

6mb/062/004/4

MONDAY, MAY 27, 1985

# The Civil War in South Africa Has Started

PARIS — Elliott Abrams, the outgoing U.S. assistant secretary of state for human rights, argued recently that many changes had been effected in South Africa since Pieter W. Botha came to power. As proof that Mr. Botha was moving away from entrenched white domination, Mr. Abrams cited the splitting off, to the right, of part of the Afrikaner tribe.

From the Afrikaners' point of view, at least two significant shifts did occur. The first was the breakup of Afrikaner tribal orthodoxy, the split between Far Right and Pragmatic Right. This break, caused by the pragmatic Nationalists' realization that they would have to co-opt the Asian and "colored" minorities to extend their power base, could not but blur the outlines of apartheid. The cosmetic blurring proved too much for the keepers of the tribe's cultural and ideological purity. This shift to a base no longer exclusively white is probably permanent: The government's declared intention to abrogate laws pertaining to "mixed" marriages makes a healing of the split impossible.

The second shift is illustrated by increased militarization and the growing political influence of the military. South Africa has moved from an old-fashioned colonialist setup, with Westminster political structures assuring vestigial democracy for the minority, to a Third World autocracy typified by pervasive state control, a rampant bureaucracy, antiquated economic structures, progressive impoverishment and a transfer of power from politicians to security experts.

There has been effervescence but no progress. Reform, in the current context, consists of piecemeal methods of adaptation. The underlying pattern remains one of military containment. Conflicting signals emanate from South Africa only because the game is veiled. The strategy is probably military — apparently incoherent and sensitive to pressure — but with clear goals.

The strategy allows for influences by, say, cultural or foreign policy developments. But the plans remain constant: Sectioning the country into a military zone that would assure control and allow for a tolerable level of resistance; liber-

By Breyten Breytenbach

*This is the second of two articles.*

alizing some obsolete apartheid fixtures to procure "colored" and Asian support and assuage foreign faintheartedness; creating alternative representative structures to divert black demands, strengthening the homelands, driving a wedge between rural and urban blacks — ultimately regrouping this mare's nest of institutions and bodies into the semblance of a participatory confederation that would leave white political and economic power intact.

These internal readjustments are accompanied by an aggressive foreign policy expressed by

---

***There has been a near collapse of the 'middle ground.' Blacks no longer plead for participation.***

---

creating or supporting rebel factions in neighboring states (Angola, Mozambique); by direct incursions (in Lesotho, Angola, etc.); by establishing a military presence of sorts elsewhere in Africa, or weaving a tissue of complicity by selling arms (Somalia, the Comoro Islands, Malawi, probably Zaire); by putting the world community before a fait accompli in Namibia.

In all this, Pretoria serves interests of the United States, which has no quarrel with the military stance and uses South Africa as a conduit for funneling aid and influence to sub-Saharan Africa. Policy-makers in Washington misread and mislead their own concerned public.

How else can the world live with the raw terror emanating from South Africa? Officially more than 250 people have been killed (including one white) since last September, when the new constitution came into operation. Recently 14,000 miners were fired for striking, before an agreement finally was negotiated. New treason trials are setting up the United Democratic Front for

liquidation by linking it to the African National Congress and thus to the Communist Party. We know from the inquest into the Uitenhage massacre that the police have orders to shoot to kill. And they do. Women and children. In the back.

Despite this, and although majority spokesmen have repeatedly asked for a total isolation of the country, a consortium of 12 European banks recently granted a \$75-million loan to Pretoria.

Among the contradictions that those nominally in power may have to solve will be overextension of their military capacities, the economic palsy that makes it impossible to follow through after breaking a neighbor (with what are they going to rebuild Mozambique?) and losing policy control over their own armed forces.

But the true changes — taking into account that any interpretation must be a blunting instrument — are the following: There has been an all but total collapse of the "middle ground" where, with mutual good will, the future could have been talked into shape. (It is true that borderline contacts with the ANC have been established, but these are as yet too timid to pull the parties into an interdependence and provoke a need to continue talks that, in turn, could create grounds for negotiations.) Blacks no longer plead for participation. The white state is rejected.

The strategy of reform, although modifying some elements, has no grip on the future. And although there is not yet a majority strategy for revolution, there is a depth to the despair and bitterness and resolution of the people — and an inner liberation, too: a cultural awareness, a political tempering — that expresses itself in the willingness to die for the cause, in the burning of corpses, in the attempts to create autonomous power centers and people's armies. The mourning, the strikes, the marching, the acrid smoke, the breakdown of white-imposed civil structures, the refusal to accept white "peace" — all flash one clear signal: The point of no return has been reached. The civil war has already started.

---

*Mr. Breytenbach, the Afrikaans poet, contributed this comment to the Los Angeles Times.*



# re Dubious udget Cuts

inflation and interest rates. In addition, the House plan also relies on slightly more dubious expectations of future spending cuts to reach its own deficit target of \$124 billion in 1988.

For instance, the Democratic plan, unlike the Senate budget, assumes that \$4 billion can be saved next year by improving government contracting and that another \$4 billion in revenues will be available from settlement of a long-standing dispute between the states and the federal government over oil money from offshore drilling.

Senators maintain that their plan would save \$115 billion in three years by holding down military spending, and House members say their Pentagon cuts would save \$137 billion.

But the budget office reports that both savings claims are exaggerated. This is because they both base their military "cuts" on reductions from the high levels assumed in an agreement, no longer in effect, between the Reagan administration and Senate Republican leaders that was announced more than a year ago from the White House Rose Garden.

"In the future years, the House budget is something like a fond hope that everyone will do what they should do," said the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Pete V. Domenici, Republican of New Mexico. "Our budget mandates the committees to change laws."

## A Comparison of Budget Plans

Rounded figures in billions of dollars for fiscal years. The President's 1986 budget was proposed Feb. 4. Senate/White House compromise plan passed the Senate on May 10; House plan was approved Thursday.

	1985 (projected)	1986 Reagan budget	1986 Senate/ White House plan	1986 House plan
<b>Outlays</b>	\$954	\$972	\$965	\$967
<b>Revenues</b>	736	793	794	794
<b>DEFICIT</b>	<b>\$217</b>	<b>\$179</b>	<b>\$171</b>	<b>\$173</b>

Sources: House and Senate Budget Committees, Office of Management and Budget and Congressional Budget Office

The New York Times

But on Saturday, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, William H. Gray 3d of Pennsylvania, defended the Democratic budget plan as a realistic alternative to the Senate spending program.

"Let me remind the president that he asked for \$50 billion in spending cuts and we gave him \$56 billion in spending cuts," Mr. Gray.

### ■ Reagan Deplores House Plan

Mr. Reagan declared Friday that the House budget would endanger national security and was "unacceptable to me and to the American people," The Washington Post reported.

Nevertheless, the president would accept the House plan to eliminate a one-year freeze on Social Security cost-of-living increases if House-Senate conferees came up with "real savings of the same magnitude," according to the assistant White House press secretary, Albert Brashear.

In a speech to the National Manufacturers Association, Mr. Rea-

gan said the military cuts voted by the House "would undermine our negotiating position in Geneva and put the defense of our nation at risk." He praised the Senate version of the budget as "a major effort to control government spending" that would "prepare the way for tax reform and help put our economy on a growth path through the end of the decade."

[On Saturday, the president devoted his weekly radio address to the tax-reform initiative he plans to offer Tuesday, The New York Times reported. Mr. Reagan, giving the first details of the plan, said it would assist families by greatly expanding the personal exemption, raising the standard deduction, lowering rates and retaining the deduction for home mortgage payments on principal residences.

[Mr. Reagan also promised that the plan would significantly reduce taxes for the majority of Americans while assisting low-income households and allowing "working poor families to climb up the ladder of success."]

# United Air Talks Over Role of New

By Douglas B. Feaver  
*Washington Post Service*

WASHINGTON — Contract negotiations between United Airlines and its striking pilots have collapsed after both sides rejected a federal mediator's proposal to settle new issues created since the strike began May 17.

No talks were scheduled and prospects are good for a protracted, bitter dispute at the largest U.S. airline just as the peak summer travel season begins.

After the breakdown Saturday, United reiterated plans to hire and train replacement pilots for the 4,900 striking members of the Air Line Pilots Association.

United has been operating 209 flights daily to 41 airports for most of the past week, about 14 percent of its pre-strike schedule.

The company said it has already hired 100 replacement pilots and that nine of them had completed training and were flying Saturday.

The carrier's cockpit, maintenance and dispatch procedures have been under special surveillance since the strike began, according to Anthony J. Broderick, the Federal Aviation Administration's associate administrator for aviation standards.

"I think we can be 25 percent up and flying by July 1," said John R. Zeeman, United's executive vice president for marketing and planning.

Five days of intensive talks apparently had settled what all par-

ties agreed was on the table: U pay new pilot schedule than c The negotia over questions and managem Both sides had the people who case of the pilo work after the case of mana did.

According of two wage so the pilots ag schedule syste renegotiated years. The so merged into years.

With that turned to "b The key was 5 trained but planned to u However, all pilots honor exchange for they would b The comp the union "d people," Mr.

A union s dos, said that these young tage, no doubt Airlines will

The airline favored senior newly hired r to union pilot picket lines.