some of us continue to endorse debasing stereotypes of ourselves. By definition, Black Consciousness is a state of mind, and it can never take root as long as we fail to redefine ourselves and dictate what we shall be called. Unfortunately, no sooner had the first leaders of the Black Consciousness movement compelled the press to use "black" instead of "non-white" (to refer to Africans, Asians and so-called coloureds) then the same press twisted the term so that it rhymed with the official "black" for African.

I would insist we call ourselves African to include those the media refers to as black plus the so-called coloured and Asians. We are all rightful occupants of a continent that was ravaged by Europe; the southern landscape together with all its oppressed inhabitants. The sooner we identify ourselves with the rest of Africa so much quicker shall we be to realise the soul force we share in common on this continent. And "African" is a term we shall always be happy to live with in a greater southern Africa. The term "Black Consciousness" needs to be expanded so that it becomes part of an African consciousness. It can still deal with our local ideological aspirations in this country while at the same time it constantly reminds us that we are here because we are African.

To decolonize our minds, we have to redefine our language. Language indicates what we think, our image of ourselves. If we use the word "homeland" without any indication that it is "so-called", then we are accepting the ideology that created the concept. We are endorsing a colonial process. If we choose to use "blacks" to include all those who are not officially called "white", and as a politically convenient term, we must still push the name "African" to prepare our attitudes for a greater future.

To call ourselves African is not racist. It is a humanistic term. That is, all those subscribe to our humanism can be included. But they must earn that place. They cannot just use a geographic convenience to support their claim. They must prove by word and

deed that they support the humanistic values of freedom and all other human rights.

The Africans in this country share the spiritual values of a culture. We should not regard customs as the only components of a culture. We may do things differently according to ethnic customs, but we are a cultural unit. No one must cheat us out of this sense of cultural solidarity. So instead of Zulu or Sotho or Xhosa or Venda or Shangaan-Tsonga customs, we should insist on "African" or "traditional" or "indigenous" customs.

SOWETAN. 16 JANUARY 1984

I am very proud to read to you responses that were made to Professor Mphahlele's article by the Secretary of this Legislative Assembly, Mr. M.R. Mzimela and the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare.

The following was Mr. Mzimela's response in "The Sowetan" dated the 15th February 1984:

ZULUS ARE A NATION

SIR - I would like to refer to the article of January 16 1984 written by Professor Es'kia Mphahlele. Although I appreciate some of the things he raises, I cannot agree with him where he denies that the Zulus are a nation.

I think he should not review the South African history as though it started with the arrival of the whites in this country. It is wrong to review South African history in the context of the colonial conquests. It would be a good thing if he checked his records correctly. I say this because in his article he puts it as if the Zulus were a creation of Pretoria, which is not the case.

The Zulus had a king as they still have one even today. Thus they were a nation even before the arrival of the whites in this country. I would also remind Prof. Mphahlele that during the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879, the British were fighting against the Zulus who were already a nation. Even after the Zulus had been defeated they recognised themselves as a nation because they remained united under their hereditary kings and on the same territory, that is, Natal.

I wonder what Prof. Mphahlele would say about the Sothos of Lesotho and the Swazis of Swaziland. Could he not regard them as nations? If he could, is it because they are now independent? One should bear in mind that it was through the accident of history that the Zulus are not independent today because their territory was included in the Union of South Africa in 1910.

To repudiate the nationhood of the Zulus is like denying both the above-mentioned countries that they are nations. According to my interpretation, the word "nation" means a large community of people associated with a particular territory, usually speaking the same language and usually having a political character or political aspirations.

The Zulus like Swazis and Sothos befit this description. If the Zulus were not defeated by the British they would still be ruling the whole of Natal even today.

As far as I am concerned, the ghost of Shepstone must be wailing to see that the Zulus are still united and still a strong nation, because his aim was to destroy the Zulu nation completely. That is why Shepstone worked very hard to draw the Zulus to the war of 1879.

TRUTH

It is always amazing when people who are expected to know the truth as it is, tend to ignore it. I am saying this because I have noticed that there is now a new trend which has developed with the young people, particularly those who have grown up in the so-called urban areas.

These people have a tendency of regarding KwaZulu as a creation of Pretoria. They regard themselves as the most well-informed but one always discovers that they are totally ignorant of the main truth regarding South Africa.

Now and again these people have been reminded that the Honourable Chief Minister of KwaZulu is still exercising the duties which were performed by his great grand-father, Chief Mnyamana Buthelezi who was the Prime Minister and Commander-in-Chief of King Cetshwayo's time.

Even the subsequent generations of the Buthelezi family continued to be the advisors and Prime Ministers of the Zulu Royal Family. All these years the Zulu nation was regarding them as such. All this indicates that the Zulus were a sovereign nation.

As a Zulu I accept that I am an African but of Zulu extraction. I am not ashamed of that. I also regard other ethnic groups like Sothos, Xhosas, etc. as my fellow South African citizens with whom we share one land.

I cannot accept that at this point in time KwaZulu should be separated and made independent from the rest of South Africa. I am saying this knowing very well that the whole of Natal and some of the portions of land which were excised and included in other provinces before the conquests of South Africa, belonged to the Zulu nation.

I would not appreciate the separation of KwaZulu from South Africa because even my forefathers had contributed to the creation of the wealth of this country. For instance my grandfather was working in Johannesburg during the early stages of the 19th century.

We all know that the conquests of this country brought some changes but I believe the Zulu people as part of South Africa need a sort of local authority which could attend to their affairs, i.e. local administration of that small portion of land which they still own.

The Zulu people need hospitals, agricultural development etc. so that they can subsist. We all believe that one day we will share the fruits of this country as South Africans.

The South African political set-up should not confuse Prof. Mphahlele to the extent of finding it an easy option that we should throw away our ethnic groupings. We all accept that we are Africans; but we cannot deny the very truth that we are of different extractions, that is Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho, Venda and so on. This is an historical fact which we cannot do away with whether we like it or not. A Frenchman cannot deny that he is of French extraction even though he is a European.

My intention is not to level criticisms against Prof. Mphahlele but to put matters in their true perspective because most people, especially the youth, could be misled by his article which refuses to acknowledge the fact that Zulus are a nation.

M.R. MZIMELA
Macekane Store
P.O. Mtunzini

The following is the response by the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare, Dr. F.T. Mdlaolose:

LET US BE AFRICAN FIRST

SIR - In his article in the Sowetan of January 16 1984 entitled "Let's Stay African", I felt in general agreement with what I considered to be Prof. Es'kia Mphahlele's main focus of attention - black unity.

It is very true that much emphasis has to be made on the necessity of black unity. Emphasis on divisions can only play into the hands of our oppressors who believe in that old colonial principle of "divide and rule." The division gets more sickening when, as Prof. Mphahlele rightly points out, "urban writers don't even care to go out there to acquaint themselves intimately with rural culture."

I would go on to say it is shameful that since the white regime has branded rural areas as "homelands" some of our brothers and sisters in the urban areas have subconsciously elevated themselves onto a higher pedestal - Urbans - and have looked down upon their brothers and sisters who have lived for centuries in areas they have just recently been baptised by the white regime as "homelands". Give a dog its name - and hang it!

This "better than thou" attitude bedevils our relationship. After all, is it not true that all of us were simply country folks not even a century ago? Is it not true that although some were born in these glorified urban areas they still have their cousins and brothers living in the denounced rural areas? (Denounced only because the white regime has labelled them "homelands") Is it not true that some of our brothers and sisters live in both worlds? Let us denounce the "homelands" label given to certain parts of ONE COUNTRY by Pretoria. But let us not denounce people merely because they happen to have been born and bred there.

While we rightly denounce Pretoria's labels we must not turn about and be so naive as to deny what we called ourselves centuries before the white man laid his foot on the soil of South Africa. I cannot jump out of being Themba Mdalose any more than you can jump out being Thabo Tsotetsi. But that does not mean we cannot be friends, relatives even, and be bounced up by one common factor - liberation of the blacks! This common factor is not incompatible with me being a Mdalose any more than with you being a Tsotetsi. The liberation goal does not depend on my skinning myself out of "Mdalose" or you opt of "Tsotetsi."

In the same vein the liberation goal does not depend on my skinning myself out of being a Zulu any more than on your skinning yourself out of being a MoSotho!

ORIGINS

A common South Africanism does not surely depend on abolition of our surnames that happen to be different, or our ethnic origins that happen to be different. In fact being South Africans, when liberated, will not bar us from joining hands with Zimbabweans, Mozambicans, Nigerians, Libyans, Kenyans etc. to become AFRICANS. I am afraid I cannot skin myself out of Mdlalose, out of Zulu, out of South African, out of African or even out of being homo sapiens species on the planet earth.

It is in my view uncalled for to get hot under one's collar merely because you heard somebody say he was Zulu or Sotho or Xhosa. It is equally uncalled for to get hot under one's collar merely because you hear somebody say he was Mogale or whatever surname. These surnames, these ethnic groups, these national groups, (Zimbabweans, Namibians, Zaireans, etc.) these continental groups (Africans, Europeans, Americans, etc.) all these do exist and it is folly to deny their existence. It is equal folly to be kept divided by them to the point of failing to get to our ultimate liberation.

There is nothing to be ashamed of in being a Zulu or a Pedi. These "names" were not given to us by the foreigners. So why get hot under your collar when some one says he is Zulu? He is only saying what is true. If we wipe out ?Zulu? we must also wipe out their history. This is unthinkable. They were after all a mighty nation built up by King Shaka out of numerous tribes. They are no tribes! In fact, there are six million of them in South Africa. It was by sheer accident of history that Swaziland, Lesotho and Botswana (with far smaller populations) because they were British Protectorates, ultimately became Swazi nation, Lesotho nation and Botswana nation. The Zulus had certainly no less justification than these three to be called "nation." Their numbers justify this. Their growth into nationhood at the beginning of the 19th century justifies this.

Their valiant stand against the English in 1879 more than justifies this. Or shall we rebaptize the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 into an "Anglo-African" war? No Sir! I am proud of being a Mdlalose, of being a Zulu, of being an AFRICAN, of being a human being but that does not by a long shot make me look down upon a Tsotetsi, or a Sotho, or any other human

being. Why should I deny or be shy of what I am? Let us be what we are.

The article by Prof. Mphahlele left me feeling a little bitter in my mouth when I could not escape the feeling that this was yet another "Zulu bashing" exercise with a bit of "Sotho, Xhosa, Venda and Shangaan-Tsonga" peppering put in for good measure. It was however remarkable that the Pedi pepper was not by any mistake added on! May be the Pedi are absolved by the learned Professor from this hateful sin that is so divisive. Please, let us "BE" African, otherwise we can never "STAY" African.

F.T. Mdlalose (KwaZulu"s Ministry of Health) Ulundi

You will agree with me that these two sons of Africa have very ably dealt with the learned Professor. The Professor's views are typical of the confusion that exists in the Black community at this time. There is a lot of energy and time that is wasted on trying to make a case for our non-existence as a national group within the South African nation. As I stated on the day I officially opened this building, Zulus in particular are a target of both white groups, and of many black groups. This is the heritage of bitterness which is brought about by the past might of the Zulu nation. The Zulus fought with both the major white groups in the last century. A section of the Zulu nation fought with Afrikaners in 1838 and the Zulu nation fought with the British in 1879. They were also involved in the Anglo-Boer War on both sides. That is why there is so much mistrust of Zulus and so much non-acceptance of their bona fides even when they state as we do so often that they committed to all the people of South Africa regardless of race. Amongst our black brethren we are also not trusted because of IMFEKANE OR DIFAQANE which shook the whole of Southern Africa and caused such great hardships throughout the length and breadth of the sub-continent of Southern Africa. History has however allotted to us an important role to play in the resolution of South Africa's problems. We will perform this task without any apology to anyone as Zulus through this Assembly, and as Africans through Inkatha/Kgare and as South Africans of all backgrounds. Our role is a crucial role, whether we like this or not and whatever those who villify us may say.

KwaZulu's first priority is education. We feel that it is through education that Zulus and black people in general will be able to play the crucial role which destiny has assigned for them as Africans and as South Africans. Equal opportunities can only start in the area of education. Our department of education does its

best under very difficult conditions to promote the educational interests of all the people of KwaZulu. We are aware that owing to disparities which are so glaring in the financing of our education we are nowhere near reaching the standards which other races have reached. That is why education is such a sensitive issue which is being exploited so easily by anyone who wishes to create confusion amongst us. We are aware as I have stated before and last year I distributed amongst you a letter of warning which we received from Swaziland which spelled out the plans of some of the external groups (and in particular the External Mission of ANC) have amongst our youth. That is why they are not confining themselves to COSAS, but in our townships they have plans to establish various surrogate youth groups under the umbrellas of youth this, and youth that. That is why even some of our Colleges of Education are targets in the spreading of this sort of propaganda. The target of all these groups is no longer Pretoria. The aim is to create feelings of antagonism against this Legislative Assembly and the KwaZulu Government. That is why in delivering this policy speech I have spelled out to you our vulnerabilities. Because whatever effort we make is under financed. The aim of these groups is to foist all blame on us for the poor quality of the services we render within the stringencies of what in terms of 6 million Zulus is a shoe-string budget. The tragedy which occurred when people lost their lives at the University of Zululand last October was the climax of this campaign which is organised from outside the campuses with the intention of villifying us in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and also as Inkatha. There are a number of our institutions which are being infiltrated and used to carry out these campaigns. I think it is important to focus on this dimension of the villification campaign, as young people's minds are also more vulnerable than the minds of adults. I am however impressed by the extent to which the Inkatha Youth Brigade is standing up to the challenges of all the orchestration of this denigration campaign against us.

Whenever these organisations wish to attack Pretoria rightly for some of Pretoria's failures in giving we blacks equal educational opportunities, we are being deliberately lumped with Pretoria as to portray us as the enemies of the people. This may turn out to be our Achilles heel.

Our second priority is agriculture. It is a great tragedy that we have not been able to achieve all that we would like to achieve for our people in the area of agriculture because a series of droughts have forced us to abandon many of our projects, and to divert our attention and resources towards just keeping people alive. We have had modest starts with small projects such as the Project Umbila with the help of KDC and our department of agriculture. We have also appreciated contributions by other organisations such as ACAT

and the University of Natal and the Bureau of Natural Resources. It is important for members of this House to impress on our constituencies that the production of food is of paramount importance. Food is our first line of defence in our struggle for liberation. As long as people starve, we can forget about being able to use our non-violent strategies for liberation successfully. We should do all we can to promote food production - after all, agriculture is the primary industry. Africa is today starving, but of course there are many reasons for this. But it would be sad to have less to eat when we achieve political freedom. Political freedom without basic items of diet for the population is meaningless. We must learn the hard lessons of our continent because if we don't we will not survive.

I have already mentioned some of the instruments in our hands with which we should carry out things that have a meaning and significance for the masses of our people. Inkatha is a mass organisation and we should therefore always focus on the masses.

I appeal to Hon. Members to be on the alert as we continue our opposition to the new constitution. There are many things which we should be planning at this moment to show our opposition to the new constitution. We must prepare our people for the campaigns we may be forced to step up in our opposition to the new constitution. I think we should study ways and means of using our consumer power for instance to indicate our revulsion to those who will participate in the denationalisation of 22 million Africans. I realise that because of the economic climate we will encounter difficulties in implementing whatever plans we prepare in order to hit at these people. But we need a long and thorough preparation, and I think the time for making a beginning in that direction is right now.

I do hope, Sir, that Honourable Members will freely debate my policy speech. I will be grateful if members tell me where they disagree with me. This is the nation's forum where we can only benefit through your collective wisdom as representatives of the people. We cannot benefit from this collective wisdom if we are not frank with each other. I thank you Mr. Speaker and Honourable Members.
