

/EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERY/

AN INKATHA - PROGRESSIVE FEDERAL PARTY SYMPOSIUM
ON THE BUTHELEZI COMMISSION

Address by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
 President of Inkatha
 Chief Minister of KwaZulu
 and
 Chairman of The South African
 Black Alliance

CITY HALL: DURBAN

8.00 pm TUESDAY 25 MAY 1982

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, friends, brothers and sisters. It heartens me very greatly to be sharing a platform in the Durban City Hall with so distinguished a colleague in South African politics as Dr. van Zyl Slabbert. I am also very heartened by the interest shown in this seminar across so wide a spectrum of fellow South Africans. I believe that this type of debate is the only kind of discussion which could well pave the way for the kind of negotiated settlements of our political differences in South Africa which will ensure peace, stability and growth. But this, of course, depends on a number of factors. It does not depend on what we who are here do alone. Nor does it depend on what Mr. P.W. Botha, the Prime Minister, does in an all-white Parliament with or without the connivance of the President's Council. It depends on the participation of all the parties involved in the present White-Black South African political conflict.

I must for this reason confess to some measure of disappointment. Had our political climate been healthier, this gathering tonight could have been even more widely representative of the relevant parties in the task of building the future of our country. We must see this as merely a start to a process of balanced negotiation. Dr. van Zyl Slabbert will, I believe, become more and more relevant to the future of South Africa, and therefore it is a highly promising start indeed. But this again depends on the time-scale we have in bringing about such a negotiated settlement of the present Black-White political conflict.

We should not see/...2.

We should not see this gathering as merely an Inkatha-PFP symposium. This would miss the point. This is a debate among different South Africans about their shared condition and about their political, social and economic future. Dr. van Zyl Slabbert and I, in our respective capacities, have merely taken a lead to demonstrate the possibility of a balanced debate. We here do not allow ourselves to fall into the temptation of regarding ourselves as the only politicians which have been bestowed by God with all the political wisdom in a manner our adversaries tend to see themselves. That is why they cling to their own particular political viewpoints as if they are the mouth-piece by which God makes known his wishes to mankind. We both believe in the involvement of all political groupings in the resolution of our political problems. We see this as setting off a debate. I know my fellow South Africans, both Black and White, sufficiently well to be able to promise you that they will prefer balanced negotiation to the costs of violence. I continue to do what I believe to be right in these circumstances because I hope self-interest will dominate. Those who wield power must I hope continue to do so in self-interest. Their self-interest ultimately will be proved to be sharing of power. This first debate is merely an invitation to all to attend a wider debate in future, for that is the only way to the political salvation of all of us in this troubled land.

A basic theme in the present policy of the Central Government, as well as in the policy of the NRP, is that the larger body of Black people should be excluded from the emerging new dispensation for Coloured, Indian and White people. Although I will deal with the President's Council recommendations more fully, I wish for now to say that the President's Council formulations follow this theme closely and it is stated that the interests of the larger body of Black people are so incompatible with those of other South Africans that a different dispensation must hold for Blacks. The incompatibility of Black interests with those of other groups form the basis for the view that there should be a political partition between Blacks and others and that the communication between Blacks and others should be through a confederation for Southern Africa. Blacks are therefore in the main consigned to a future in which they will exist in separate mini-states with a tenuous link to a common affairs of South Africa through an as yet undecided confederal body. There is another very dangerous

there are so many deeply disturbing factors that I look at the sea of faces in front of me for some kind of acceptance or rejection. This meeting to me is important because for the first time I can say some things about the Buthelezi Commission Report in contrast to the President's Council and the constitutional blueprint which South Africa's whites-only parliament has committed itself to. This meeting is important because I do not intend to play political marbles in the face of destitution and destructive violence. How you respond tonight is important.

I am not indulging in the orator's armoury of trickery; I am now a simple Black peasant standing amidst my people and looking at you in this face to face situation and asking are you prepared to walk a new road? Are you prepared to join me in the politics of survival? Are you prepared to become political authors in writing the history of justice, or are you the ghouls which applaud sub-human laws, the denial of human rights and the physical torture of the victims of apartheid?

I speak with the Prime Minister and his Cabinet. I am made intensely aware of what the nature of their politics is. I am telling you that the nature of White South Africa's politics right now is classical apartheid. I remind you this is a prescription for violence.

We in Inkatha have made it clear that our position is for one-man-one-vote in a unitary state with reliance on a Bill of Rights based on the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to provide the necessary safeguards. Because I have said that we in Inkatha are prepared to look at alternatives, it must not be forgotten that our basic position is a one-man-one-vote position. There is, from our point of view, no need to change the constitution other than to give us the vote in order to put ourselves as South Africans in a position to bring about whatever changes are necessary.

As I stand before you now, I am repeating an offer to move towards a compromise solution. Quite clearly the Black majority in this country must be brought to a position where they share

Quite clearly political dialogue must begin with the acceptance of this fact. If this fact is not accepted; if White politicians insist that there is such a thing as White South Africa where Blacks have no fundamental human and civic rights, then the meeting place for Whites and Blacks cannot be within the framework of the country's political institutions.

I wonder if the average White recognises that the White Government and the White administration, and the White so-called security forces have resorted to extra-parliamentary means to enforce White supremacy. The minute a country employs violence to uphold party political opinion it has forfeited the right to govern. South Africa is sustained as a White supremacist stronghold by the employment of institutionalised violence outside of the accepted civilised processes of law and administration.

When a prisoner is battered in the cells of some obscure jail where he is held incommunicado in solitary confinement, civilised standards have been abandoned. I am not indulging in rhetoric. Everyone of us know that political prisoners have been battered to death, or have committed suicide to avoid that battering, in the name of apartheid. We all know that the blood of young Whites is an expendable commodity in the pursuit of the National Party's ideology. The South African army, and its whole defence system in fact, is used by the National Party to support an ideological position of a minority. I would dearly love to live in a country which I was prepared to fight for and die for on the battlefield. I come from a warrior stock and the history of my family through the ages has been a history steeped in the traditions of war. I would be mortally ashamed of any son of mine who fought in the South African army to defend this apartheid regime's version of South Africa. I don't think that White blood, and particularly the blood of White youth is expendable. Nor do I think the blood of Black youth is expendable.

I search for non-violent alternatives and in that search I am not encouraged. It must be recognised that you cannot make soldiers out of servants, and you cannot rely on the blood of those you make politically subservient. It must be recognised that Whites cannot rely on Blacks within the framework of present Government policy.

One of the things.../25.

We have here looked at political solutions but it is illogical to talk about solutions without defining the problem. What precisely have we attempted to solve in this country? What are the natures of the various forces which are there warping people's souls, making them prepared to be involved in, pursuant to and witnesses of human atrocities? What is the nature of the forces in our society which lead to a situation so inequitable that one-fifth of the White population owns 87% of the land and controls 100% of it? What is the character of social, economic and political forces which lead a minority of the White minority to such political ultra-right stances that they endorse themselves out of the political process?

There is an urgent need to ask this kind of question and to have the guts to answer these questions. I who embrace every man and every woman of all sections of our community in the love of brotherhood and comradeship am offended by the de facto situation in South Africa. However it is presented it is not a matter of opinion that we have one of the most inhuman sets of security laws in the world, no matter how we present it.

It is a fact that those who are supposed to administer justice in this country actually torture people in solitary confinement, where no eyes can see the atrocities which are committed. I am deeply offended by the fact that many South Africans, mostly White but some Indian, Coloured and Blacks as well, find themselves ashamed with me but are prepared to live with that shame for whatever reason they have. This throng of Whites, tinged with its dashes of Black, Coloured and Indian, are bizarre spectators of torture, sub-human and inhuman treatment of people.

A great deal of the energy of this country's administrative system goes into whipping Blacks into obedience. There is a considerable mass of force necessary to maintain the status quo. How can I bring home to every mind and heart here tonight the fact that Government forces jail hundreds of thousands of people every year simply because, in the search for survival, they offend the White man's exclusivity? White exclusivity equals Black death in this country. White exclusivity is built upon the denial of fundamental human rights. White exclusivity creates the need to protect White vested interests.

How can I .../22.

How can I persuade you that it is my love for you which drives me to this deep concern and deep sense of shock at which I see and hear every day of my life. What on earth is there that will enable me to convey to you at this meeting tonight that this is a serious affair. It might well be that after some such meeting as this, I pack my bags and go home, never to come here again in this way. How can I persuade you that the 'me' in this statement is not important? How can I persuade you that a Black man in this day and age who is prepared to embrace all in brotherhood and who even now pursues non-violence and whose pursuit of non-violence is still actually supported by masses of Blacks? How can I persuade you that such a Black must now necessarily begin to accept that he may have to pack his bags and go home, and let the whole avalanche of violence sweep ahead and destroy with impunity that which is good and that which is bad.

Ladies and gentlemen, friends and comrades, you just must accept that if I go back to Mahlabatini and pursue my responsibilities amongst my people at the tribal level, you in this city and every city in the country will be devastated by a kind of violence you just are not prepared for. White South Africa is not prepared for the horrors of a race war. The atrocities which could be committed in mob violence are beyond your comprehensions. If they were within your comprehension, you would not support either actively or pacifly a system of government, a kind of administration and a political philosophy which is guaranteed to produce a violence beyond your comprehension.

I do not threaten violence. I am sane enough to be terrified by the prospect of this atrocity. I am realistic enough to know that that prospect is there and I come to you tonight to say the first thing, and the first thing is: If politics is not about the solution to this country's problems; if it is an academic venture, then I will pack my bags and go home.

This meeting tonight may be a very important meeting in my political career, not necessarily because I am sharing a platform with somebody whose political style distinguishes him, but because at this juncture of our history, there are so many poignant issues and

ourselves and the Central Government. Once these White Papers are completed they will be made available to the Central Government with certain proposals for a procedure for dealing with them. Only at that stage will the Central Government's full and formal reaction to the Buthelezi Commission be asked for and made known. At this stage the reactions have been informal and I will not hold the Central Government to the content and tone of their initial reactions.

I believe that what flows out of the Buthelezi Commission Report and what appears in the White Papers will be the subject of considerable and ongoing debate between ourselves and the Central Government. What we hope and indeed expect is that out of this process will come the beginning of a process of negotiation between ourselves and the Central Government about constitutional development for ourselves in KwaZulu, for Inkatha and for Black people generally. The Central Government does not yet know the content of what our proposals will be in order to commence this process of negotiation, and therefore anybody who assumes that the initial, informal reaction of the Prime Minister is the full and final reaction to the Buthelezi Commission may be sadly mistaken. The real consequences of the Buthelezi Commission are yet to become manifest.

The time has passed when any responsible politician can operate only in terms of self-interest. The mounting forces for disorder and chaos in our society have imposed a new burden of duty and commitment on all our leaders - Black and White. This duty is to reconcile self-interest with the general interest and to seek ways and means of modifying self-interest in such a way as to be able to join hands with others. If Inkatha can reconcile its own policy stand with the recommendations of the Buthelezi Commission, then so can other responsible political leaders in South Africa. Those who stick to narrow and dogmatic party policies are the true advocates of violence in South Africa. I do not believe that the larger mass of South Africans, White and Black, will tolerate them for much longer.

The search for common interests across racial divisions is a keynote feature of the Buthelezi Commission Report. As with other constitutional reports this seeking for agreement between groups is called consociation. Consociation, as many of you may know, ladies

~~and gentlemen, is a form of co-operation among leaders of different~~
 groups in which they partly set aside their group interests in order to strive for a new interest. This new interest is that of finding common ground. I am aware that this type of coalition of group leadership is a way in which certain deeply troubled societies in the past have been able to find a way through the minefield of group conflict. Consociation is what political leaders can achieve when the alternative is a fate too ghastly to contemplate. Consociation is a process of reconciling the seemingly irreconcilable.

I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that we have reached the stage in South African political life where the need for this kind of coalition leadership has become an urgent necessity. The Buthelezi Commission Report and many other indications show that there is a rising tide of militancy among the Black people. While we do not face a revolutionary situation yet, increasingly Black leaders like myself feel that at any time some event may occur which will provide a spark for a general surge to throw off the shackles of political and social inequality. When that happens reason will go by the board. Given the fact that we as Black leaders have never been allowed the full scope for assuming the full responsibility of Black leadership in South Africa, I fear that we may not be able to control or moderate that surge for freedom. The Buthelezi Commission Report warns of this and I warn of this tonight. These warnings are not idle. I am aware that the Buthelezi Commission spent well over a hundred thousand rands in meticulous and painstaking research into the climate of political consciousness among Blacks. Their findings are the closest approximation of the real state of affairs that I can think of.

One of the things we have tried to do tonight is to look at the anatomy of conflict. Let us begin with the conflict that we already know because for me unless politics in this country is about the elimination of existing conflict as well as the avoidance of a terrible future, then politics ceases to be a worthwhile pursuit and the whole world will understand with us that we have only got a present and a future characterised by increasing revolutionary violence.

NRP, a party with some significance in Natal. In declining to endorse the balanced compromise proposals in the Buthelezi Commission they have indicated that they perceive a route of political partition for Blacks as being the most desirable answer. They do, however, allow for the participation of some so-called urban Blacks in the affairs of the common society. The mass of people who are our followers, however, are - as with government policy - relegated to the desert of political alienation under a confederation. They have mentioned certain proportions of representatives of different races as being the definite outcome of the Buthelezi Commission proposals should they be implemented in this region. This particular rejection worries me on three grounds. Firstly, in reading through the Buthelezi Commission Report, it has become clear to us that there has been no attempt made to specify a system which would produce any fixed ratio of representatives of different races. The proposals seem to allow for an over-representation of Whites, Coloured and Indian people as compared to their numbers in the population. This over-representation may be considerable or it may be slight but it is highly probably that it would exist.

We cannot understand where in the Report the NRP finds evidence or grounds for the assumption that public representatives will be a fixed ratio according to population. Therefore I am worried about their inability to understand this Report.

Secondly, the Report of the Buthelezi Commission makes it quite clear that at the most important level, the executive level of political authority in the region, there will be a balanced consociational cabinet type of body which will certainly not have groups represented in proportion to their ratios in the general population. This is a concession to the need for a balanced ongoing accommodation between the positions in our society. It discriminates in favour of smaller groups, but we accept it because we recognise the need for a balanced and equitable process of negotiation in the government in the future. The fact that the NRP has chosen to overlook the balanced nature of the suggested executive makes me wonder whether or not they are interested in any compromise at all. Thirdly, the Buthelezi

Buthelezi Commission Report grasps the essential task for the future, and that is our duty to move away from divisions and conflicts based on race. Conflicts based on race will tear our society apart and land us all in the trash-can of underdevelopment. The Buthelezi Commission appears to accept the sensitivities and the fears of the minority groups and accommodates these but makes proposals which will allow groups to transcend race and find common interests across racial divisions. It tries to make provision for the sense of security which will allow people to recognise their real interests as South Africans and not only their historical and traditional racial preoccupations. Without this process of discovering our real interests, our future is bleak indeed. In rejecting the Report, the NRP appears to have set its face against transcending racial divisions and seems to cling desperately to labels and categories on the basis of skin colour.

For these three reasons my confidence in the ability of the NRP to participate in the building of a collective future of peace and stability has been sorely undermined. I am heartened, however, that the Buthelezi Commission Report itself reveals that so many other groups and organisations among Whites in Natal are supportive of the essential requirements for moving into a future of peace and stability. Perhaps we can look forward to these organisations and groups showing the way.

I would like to return now to the whole issue of the Government's reaction to the Report of the Buthelezi Commission. At this stage the Central Government has not been approached for a formal response to the Commission. This was a Commission of the KwaZulu Government and the Commission has reported to us. Once we have deliberated on the Report we will consider preparing White Papers on the various aspects of the Report. These White Papers will be part of our official response to the Commission.

Some of the recommendations in the White Papers will be in a form which we can consider implementing immediately within KwaZulu, and we will proceed with such implementation. Already we recognise numerous recommendations which can be dealt with on this basis. Other aspects in the White Papers will be topics for negotiation between

industrial relations consultant looking only at the home circumstances of employees and not at their working lives.

The Buthelezi Commission has reported to my government and we are in the process of considering the report in great detail. We have not yet finalised our response and therefore I am not going to give you my final and formal reaction to the Report. I can say at this stage, however, that thus far we in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly have been very pleased with the Report, and I anticipate that a very great deal of it will be found to be completely acceptable.

This does not mean to say that the constitutional recommendations of the Buthelezi Commission coincide with Inkatha policy. We did not set up the Commission to formulate a policy for Inkatha. We in Inkatha have over a process of years formulated our views and these views are firmly held. I have enunciated these views many times and so have my colleagues. We in Inkatha have to formulate our policy views as Blacks and as South Africans. We support the principle of an open democracy with the right to participation by all Blacks in a central parliament. There is no reason why we as Blacks should want and desire anything different, and therefore we hold to that as our policy.

However, we established the Buthelezi Commission in order to find the grounds for compromise. We knew that it would not end up endorsing Inkatha's policy because the Commission was set up to take full account of the views of other groups. We set it up so that the Commission as a body could assess the different views of different groups and, in the light of reality, formulate an approach to a workable compromise. As far as we can see, the Buthelezi Commission has done this admirably. Our assessment is that it has been extremely sensitive to the realities of our divided society, and has come up with proposals which, on the one hand do not satisfy any particular group, but on the other hand definitely represent something which a very substantial proportion of all South Africans could accept as an adequate alternative to the ideal.

We in Inkatha, therefore, are looking at the recommendations in this Report as a basis for negotiations in the future about an

arrangement which all could accept. We are looking at the Report as a basis for creative compromise. We will not rule it out of court simply because it does not conform to Inkatha's policy. We see this as our contribution to the kind of give and take that must characterise successful negotiation for peace and progress.

We have hoped and still continue to hope that other groupings will see recommendations along these lines as a basis for negotiating a compromise. Thus far we are disappointed. The Prime Minister, the Honourable Mr. P.W. Botha and the Minister of Finance who is leader of the National Party in Natal, have both indicated that while they see considerable merit in parts of the Report, the central constitutional recommendations are not acceptable. I would like to say more about this presently and therefore I will not say anything more about the central government's reaction at this point in my address to you.

Although I wrote to Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the External Mission of the ANC inviting them to participate, I got no formal reply from him. I never got an outright refusal to participate. I have seen a transcript of a Freedom Radio broadcast from Addis Ababa, which purports to represent the ANC's External Mission's reaction to the findings of the Commission. It was clearly done on the basis of snippets from newspapers. I cannot take it to represent the ANC's External Mission's view of the matter. More recently, one member of the Executive of the External Mission of the ANC asked for a copy of the Commission's Report and it was delivered to him. An Executive member of the PAC in exile also requested me to send him a copy and I did so. It is not true that the External Mission made a formal refusal not to participate. As a matter of fact, Mr. P.W. Botha stated as his reason for not nominating a National Party representative to the Buthelezi Commission the fact that I had extended an invitation to members of the External Mission of the ANC. I believe that all political groupings inside and outside South Africa must participate in finding a solution to our problems.

There have been others who have withdrawn from supporting the proposals of the Buthelezi Commission. One of these is the

One of the things which has enabled me to succeed in stemming the tide of anger is the fact that apartheid has been crumbling - whether by default or by design, it makes no difference. If, however, the forces - which are primarily economic and demographic - which have made apartheid the nonsense that it is - are blessed by a new set of security laws and enshrined in a new set of restrictive constitutional moves, the metal of what I am saying and its fire is minimised when I meet Black demands for more radical action. I am made to explain why I told the world not to condemn Mr. P.W. Botha when he first took office. I am made to explain why I embraced Dr. Koornhof at a public meeting soon after his appointment. I have to explain why I hold out hope for the future. White liberalism can be far more moralistic in what they are saying. There is not the urgent need for them to be practical. For my people morals which have no practical value are no morals at all. Starving people do not moralise about their position.

According to a report in The Star dated the 15th March, the Prime Minister reacted to a report about what I had said would be the consequences of not accepting the Buthelezi Commission Report findings. I had warned that this was an effort characterised by peace and goodwill, and that it was an alternative to violence. The Prime Minister said the State would maintain law and order with all the power at its disposal. In the reported television interview, Mr. Botha said that bloodletting could not come from one side only. Why in Heaven's name can the Prime Minister not publicly accept that the Buthelezi Commission approach is a peaceful approach. Why doesn't he stand with me and tell South Africa that we must find one or another peaceful solution or there will be violence. Instead of standing with me he threatens me. Let me assure you here today that this outburst was politically unseemly and totally unwarranted.

I have always maintained a non-violent stance. There have been threats against my life because I refuse to endorse violence. Our position in this regard cannot be made clearer than it is. That does not stop me nor you from looking very seriously at the possibility of non-violence failing.

Mr. P.W. Botha threatens me with whatever he is threatening me with in this kind of statement. He himself is directing the employment of violence every day on our borders. He himself is designing even harsher legislation to dominate Black South Africa through the courts and in jails. In his President's Council moves he is prescribing violence. I can say this to you because these are the facts of the matter. I can share with you my deep fear of the consequences of these things, and I say to you that I am not a leader who will force his opinion upon the electorate. I stand with my people on whose behalf I speak here tonight and because I do so I will tell you what they say and what they feel. The Prime Minister's outburst against me was an outburst against my people. He himself always warns of the so-called total onslaught and violence. I never understand that his warning means that he in fact desires to see that onslaught or that he is in any case responsible for it.

I make numerous speeches, in fact many major speeches during the course of every year. I meticulously document my position. Every year hundreds of thousands of words record my political thinking. I am one of the known factors in South African politics. No other active politician has a position as well documented as mine. In this documentation I have made it clear that my position is amongst my people. Their options are my options and I lead them within the framework of a participatory democracy and I am their servant. They tell me to tell Mr. P.W. Botha that we hear him as making an empty White boast because never again will the Zulus be crushed by might.

We stand where we stand and we can say what we say because Mr. P.W. Botha can in fact do nothing about it. We are not afraid and if I do fear, it is for Whites. Never before in this country has anybody said to you quite so simply that if you allow the Blacks to go on generating anger and if you allow Whites to go on stoking the fires of that anger, then you will be crushed. The total cost of that crushing will not be counted until it is too late. In this sentiment I invite you to sit round my fire and eat out of my pot and to be my friend. Is there no merit in the hand of strength which comforts?