RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR HERMAN GILIOMEE'S ARTICLE 'THE PATTERN OF POLITICS' - ON MY VIEWS ON BLACK LOCAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS

BY - Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
President of Inkatha;
Chairman of The South African
Black Alliance
and
Chief Minister of KwaZulu

21 July 1983:

ULUNDI

The issue of whether Inkatha should or should not participate in the elections of Black Local Councils in Soweto under the new Act, has arisen not because I have changed my views on participation per se, but because of a department of Foreign Affairs hand-out, which was distributed heavily to justify black exclusion from Mr P. W. Botha's Constitutional proposals. It was distributed on behalf of the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning. This information sheet put the question: "Why are Blacks not included in the new dispensation?" And the answer is: "Blacks already have their own governments and administrations as, for example, in KwaZulu (where Zulu Ministers attend to own affairs) or in Soweto where new Councils with extended powers are to be established".

My first reaction to this was a letter with my strong objections addressed to the Minister of Cooperation and Development, Dr. Koornhof. I received a wish-washy reply which did not address the issue at all. I reminded Dr. Koornhof that blacks of KwaZulu had never accepted the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly as representing a final solution for South Africa's political problems. I reminded the Minister

that Whites had Town Councils, Provincial Councils and other civic bodies, which are not a substitute for their representation in Parliament. I told the Minister that after reading what the handout says about Community Councils in Soweto it would now be problematic for me to encourage my people to support them. I reminded the Minister that he knew very well that we want to participate in the final decision-making bodies of our land. I added that the Buthelezi Commission was the very measure of our rejection of the apartheid ideology. I demanded a public withdrawal of what the information sheet stated in Parliament by Dr. Koornhof or another Minister. This has never been done.

I have raised the issue at various meetings including the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, the Lebowa Legislative Assembly, the South African Black Alliance meetings and at a public Rally in Soweto in May. Recontly I raised the issue at our policy-making body which is the Inkatha Annual General Conference. I repeated what I had said so many times that if what the information sheet stated was the view of the government, then I saw no reason why Inkatha should participate or encourage participation in the Soweto Council elections. Because there was not enough time for Conference to debate the issue I suggested that it be referred to the Central Committee for debate and final decision on the issue. While it is my duty to guide the Movement which I lead, as leader, I always leave final decisions to the people themselves. I do so as a democrat.

In the circumstances therefore it is quite wrong for Professor Hermann Giliomee to pontificate on the issue on behalf of myself and Inkatha, without bothering to ascertain what is the correct position on the issue. I thought that relations between me and Professor Giliomee were normal. He helped us in the Buthelezi Commission and I have high regard for him.

To speak for me as the Professor does in the article as if when I objected to our exclusion in the Constitutional Proposals I did so on behalf of what whites call 'urban blacks,' is a distortion of my views. I have never regarded rural and urban Africans as having separate destinies. My reason for this is that no other race group in South Africa, nor any Nation in the world is divided into separate entities along those lines of being Rural or Urban. Why must this apply only to Africans? Professor Giliomee has therefore no right to mislead the public by suggesting that I was arguing against the exclusion of only the so-called 'urban Africans' from the Constitutional dispensation. I am opposed to the exclusion of all Africans regardless of whether they are Urban or Rural.

I also express my dismay that Professor Giliomee has concluded that we ever at any time accepted responsibilities in Regional Legislatures such as the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly as making up for black denial of full political rights, including participation in the final decisionmaking body which is Parliament, I am in fact embarrassed that a Professor of History should in this day and age write about what he describes as my "willingness to accept" a KwaZulu Homeland, when he should know better. Surely Professor Giliomee knows very well that the Zulu people faced Afrikaners in the Battle of Blood River in 1838 in an armed resistance to the rape of KwaZulu. The Professor also knows that the Zulu people also faced the might of the British army in 1879 for the same reason. Professor Giliomee should know as a historian who follows current events that my leadership in KwaZulu was not created by what he . describes as "accepting the KwaZulu Homeland." How does

one "accept" a place which is part of an area in which all his ancestors are buried, and where his family has lived for hundreds of years? Zulus after all governed themselves under a Monarchical system long before Pieter Retief approached King Dingane at MGUNGUNDLOVU with requests for land because the whole country was theirs.

It is common cause that the structure of a 'KwaZulu Homeland' in the form of a Legislative Assembly was imposed on the existing framework of Zulu traditional administration, in which I had a traditional role at local level, and at the Zulu 'National' level. I was begged literally by the Zulu people at the time not to abandon them when that framework was imposed by force. I cannot therefore understand why Professor Giliomee tries to compare the incomparable. How can be compare by implication my traditional leadership role within a Zulu National group which has existed for hundreds of years with participation by my people in the Black Local Councils that are being created now by the government. I say this notwithstanding the fact that I have never found it anathema for black patriots to participate in governmentcreated structures such as Community Councils, if they have been created for blacks. It is for this reason that I would prefer true patriots to participate in them rather than people who do not have the interests of people at heart. In this view I totally agree with Dr. Nelson Mandela's views in 'NO EASY WALK TO FREEDOM' which I would quote if newspapers were prepared like me, to break the law, by quoting it as I have done so politically at rallies in Soweto, in support of my argument on the issue of participation in governmentcreated bodies. I have not changed my views. But when the government excludes Africans from the new political dispensation, and then expect me to still support participation in the new Black Local Councils, even after the government has

stated / ... 5

stated in black and white that these local Councils are now not just local civic bodies, but a substitute for African exclusion in Parliament under the new political dispensation, I am stymied as to what Professor Giliomee expects me to do. To me this is not a question of querying participation as such, but after the publication Tof the information sheet we face the new interpretation of participation in black local Councils by the government itself within the context of the new political dispensation. Participation by other race groups in Provincial, Municipal and Village Management boards has not been given as a part for excluding them in Parliament under the new constitutional dispensation. Why does the Professor try to confuse such a clear-cut issue with all the red-herrings he drags into his article?

PACTERT

The Federation speech which I delivered in Cape Town in 1974 to which Professor Giliomee refers, was also made in the context of the understanding that this country must have one legislature for all people, for the very reason that I have never accepted the notion of independent Homelands a'la Pretoria, as the final solution for South Africa's political problems. I therefore do not understand why my Hoernle Memorial Lecture on Federation was dropped into Professor Giliomee's article on my pronouncements on participation in Black Local Councils. As I stated in my letter to Dr. Koornhof, the Buthelezi Commission itself in which Professor Giliomee participated, is the very measure of my and the Zulu people's rejection of apartheid and its consumntion through independence and Mr P.W. Botha's Confederation of States. I was not prompted by any fear of losing credibility as Professor Giliomee suggests in his article, in taking the stand which I took at the Inkatha Annual Conference. I am a pragmatic politician, and I am

not always prompted by ideological considerations in taking my political stands. I am always prompted by what I consider to be in the interests of all South Africans in the final analysis. I am the servant of the people and interpret their wishes and aspirations.

Inkatha has a presence in Soweto and other Reef townships through its branches. It does not need to establish a presence on the Witwatersrand through what Professor . . Giliomee describes as "Control over townships on the Witwatersrand". It is much more important to have the people's support, than the control of Councils which do not enjoy the confidence of the people.

Even if one assumed through Afrikaner mentality that my base was Zulu only, as Professor Giliomee also implies, which it is not, it is still a fact that Zulus live all over South Africa and not merely in the rural areas. The major townships of Durban for example are in KwaZulu, and they all have branches of Inkatha.

I am also unaware as Professor Giliomee states that the South African Black Alliance is "in trouble", whatever that is supposed to convey. We still have a Coloured representation in the South African Black Alliance even after the defection of the Labour Party, because not all Coloureds agree with the decision of the Labour Party on participation in the Tri-cameral Parliament without African participation.

I take very strong exception to Professor Giliomee's statement in the article that I have ever at any time tried to promote Inkatha as an internal wing of ANC. I challenge

Professor Giliomee to state when I ever stated that I was attempting to do this either to him or anyone else. I have always stated, and did so even to the then Minister of Justice and Police Mr Jimmy Kruger in 1977 that Inkatha is rooted in the ideals of the African National Congress as propounded by the founding fathers in 1912. We follow the strategy of non-violence which the African National Congress pursued when it was functioning right to the time it was banned.

When I went to London with my colleagues in 1979 to meet Mr Oliver Tambo and his colleagues we had been requested by him to do so. We were not doing so to curry favour with the External Mission of ANC which he Mr Tambo is Head of. After all the External Mission of ANC was established by our then President-General Chief A. J. Lutuli, to do international diplomatic work for black people of South Africa, when many of us were members of the African National Congress. The decision to go into the armed struggle was taken independently by the External Mission of ANC. In spite of this, I have always stated that Inkatha has the same goals as the External Mission of ANC, to bring about a non-racial democratic government in South Africa. We differ only on strategy. We went to London on that understanding. It is indeed quite incongruous to state that I wanted Inkatha to be the internal wing of the external Mission of ANC, which is committed to the armed struggle, when Inkatha espouses non-violence.

People join Inkatha voluntarily. We present a philosophy and a strategy and people support us on the basis of these. We never use strong-arm methods such as burning of people's houses and maiming or killing them to intimidate them into supporting or joining us.

I have never understood why the external Mission of ANC . turned their wrath on me and Inkatha from 1979. But I think the reason was that Inkatha would not agree to be a surrogate of any other organisation, and also on account of the political one-upmanship game which is common throughout Southern Africa. I have never attacked the external Mission except to defend myself, and in order to put the record straight to counter their international campaign of villifica ion directed at me and Inkatha rather than at Mr P.W. Botha and the National Party government. Our target in Inkatha is the Racist Minority Regime and not other black organisations.

It is often forgotten that the OAU, the Frontline Presidents and other Heads of State including the President of Nigeria, have tried to influence the external Mission of ANC and the PAC to merge or at least to work together without any success, after 24 years.

I am disappointed to see an Academic I respect as I respect Professor Giliomee quoting Professor Roger Southall to support his own arguments. It is common knowledge that ever since he left the National University of Lesotho, Professor Roger Southall aligned himself with the external Mission of ANC, and has since been their spokesman at every Conference of Black Studies. He is a well-known arch-enemy of Inkatha who never loses one opportunity to denigrate me and Inkatha. His alignment to the external Mission of ANC is ideological and has nothing to do with any academic impartiality that people often erroneously assume to be an attribute of all Academics.

As for what Professor Giliomee call my "troubles", I would be glad to know what form these troubles have taken. The Conference of Inkatha we have just had, has been the best ever with thousands of delegates and observers from as far afield as Cape Town and Johannesburg. I have also just returned from a very successful European tour. The statement by MR HANS VAN DEN BROEK the Dutch Foreign Minister at the HAGGUF, after my visit to Holland, says volumes in this respect. The Foreign Minister stated in the Dutch Parliament that from now onwards they will not make any distinction between the external Mission of ANC and Inkatha, as far as giving us support is concerned. To me these are unprecedented break throughs for Inkatha.

I would be interested to know why Professor Giliomee thinks that I have missed an opportunity to get a base on the Witwatersrand. There is no other leader other than myself who addresses tens of thousands of black people in Soweto each and every year for the last 10 years. How is this possible if I have no base on the Witwatersrand?

It is the South African government which has put me in an impossible position through their information sheet. I gave the Minister of Cooperation and Development an opportunity to work out a government repudiation of what the hand-out states. This has not been done. I would like to ask why are we Blacks always expected to bend backwards to meet the government half-way and not vice-versa? In this case we do not even have space for bending backwards. We have the Buthelezi Commission findings which so far have not been touched even with a badge pole. It is time White South Africa realised that even we Blacks have only two cheeks not more. We have turned the other cheek in compliance with the Christian ethic and we have none left to turn to White South Africa for another slap.

There is no doubt as far as the question which Professor Giliomee poses that the Tricameral Parliamentary system is a step in the wrong direction. There is also no doubt that black people must assume responsibility for their own administration at local level. But if this is put out as a substitute for representation in Parliament, then even Black Local Councils in those circumstances are a step in the wrong direction.

If Professor Giliomee thinks that I am going into the wilderness by taking this stand as he implies, then I can only say that other men in South Africa such as General Hertzog for example took a step into the wilderness, when a principle and their people's future was at stake.

RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR HERMAN GILIOMEE'S ARTICLE 'THE PATTERN OF POLITICS' - ON MY VIEWS ON BLACK LOCAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS

BY - Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
President of Inkatha;
Chairman of The South African
Black Alliance
and
Chief Minister of KwaZulu

21 July 1983:

ULUNDI

The issue of whether Inkatha should or should not participate in the elections of Black Local Councils in Soweto under the new Act, has arisen not because I have changed my views on participation per se, but because of a department of Foreign Affairs hand-out, which was distributed heavily to justify black exclusion from Mr P. W. Botha's Constitutional proposals. It was distributed on behalf of the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning. This information sheet put the question: "Why are Blacks not included in the new dispensation?" And the answer is: "Blacks already have their own governments and administrations as, for example, in KwaZulu (where Zulu Ministers attend to own affairs) or in Soweto where new Councils with extended powers are to be established".

My first reaction to this was a letter with my strong objections addressed to the Minister of Cooperation and Development, Dr. Koornhof. I received a wish-washy reply which did not address the issue at all. I reminded Dr. Koornhof that blacks of KwaZulu had never accepted the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly as representing a final solution for South Africa's political problems. I reminded the Minister that Whites had Town Councils, Provincial Councils and other civic bodies, which are not a substitute for their representation in Parliament. I told the Minister that after reading what the handout says about Community Councils in Soweto it would now be problematic for me to encourage my people to support them. I reminded the Minister that he knew very well that we want to participate in the final decision-making bodies of our land. I added that the Buthelezi Commission was the very measure of our rejection of the apartheid ideology. I demanded a public withdrawal of what the information sheet stated in Parliament by Dr. Koornhof or another Minister. This has never been done.

I have raised the issue at various meetings including the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, the Lebowa Legislative Assembly, the South African Black Alliance meetings and at a public Rally in Soweto in May. Recontly I raised the issue at our policy-making body which is the Inkatha Annual General Conference. I repeated what I had said so many times that if what the information sheet stated was the view of the government, then I saw no reason why Inkatha should participate or encourage participation in the Soweto Council elections. Because there was not enough time for Conference to debate the issue I suggested that it be referred to the Central Committee for debate and final decision on the issue. While it is my duty to guide the Movement which I lead, as leader, I always leave final decisions to the people themselves. I do so as a democrat.

In the circumstances therefore it is quite wrong for Professor Hermann Giliomee to pontificate on the issue on behalf of myself and Inkatha, without bothering to ascertain what is the correct position on the issue. I thought that relations between me and Professor Giliomee were normal. He helped us in the Buthelezi Commission and I have high regard for him.

To speak for me as the Professor does in the article as if when I objected to our exclusion in the Constitutional Proposals I did so on behalf of what whites call 'urban blacks,' is a distortion of my views. I have never regarded rural and urban Africans as having separate destinies. My reason for this is that no other race group in South Africa, nor any Nation in the world is divided into separate entities along those lines of being Rural or Urban. Why must this apply only to Africans? Professor Giliomee has therefore no right to mislead the public by suggesting that I was arguing against the exclusion of only the socalled 'urban Africans' from the Constitutional dispensation. I am opposed to the exclusion of all Africans regardless of whether they are Urban or Rural.

I also express my dismay that Professor Giliomee has concluded that we ever at any time accepted responsibilities in Regional Legislatures such as the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly as making up for black denial of full political rights, including participation in the final decisionmaking body which is Parliament. I am in fact embarrassed that a Professor of History should in this day and age write about what he describes as my "willingness to accept" a KwaZulu Homeland, when he should know better. Surely Professor Giliomee knows very well that the Zulu people faced Afrikaners in the Battle of Blood River in 1838 in an armed resistance to the rape of KwaZulu. The Professor also knows that the Zulu people also faced the might of the British army in 1879 for the same reason. Professor Giliomee should know as a historian who follows current events that my leadership in KwaZulu was not created by what he describes as "accepting the KwaZulu Homeland." How does

one "accept" a place which is part of an area in which all his ancestors are buried, and where his family has lived for hundreds of years? Zulus after all governed themselves under a Monarchical system long before Pieter Retief approached King Dingane at MGUNGUNDLOVU with requests for land because the whole country was theirs.

It is common cause that the structure of a 'KwaZulu Homeland' in the form of a Legislative Assembly was imposed on the existing framework of Zulu traditional administration, in which I had a traditional role at local level, and at the Zulu 'National' level. I was begged literally by the Zulu people at the time not to abandon them when that framework was imposed by force. I cannot therefore understand why Professor Giliomee tries to compare the incomparable. How can be compare by implication my traditional leadership role within a Zulu National group which has existed for hundreds of years with participation by my people in the Black Local Councils that are being created now by the government. I say this notwithstanding the fact that I have never found it anathema for black patriots to participate in governmentcreated structures such as Community Councils, if they have been created for blacks. It is for this reason that I would prefer true patriots to participate in them rather than people who do not have the interests of people at heart. In this view I totally agree with Dr. Nelson Mandela's views in 'NO EASY WALK TO FREEDOM' which I would quote if newspapers were prepared like me, to break the law, by quoting it as I have done so politically at rallies in Soweto, in support of my argument on the issue of participation in governmentcreated bodies. I have not changed my views. But when the government excludes Africans from the new political dispensation, and then expect me to still support participation in the new Black Local Councils, even after the government has

stated in black and white that these local Councils are now not just local civic bodies, but a substitute for African exclusion in Parliament under the new political dispensation, I am stymied as to what Professor Giliomee expects me to do. To me this is not a question of querying participation as such, but after the publication lof the information sheet we face the new interpretation of participation in black local Councils by the government itself within the context of the new political dispensation. Participation by other race groups in Provincial, Municipal and Village Management boards has not been given as a part for excluding them in Parliament under the new constitutional dispensation. Why does the Professor try to confuse such a clear-cut issue with all the red-herrings he drags into his article?

The Federation speech which I delivered in Cape Town in 1974 to which Professor Giliomee refers, was also made in the context of the understanding that this country must have one legislature for all people, for the very reason that I have never accepted the notion of independent Homelands a'la Pretoria, as the final solution for South Africa's political problems. I therefore do not understand why my Hoernle Memorial Lecture on Federation was dropped into Professor Giliomee's article on my pronouncements on participation in Black Local Councils. As I stated in my letter to Dr. Koornhof, the Buthelezi Commission itself in which Professor Giliomee participated, is the very measure of my and the Zulu people's rejection of apartheid and its consumation through independence and Mr P.W. Botha's Confederation of States. I was not prompted by any fear of losing credibility as Professor Giliomee suggests in his article, in taking the stand which I took at the Inkatha Annual Conference. I am a pragmatic politician, and I am

not always prompted by ideological considerations in taking my political stands. I am always prompted by what I consider to be in the interests of all South Africans in the final analysis. I am the servant of the people and interpret their wishes and aspirations.

Inkatha has a presence in Soweto and other Reef townships through its branches. It does not need to establish a presence on the Witwatersrand through what Professor . . Giliomee describes as "Control over townships on the Witwatersrand". It is much more important to have the people's support, than the control of Councils which do not enjoy the confidence of the people.

Even if one assumed through Afrikaner mentality that my base was Zulu only, as Professor Giliomee also implies, which it is not, it is still a fact that Zulus live all over South Africa and not merely in the rural areas. The major townships of Durban for example are in KwaZulu, and they all have branches of Inkatha.

I am also unaware as Professor Giliomee states that the South African Black Alliance is "in trouble", whatever that is supposed to convey. We still have a Coloured representation in the South African Black Alliance even after the defection of the Labour Party, because not all Coloureds agree with the decision of the Labour Party on participation in the Tri-cameral Parliament without African participation.

I take very strong exception to Professor Giliomee's statement in the article that I have ever at any time tried to promote Inkatha as an internal wing of ANC. I challenge

Professor Giliomee to state when I ever stated that I was attempting to do this either to him or anyone else. I have always stated, and did so even to the then Minister of Justice and Police Mr Jimmy Kruger in 1977 that Inkatha is rooted in the ideals of the African National Congress as propounded by the founding fathers in 1912. We follow the strategy of non-violence which the African National Congress pursued when it was functioning right to the time it was banned.

When I went to London with my colleagues in 1979 to meet Mr Oliver Tambo and his colleagues we had been requested by him to do so. We were not doing so to curry favour with the External Mission of ANC which he Mr Tambo is Head of. After all the External Mission of ANC was established by our then President-General Chief A. J. Lutuli, to do international diplomatic work for black people of South Africa, when many of us were members of the African National Congress. The decision to go into the armed struggle was taken independently by the External Mission of ANC. In spite of this. I have always stated that Inkatha has the same goals as the External Mission of ANC, to bring about a non-racial democratic government in South Africa. We differ only on strategy. We went to London on that understanding. It is indeed quite incongruous to state that I wanted Inkatha to be the internal wing of the external Mission of ANC, which is committed to the armed struggle, when Inkatha espouses non-violence.

People join Inkatha voluntarily. We present a philosophy and a strategy and people support us on the basis of these. We never use strong-arm methods such as burning of people's houses and maiming or killing them to intimidate them into supporting or joining us.

I have never understood why the external Mission of ANC turned their wrath on me and Inkatha from 1979. But I think the reason was that Inkatha would not agree to be a surrogate of any other organisation, and also on account of the political one-upmanship game which is common throughout Southern Africa. I have never attacked the external Mission except to defend myself, and in order to put the record straight to counter their international campaign of villifica ion directed at me and Inkatha rather than at Mr P.W. Botha and the National Party government. Our target in Inkatha is the Racist Minority Regime and not other black organisations.

It is often forgotten that the OAU, the Frontline Presidents and other Heads of State including the President of Nigeria, have tried to influence the external Mission of ANC and the PAC to merge or at least to work together without any success, after 24 years.

I am disappointed to see an Academic I respect as I respect Professor Giliomee quoting Professor Roger Southall to support his own arguments. It is common knowledge that ever since he left the National University of Lesotho, Professor Roger Southall aligned himself with the external Mission of ANC, and has since been their spokesman at every Conference of Black Studies. He is a well-known arch-enemy of Inkatha who never loses one opportunity to denigrate me and Inkatha. His alignment to the external Mission of ANC is ideological and has nothing to do with any academic impartiality that people often erroneously assume to be an attribute of all Academics.

As for what Professor Giliomee call my "troubles", I would be glad to know what form these troubles have taken. The Conference of Inkatha we have just had, has been the best ever with thousands of delegates and observers from as far afield as Cape Town and Johannesburg. I have also just returned from a very successful European tour. The statement by MR HANS VAN DEN BROEK the Dutch Foreign Minister at the HAGUE, after my visit to Holland, says volumes in this respect. The Foreign Minister stated in the Dutch Parliament that from now onwards they will not make any distinction between the external Mission of ANC and Inkatha, as far as giving us support is concerned. To me these are unprecedented break throughs for Inkatha.

I would be interested to know why Professor Giliomee thinks that I have missed an opportunity to get a base on the Witwatersrand. There is no other leader other than myself who addresses tens of thousands of black people in Soweto each and every year for the last 10 years. How is this possible if I have no base on the Witwatersrand?

It is the South African government which has put me in an impossible position through their information sheet. I gave the Minister of Cooperation and Development an opportunity to work out a government repudiation of what the hand-out states. This has not been done. I would like to ask why are we Blacks always expected to bend backwards to meet the government half-way and not vice-versa? In this case we do not even have space for bending backwards. We have the Buthelezi Commission findings which so far have not been touched even with a badge pole. It is time White South Africa realised that even we Blacks have only two cheeks not more. We have turned the other cheek in compliance with the Christian ethic and we have none left to turn to White South Africa for another slap.

There is no doubt as far as the question which Professor Giliomee poses that the Tricameral Parliamentary system is a step in the wrong direction. There is also no doubt that black people must assume responsibility for their own administration at local level. But if this is put out as a substitute for representation in Parliament, then even Black Local Councils in those circumstances are a step in the wrong direction.

If Professor Giliomee thinks that I am going into the wilderness by taking this stand as he implies, then I can only say that other men in South Africa such as General Hertzog for example took a step into the wilderness, when a principle and their people's future was at stake.

· STEMEIL Please RESIDENS TO Profesion Herman GILLOMEE'S ARTHOLD THE PATERY OF POLITICS - DOW MY WEWS ON BLACK LOCAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS - By Magareter a Duthelly - bronderet of Intente ; Charmon of the look Mucan Made Allvance be use of white Judeta hand or hand of med Someto mit postrupte in the elections of breeds house Comerles mi under to new Act, has anon to mit become I I have changed my news on patrapoten per se, but because of a In Affairs department of Freye offers hand out a much sent that were downshiped hearty to justy black exclusion for Mr. P.W. Extra Constitutional proposts. It was got distributed on behalf of to Department of Comme. Mrs information sheet put the guestion: "Why are Marks not included in to new dispensation?". And the answer is: "Placks shready have been am grennests and administrations as for example, in knather (where July Ministers about to our affairs or in Someto where now Commada with extended powers are to be established My fant reaching to this was a little was my Observation and Development, Dr. brotholy, of received a willy worky reply of unch did not address by Jane at all. I removed Dr. Comment that poloces of lessoyulu had never accepted to be something to the lessoyulu happenenting transfer as segmenting as final colution for South Muca's required on final colution for South Muca's

foldered, problems, I reminded to Nimity that writes had Tom Comeils, Promand Compiles and the are hours jumeli are not a substitute for prepremetation in lawrenent.

I tal to Minuter that after the reading what to handent cays about Comment. Comerle in Smet it would now be problematic for me to evening my people to support bem I reminded to Minney but he tenen very well that we would to participate in the friend deem making hodies of on land. I stated that the Buth sley Commission was the very messere of our rejection of the exportered wholedogy. I demanded a public with drownal of what the information such stated in Parkoment at various neetings including the length hequilative hequilative hequilative hequilative hequilative hequilative hequilative to Such a formation of the south of the commentation of the commentation of the commentation of the commentation of the south o participation in the Saveto Court engine time to for Conference to debate too irme

I engineed but it he referred to the Central Committee for debate and final demans on to come. While it is my duty to movement windy lead, as the leaders I always leave final decisions to to people thouselves. I do so as a democrat. In the curemmsterness transfer it is gute wrong for Professor Hermann Columbia to postificate on to ome on whalf of myself and tribute northerny to ascarlani met ista correct pontoni on le come de l'aferrer Colonnee were normal, me and Professor Colonnee were normal. He helped us no to Buthelyi Commani as I have high regard for him.

To speak for me as to Professor does we to actively as if contributed Proposition as the Uniqueted to an exchange for the So, on taking what whites call when leads, is a distortion of my sense. I have never regarded rural and below Morcoms as heaving separate destrictes. My moson for this is but mo the race group we link Whita a nor my haterest in he world is almy those distributed with sporte entities almy those lines of very land 20 thom. Why must thus apply only to Moreons? Professor Johnsel that has a good to misled the further by angular that was a good grant to exclusion of only internation of pricated of internations. In the Combathand dispersations of I am spread to the exclusion of all aprices regardless of whether they are below & Kural.

Godo express my district before Cyclismose has concluded to the ever at any time accepted responsibilities in the legislatures such as to law of yells hequesting known to be demad of full proticed rights well-drup portrapolarism of full proticed rights well-drup portrapolarism in to final decision making body when is Parliament. I am no feet embarrared but a Professor of Huston's sumed in the day and of age to the other with the describes as my willingness to recept " a known from the found of when he comed form better. Surely Propersor Submile found to your people found Africaners in to trathe of Blood lines in 1858 in an angular environment to be rope of throught. He Professor also times to to your furth. els faced to mught of to Brown army in 1879 for to came near. Professor I when a so a historian who folius cument events bet my leadering and anyth was not creded by what he describes as "accepting to know your Homeland" the area port of an area minusch all his aneutors are hursed, and where hus family has lived for hundreds of years? Julius often all governed hunsaws mader a Monarchical cyptures long before Preter Retref approached King Dingone at Monuround works for land the the come to whole comby no trevis,

the It is common came that he structure of a c lawar july Hameland " in to form of a hepitative Availey was imposed on to existing fromework of July traditional administration, in which I had a traditional will at level, I loved level, and at the Zuen "haterel" level. I was begand literally by to your purple at to time and to abounder them when bot framework was imposed by force, I semust therefore understound why Profess gelieves bres to compare to incomparable. How can be compare by implication my traditional leadership rule without a year habited group which has exceed your people in to seed loved Congels but are being created in by the gramment. I say this instructionaries to feel best I have never found it anotherna for beads pabriots to pertrappet "in their here help created for blacks. It is for the rescribed wind freshed for blacks. It is for the rescribed wind freshed for blacks. It is for the rescribed wind freshed for patriots to pertrappet in beautiful. withen than people who do not have the of whereits of people at heart. In this ven totally agree with Do. helm Mandela's vers in 'NO Erasy which TO FREEDOM's were I would just if herrypapers were prepared like me to breek to law, by quoting it as I have done so forbidly at rallies in Somety, in support of my definitely on to usue of policyclion in goment of theme not changed my news. But when the zumment excludes approved for the new political dispensation, and respect me to still support participation

te new seade local Corals, even after te grenment her stated in beacle and write bet has local Country or mose of the first local cause houses, but a surphite for offeren exclusion in Pacharet under to new probled degensation; I am stymical as to what Professor Gennel expells me to do. To me this is not a greston of greeging participation as each, but after the publication of the information much met face the new interpretation of the president in brush local Cornels lay to green met itself inthin to context of to new predict dispensation. Park yestom My the rale groups in Praised miningal Ly the rale graps in training humany of the sound village Management hoards has not her as a fitted for excluding term in Parliament, under to new Combitational dispunsation.

Why does the Professor try to confine one a clear-out issue with all by red herroris he day drags into this article?

The Jedenation speech and delivered in Constitution in 1974 to word Professor we Cape sum in 1974 to much Professor Gloome refers, was also made in the context of the majority that this comby must prople, for the very reason but I have never accepted the notion of magnificent Humelands a la Postonia, as to find solution for but Moveers political problems. I weapon do not maistana

why my Horne Memorial bestore on Jedendom was dropped into Perferrer Splusme: anticle on my prominements
on portrapotonis no tracte local Cornerts.

As of credition to Dr. townholfs to Brithely
Common study as which Britisher Splusmele
portrapotods is to very manne of sory
and to July people is rejection of aportand and its commotion trays warfundance and Mr. of w. Pothers Confederation of Clotes, I was not prompted by any fear of losing anathrity as Professor Glumes suggests in his article, in taleng to stand which I took out to Inleation Promal Confesence. amapraguatic politicians ad I am not droups prompted by ideological connections w today my political stands. I am
always prompted by what I canader to be
in bet interests of all but Mpricans in
bet friedly analysis. I am to smooth of to pupe and
Interests these a presence in Sancto
and the Reef to manys through its branches.
It does not need to establish a presence on
the wholes and to establish a presence on Sulsome describes as "Control over to insomps on none important to have to people? supports to an to autot of commonly which do not enjoy the Confidence of to people. nontelety that my have now your my sais Portugue Gellumes also implies,

& Julia live all was South Monica and major tomorrows of and may all have tranches of Inhetta Professor Cytumes Professor and also unamore as Professor Columnes states hat the South Wymram Black Alliance is "in trouble", unabover that Colored representations forty become not all tolars and to the tolars of the Colored representations forty become not all colored agree not to deem of to the tolars forty are posterpolon in to the commend failiament without apricen potrapotion. Gloves statement in the above hat I other word In the tred to prompte photo as an internal way of Arac of challenge Purperson of forme to State when I ever stated hat of automorphisms to do thus enter to him or anyone also. I have always stated, and did so even to be them Minuter of Justice at Potree Mr. Jiany Congress but Industria is Noticed into the soleols of the Minion Noticed Congress as proposed by the foundary of fathers in 1913. We follow the strokeny of Ministeries which the Minion Notices of the Mi Corgoers puremed when I was functump When I went to hunder not my collegues will reg to meet the Olmer Dands and has collegues me had been requested by him to do

so be were not day so to curry farm white the External Museum of NNC work he Alex Jambo excellented by our tran Premaint Person Charles & A. J. hubale, to do international deplimation of the works for trade people of Just Monce, when we'd of is very members of to offer our National Corpuss. The decision to go who to armed striggle was from marginally by to Extend Minn of MMC. In spite of tens I have always stilled that Industry the same gods as to returned Muse of Mac , to bring about a non-racel democratic gramment is book White. We differ my on strategy, we went to handon on but maintainedy of a mored quite incongruens to wanted fuested to be to internal worming of the external roman of AMC jumes is committed to lo anned single, when Indute exposes non-volence. People jam Induter volunterly, we prosent a forbeighty and a strategy and people comput is an that havis of these. We never use strang own methods ench as humming of pupil's homes and marning or billing them to intermedall than justo supporting or going us, have never understood why to external mussing of ANC timed their wroth at me end fretested But I thank to nesson was that Industry he as surrogate of Industry would not you be a surrogate of any the organisation's and also time account of the present one symaning game which is common the symant South am Minita. I have never subselved to extend Musica except

to defend injuly and a put to record strongly substant were strongly substantial street and substant their companying advicated at me and soler than the Somewhere. May for Our target on to the in Galester is to Track mounty Rigure and not other bed organizations if the often forther that the OAU IE freeling Previously and other Heads of Shall shall be shal State including to Prendent of Myana, have fred to influence to external Myanu of kNC and to PAC to merge or tog world together noticent any encess, after six years.
I am disappointed to see an headernice
I respect as I repet Professor Johnne gusting Ruger Ruger Southall to import his our organients. It is comme conviledel und ever since he left to hatemel Il University of hearths, Parform Ruger Southold of aligned humself with the external Mission of AMC, and her since him them spokes men at every Conference of Read Soudies. He is a well broom and enemy of tribents who never loves are appointment to demonde me and Industre. His abjument to be externed Musem of AMC is indertogrand and has moting to do not any academic importably but people often erroreously gotime to be an all whole of all cells my "trulles", I would be glad to know what from their trulles have taken.

he Confermer of Indication we have just had, has cand observers for as for afield as

Capshin and Juhamushing. I have also just

Justined for a very encusful Employ tours!

The Webenest by the Doth Dough Minutes on to HARCUE

often my just to the Molland Caps volumes on

this regical to the Doth Purhament

but for my and to the Doth Purhament

but for my and the trained on to Doth Purhament

but for my and and they mile not make any distriction between to external runarion of ANC June trules had home mused on Offerhands to get a have on the historiand There is no oth leader the beam suggest other secures tens of the mondes of beaute purple in Smets each and every feer in the last is years. How is too prompte of I have no box on to withoutersound? It is to South Wincom government which has put me in an impossible pontin through Corporation at Development an opentual to work ant a greenment reproduction of what he hand-out states. This has not been done. I would like to ask why are me bleeded sharps expected to lead bedowneds to meet to gramment had may and not vice-versa? In this case we do not even have space for tending backwards. We have to Bruthely Community timen so for hext not been to nether even with a badge pole? It is time while such Winca weekend that

exer we keeds have my two cheeks " but herse turned to oter the in compliance to turn to write such affice for muchant much Porferer Schoneer that the Tricamerel Parls amentary Expten is a step in the wrong direction. From is also no doubt that black people must arms respectfully for their our ordinantistim at local for level. But if this put out as another for Representation in Positionment, then exent Beach local Comerles in those committances The factor of the wing direction of the fact of the forther that I am gong the wild the wild the stand of the wild the w can only say but the men in lanks the a stop test desires, when a prompte and here people future was at croke. Mangoreta