

NATAL WITNESS 3 JULY 1989
Unban ANC call after Lusaka visit

LUSAKA — The largest group of white South Africans to meet with the African National Congress ended four days of talks yesterday by calling for the ban on the ANC to be lifted.

A joint statement after talks between 117 whites and about 50 ANC officials said the two groups differed in strategy but agreed on the need to end apartheid. "Our conference has enabled the exchange of views and the exploration of common perspectives among South Africans committed to the shared objective of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa," they said.

They said the talks, attended by

23 white university professors, 20 businesspeople, 16 journalists, five editors and several members of town or city councils, enabled the ANC "to develop a deeper understanding of the conditions within the white community".

The delegates called for the bans to be lifted on opposition groups, the release of political prisoners including Nelson Mandela, the withdrawal of military and paramilitary forces from black townships, the lifting of the state of emergency and "the abrogation of those apartheid laws that seek to criminalise legitimate political activity".

The ANC acknowledged the role

of the white progressive parliamentary opposition in winning over white public opinion.

Former Progressive Federal Party MP Helen Suzman said most of the whites at the talks opposed economic sanctions against South Africa and the use of violence by the ANC. "I think we have learnt a lot and I think we have taught quite a lot as well. Our aim is the same but the strategies differ." The ANC defended its decision to include guerrilla Hein Grosskopf in its delegation. Some white delegates objected to the presence of the man wanted by South African police for his alleged connection to bomb attacks. — Sapa-Reuter.



■ Expatriates show their support on the nationality issue yesterday.

Expats echo call for abode

HUNDREDS of expatriates yesterday donned yellow T-shirts bearing the message "Hongkong is our Home" in a show of solidarity with the Chinese people on the nationality issue.

The "Right of Abode" rally in Chater Gardens drew more than 500 foreigners living in Hongkong.

As Cathay Pacific Flight 250 carrying Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, was winging its way to Hongkong over the South China Sea, on the ground Legislative Councillor Mr Martin Lee drew applause from the crowd as he told them:

"If Mrs Thatcher and Sir Geoffrey Howe are so confident of the Chinese, they are welcome to live

in Hongkong - without their British passports - after 1997."

Co-organiser Mrs Jenny Parr began the rally with a minute's silence to mark what she described as "the continuing persecution going on in China at the moment, and to demonstrate the total despair of the people of Hongkong".

The first speaker, Mr Martin Lee, told the demonstrators they were obligated to the people of the territory.

"It is a problem that all of us must join together to solve. It is not a problem for the Chinese people alone."

Mr Lee was joined on the makeshift podium by fellow Legislative Councillor, Mrs Elsie Tu.

"I feel ashamed when I meet my Hongkong friends and know I have a British passport," she said.

"I feel so ashamed to have a way of escape when others don't."

Co-organiser of the rally, management consultant Mr Cliff Reece, said yesterday's event was the beginning of a determined campaign by British expatriate businessmen to put maximum pressure on the UK government to reconsider the right of abode issue.

He said they were awaiting the decision of five of Hongkong's largest companies on whether to launch an advertising campaign in Britain to publicise right of abode arguments.

AFTER 40 years of messianic self-certainty, the National Party is at last beginning to struggle honestly, I think, with the central issue of South African politics, which is liberty. It fails because it cannot break out of the South African paradigm: the obsession with groups.

That is why the party leaders, in setting out their five-year plan last week, went to quite unusual lengths to suppress, or even to distort, the findings of the Law Commission on the need for a South African bill of rights.

The problem is that the party's plan of action flies in the face of the central finding of the Law Commission: that rights vest in the individual, not in the group. And the Nationalists remain wedded to "the white group," which is neither culturally coherent, nor linguistically uniform, nor politically united, nor even very religious.

The Law Commission's Working Paper 25, drawn up under the chairmanship of Mr Justice Pierre Olivier, a government-appointed Free Stater, puts forward its own plan, conservative but workable, to take South Africa to democracy. The differences between the NP plan and the Law Commission's plan are illuminating.

The Law Commission calls, first of all, for a statement of policy by Parliament "that it is in favour of the protection, in a bill of rights, of the generally accepted individual rights and cultural, religious and linguistic values".

Then, it suggests, government should embark immediately on the major task of systematically repealing all laws which would conflict with the bill of rights. The effect of this process, of course, would be steadily to widen the area of liberty for those South Africans most deprived of it.

Simultaneously, says the Law

The five-year plan *BUSINESS DAY - 3 JULY 1989* sets the stage for ten years' turmoil

KEN OWEN

Commission, there must be a thorough process of education on questions of human rights, followed by negotiations on a new constitution, which should be submitted finally to referendum.

The test of this plan, as of the NP's five-year plan, is not whether it meets some intellectual or moral criterion, but whether it will bring the country to rest. Since it carries the promise of democracy — of equality before the law, liberty and justice — at the end of it, the Law Commission's plan has a chance of success. Probably nothing less can succeed.

The chances of its success lie in the content which it gives to a bill of rights — rights which no legislation or executive act would be permitted to infringe.

At the top of the list, Article 1 of the proposed bill of rights, puts the right to life. Second, in Article 2, comes the following:

"The right to human dignity and equality before the law, which means that there shall be no discrimination on the ground of race, colour, language, sex, religion, eth-

nic origin, social class, birth, political or other views or any disability or natural characteristic."

The only exception it makes is temporary "reverse discrimination", or affirmative action, to overcome the historical disadvantages inflicted on some people by past discrimination.

The Law Commission distinguishes between political rights, intended to protect minorities against oppression, and other rights. The former, it says, are matters for negotiation, to be incorporated in an agreed constitution; the latter must be protected by the bill of rights, as belonging to the individual.

Its words on this point are worth quoting exactly: "In our society, cultural, religious and linguistic values should not be protected as 'group rights' since a group is not a legal persona. These rights should be protected in a bill of rights by way of individual rights."

"In public law," the commission says at one point, "our courts have never recognised an entity known as a 'group' or a 'minority' which can, as such, enforce rights."

Elsewhere it says: "It is unnecessary to protect the so-called group

interests or minority interests in the sphere of culture, religion or language by trying to define the group concerned and conferring legal personality upon it. All that is needed is to designate the interests in question as interests protected by law and to leave it to any individual to protect the interests through court proceedings where necessary."

This approach — if only the National Party would realise it — takes care of all the legitimate concerns of minorities. Indeed, the commission is emphatic: "The protection of minorities in this country is essential, since to ignore the rights of minority groups would be to invite endless conflict."

Even the right to dissociate, so beloved of Nat politicians, is catered for, subject to the all-important qualification that it will not include practising discrimination on the ground of race, colour, religion, language, or culture if public funds are used. Exclusive groups, whether churches or clubs, wine-tasters or garlic-eaters, will be permitted

provided they pay for their own exclusivity.

With these ideas before them, the National Party leaders have opted instead to search for a constitutional model "to prevent domination of one group by another". Instead of accepting the bill of rights put forward by the Law Commission, the NP talks of "considering the advisability" of a bill of rights.

Worse, knowing that the Law Commission has pronounced the idea of "group values," whether cultural or linguistic, to be foreign to our law, the NP still insists on a bill of rights that will protect "both individual rights and group values".

Where the Law Commission calls for a review of the law to purge the statute book of discriminatory measures, the NP calls for a law review to contain the costs of litigation, and hunts for ways to preserve group areas without the Group Areas Act.

The five-year plan talks of representation, but not equal representation; of rights, but not of justice; of democracy, but not of equality. The party still hovers at the edge of democracy, not daring to plunge.

The breakthrough from group-think to the concept of individual liberty, let us confess, is not easy, especially not when our archbishop struts about like a pre-revolutionary cardinal, proclaiming his lust for power. Even the Progressive Party, it is worth recalling, started out with a qualified franchise which was designed to evade equal rights.

But there is no middle ground. All discussion of democracy begins, it does not end, with a universal franchise. The National Party, under a new leader, had the chance to commit itself to a democratic system, to adopt the 10-year plan of the Law Commission and to create a prospect of peace in the 1990s. Instead, it has chosen to continue the vain search for the elusive formula to preserve racism by another name.

By that choice, it has built conflict and turmoil into the next decade.

South Africa

NATAL WITNESS 3 JULY 1989

Assessing the 5-year plan

THE National Party is not going to make its five-year plan widely available, it appears, rightly calculating that few voters are going to wade through this boring 22-page document. The NP knows that the mass of the electorate seldom reads policy statements of any length. After a hard day's work few people have the time or the inclination to do so.

The document will be read and re-read by the minority who have a vocational interest in politics, by academics of all descriptions, by diplomats and by political correspondents who will, in their turn, produce many thousands of words of analysis and criticism. Although they may glance at a pamphlet or two, most voters rely on a gut feeling that a particular party can (or cannot) be relied upon to protect their interests.

So the five-year plan itself will go on the back-burner until further notice while a few central ideas are assiduously plugged, sending the appropriate subliminal message to the voters. Yet it will not be easy for the NP this time, as they will have to send out two sets of conflicting signals. To traditional conservative-minded supporters the NP will want

to sound reassuring, suggesting that nothing is going to change very much at all. At the same time a contrary message will have to be got across to the English-speaking and Afrikaner verligte electorate — who knows that the economy will continue to stagnate unless there is a sharp change of direction, restoring stability and confidence.

So it rather depends how you assess the National Party's likely direction in the post-PW era. Is the NP in the FW era really preparing to negotiate with the ANC? It seems to me that the primary purpose of the five-year plan is to gain time abroad while Mr F.W. de Klerk gets through the September election without losing too much ground. It does not commit the NP in binding fashion to anything very concrete. It sets a number of admirable goals while not telling us very clearly how the NP intends to reach those goals.

What, in fact, can the NP be expected to do after September 6? Obviously, much will depend on the election result. Meanwhile a measure of scepticism seems warranted. Is there really a possibility of the NP adopting a Bill of Rights? The five-year plan expresses cautious appro-



Mr F.W. de Klerk

val of the principle, which will make the right kind of impression abroad. Yet again the NP commits itself to nothing very specific.

What a pity that Mr De Klerk does not feel confident enough of the way

ahead to endorse the SA Law Commission's proposals. The commission's working paper provides admirable guidelines which could change the face of South Africa. A Bill of Rights, it says, would have to be preceded by the introduction of an "equal and equivalent" franchise.

The right to the vote on the same basis as everyone else is now generally recognised as a fundamental human right. But what about protection from group domination? The commission notes that group rights as such cannot be directly protected in a Bill of Rights as groups are not legal persons. In protecting individual rights of language, culture, religious freedom, freedom of association, physical security, and so on, however, legitimate group rights can indeed be protected.

There can be no question of introducing a Bill of Rights, we gather, as long as racially discriminatory legislation remains in force. As the law commission notes, such legislation would first have to be purged from the statute book. Will the NP even contemplate such a thing?

The five-year plan introduces an intriguing but rather insubstantial suggestion that race could be pro-

Assessing the 5-year Plan.

gressively abandoned as a criterion for group protection — and replaced by cultural criteria. Carried to its logical conclusion, this means that separate schools and group areas could be provided for Afrikaans-speaking South Africans and English-speaking South Africans to the extent that they want them — rather than for whites as such; and for Zulu, Xhosa or Sotho-speaking South Africans rather than for blacks as such.

What the white electorate will make of all this on September 6 is anybody's guess. Is it simply a plan to keep blacks in their traditional place? And whites in theirs? Or does it really signal a readiness to negotiate a new South Africa? And what will be the black response? Is there anything in the five-year plan to induce the black leadership to come to the negotiating table?

Rationality is about to fly out the window in the election campaign. Let us hope that whatever government is in power after September 6 will believe it has a mandate to negotiate with the black leadership, paving the way for a new South Africa.

• Gerald Shaw is associate editor and political columnist of the Cape Times.



30p L SM

Hong Kong protesters jeer and boo Foreign Secretary

Howe pledge fails to dispel colony despair

● Chanting demonstrators besieged Sir Geoffrey Howe in Hong Kong last night while he dined with the Governor

● The Foreign Secretary told local journalists on his arrival that "you have no stauncher friend than Britain"

● But he refused to accept a petition calling for the right of abode in Britain for the colony's 5.7 million residents

● One banner portrayed Sir Geoffrey as a giant panda crunching bamboo shoots and crushing people

From Andrew McEwen and Chris Pomery, Hong Kong

Sir Geoffrey Howe, the Foreign Secretary, was last night besieged by chanting demonstrators in Hong Kong on the eve of a speech in which he will try to reassure the people of the colony about their future without conceding demands for their right of abode in Britain.

Hundreds of people staged a vigil outside Government House, sitting in rows facing apparently bewildered police. Inside, Sir Geoffrey dined with Sir David Wilson, the Governor, who has made it clear that he backs the people in their demand for assurances that they would be allowed to go to Britain as a last resort.

Earlier, thousands of people jeered and booed when the

Foreign Secretary arrived at the airport. The demonstrations were smaller than expected, but large by Hong Kong standards. Until the Tiananmen Square massacre in Peking a month ago, mass protest was almost unknown here.

Mr Henry Cheng, one of the leaders of the sit-down protest at Government House, said

Li Peng's excuse.....6

that people would rather chant and sing than feel there was nothing they could do to change Britain's attitude. But others spoke of a sense of despair after a report by the Commons foreign affairs committee last Friday which backed the Government's decision that a right of abode in Britain could not be granted to all 3.2 million people in the colony who are eligible for British passports.

Sir Geoffrey said at the airport here that he had come to "listen and explain", and told local journalists "You have no stauncher friend than Britain." The journalists booed, however, when the Foreign Secretary turned away without answering their questions.

"You feel threatened and beleaguered by what has happened. So that is why I am here on my eighth visit, to emphasize that Britain's commitment to Hong Kong is resolute and unchanged," he said.

In another apparent snub, Sir Geoffrey refused to accept in person a petition from civic leaders calling for greater democracy in the colony and the right of abode in Britain for all of its 5.7 million people.

The petition, which organizers claimed contained some 600,000 signatures, had been carried to the airport at the head of a crowd of about 5,000 people.

"Sir Geoffrey refused to meet us personally," said the Rev Lung Kwong Loan, one of the organizers. "We are very dissatisfied. The purpose of his coming is to hear the Hong Kong people's voice. His first gesture is only to meet officials... I think he insulted the Hong Kong people's opinion. His commitment is all in words..."

Two other demonstrations

emphasized the depth of feeling in Hong Kong, although with significantly reduced numbers compared to the three big pro-Chinese democracy marches held in May and June in which almost a million people took part.

In spite of pessimism about the outcome of the visit, some 1,500 expatriates, mainly British and American executives and civil servants working in the colony, held a meeting at the Cenotaph in the morning and cheered as speakers vowed to show solidarity with Hong Kong's people.

"We just got lost in the crowds," said Mr Cliff Reece, a management consultant, one of the organizers, "but it's very important to the Hong Kong Chinese that they see how we feel. I was going to burn my British passport."

Citing Britain's reaction to the Hong Kong situation as racist, Mr Reece added that it was "sickening" to see Sir Geoffrey there "when he's saying nothing positive".

The final demonstration, a march of 20,000 people to Government House in the early evening, produced graphic slogans and lurid slogans.

Sir Geoffrey, whose visits usually bring bad news, was portrayed as a giant panda crunching bamboo shoots and squashing people under his bulk.

Another banner made a derogatory scatological statement about Mr Robert Adley, MP, chairman of the all-party British-China parliamentary group, who was quoted in the Sunday press here warning people not to intimidate Sir Geoffrey and saying that Britain might pull out before 1997 if the colony became ungovernable.

Although Sir Geoffrey is likely to promise an accelerated transition to democracy and a Bill of Rights, for most marchers the key issue remained the demand for the right of abode in the UK.

"The issue is right or wrong, not white or Wong", proclaimed one banner. "You must get some bulletproof paper for printing our Basic Law", read another, referring to Hong Kong's post-1997 constitution, currently being drafted by a Chinese-appointed committee.



Baiting the British "panda" protesters jeering outside Government House yesterday after Sir Geoffrey Howe's arrival

INSIDE

Making it in 1992

● British executives will need new skills to succeed in Europe. The Times looks at some who have a head start. Page 17

TOMORROW

THE TIMES APPOINTMENTS

● Because of the rail strike the Appointments section, with 18 pages of top jobs, will appear tomorrow.

PORTFOLIO BOND

● Three people shared Saturday's £2,000 daily prize (see page 3). Today's game: page 25

Continued on page 20, col 4

Review 2

THEY SAID IT THIS WEEK

HOWE

"The events of recent weeks don't make that treaty (the Joint Declaration) any less binding. They do make its strict observance all the more necessary."

— British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe speaking at a lunch hosted by the Governor.

CHAN

"I told him I wanted to emigrate to the United States and not to Britain."

— Ms Chan Ngan-ling, owner of the Pak Shing Chiu noodle shop, who spoke to Sir Geoffrey Howe during his Causeway Bay walk-about.

REECE

"I am absolutely ashamed to be British and I know that a lot of people in Hongkong feel the same way."

— Mr Cliff Reece, who helped organise an expatriate rally in support of the right of abode plea, after meeting Sir Geoffrey Howe.

LAM

"Let her come and find out by herself that we are in some ways more prosperous than Britain and that we will help develop Britain instead of begging for social assistance if we have to go to the UK."

— Legislative councillor Mrs Peggy Lam welcoming the idea to invite British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to visit Hongkong.

TIMES

"Sir Geoffrey's performance has been so inept as to make his voyage seem worse than pointless."

— Editorial in The Times newspaper which heavily criticised Sir Geoffrey on his return to London.

BLYTH

"You get sick of Benjamin Franklin's portrait."

— Chief Inspector Dennis Blyth who took 4½ hours counting 1,600 bundles of US\$100 notes taken from suspected bank thief Stephen Hedges arrested in Hongkong.

STALLER

"I have always held that sex is beautiful and that to show it on glossy paper is even more beautiful."

— Porn star Ilona Staller, in a Rome court, facing charges that she produced obscene shows and publications even after her election to the Italian parliament.

GORBACHEV

"We would like to see the country evolve towards a new China, peaceful, re-integrated into the world's economy and life, with good relations with all peoples."

— Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev during his state visit to France.

SIHANOUK

"I don't trust Pol Pot at all. Pol Pot remains very ugly, not physically but morally."

— Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia speaking in Beijing about the prospects of peace in his country.

TAPSELL

"It is an incredible statement, quite the weakest I have ever heard in opposition to our seeking a sporting competition in New Zealand."

— New Zealand Sport Minister Peter Tapsell reacting to a Soviet official's claim that high radiation levels made the country unsafe as a venue for the world chess championships.

THE CITIZEN COMMENT

3 JULY 1989

DP crisis

ONCE upon a time, there was a Progressive Federal Party which had 17 Members of Parliament, a strong party machine and a dedicated following.

It was the voice of conscience of South Africa, and before its demise it was led by Dr Zach de Beer.

There was also an Independent Party, which had no seats in Parliament, but that didn't worry its leader, Dr Denis Worrall, who made up with ambition what he lacked in political clout and numbers.

There was also the National Democratic Movement, which consisted of three Members of Parliament — its leader, Mr Wynand Malan, an MP by grace and favour of the PFP, and two defectors from the PFP. The NDM had few members and no clout whatsoever.

Came the merger of the three parties, and to avoid any suggestion that the new party was the PFP in drag, the governing bodies of the party were structured so that the PFP did not have the top positions it deserved to have.

Many Progs were uneasy about the merger. But they comforted themselves by believing that Dr De Beer would become the DP's sole leader. However, Dr Worrall and Mr Malan saw to it that they were appointed co-leaders with Dr De Beer.

It soon became apparent that Mr Malan was exercising a remarkable influence on party decisions — remarkable because he brought hardly any dowry to the shotgun "marriage" of the three parties.

Now, thanks to Mr Malan, abetted by Dr Worrall, the DP has been plunged into its first crisis.

This is over the party executive's decision not to put up any Indian candidates in the House of Delegates election, other than the three existing MPs, unless they could bridge the Parliamentary and extra-Parliamentary groups.

The DP will also not contest the Coloured House of Representatives election.

Mr Pat Poovalingam, one of the three DP Indian Members of Parliament, threatened to quit the party, saying: "I am astounded that so-called non-racists have accepted the racist stance of the UDF and ANC, which demand a boycott of the House of Delegates and House of Representatives in return for supporting White candidates for election to the pure-White House of Assembly."

He accused Mr Malan of being "pro-ANC" for many months, an accusation Mr Malan rejects. He accused Dr Worrall of "cynical opportunism", a charge which Dr Worrall also rejects.

He had nothing to say about Dr De Beer, the reason being clear. Dr De Beer favoured DP participation, Mr Wynand was against it and Dr Worrall wanted a "compromise".

In the event, Mr Poovalingam announced he would form his own Non-Racial Democratic Party, but has delayed his resignation "for a few days."

All we can say is that if the DP won't fight the Coloured and Indian Houses, its claim to be a democratic organisation seeking support and representation across the colour line is a hollow one.

Furthermore, Mr Poovalingam's condemnation of the DP's decision as racist is justified, since the party is only fighting the White House of Assembly elections.

Finally, Mr Malan's predilection for extra-Parliamentary politics, with the ANC and UDF at the top of his list, suggests that he should not fight the Randburg seat either, since the extra-Parliamentary groups reject the tricameral system.

Mr Malan is quite indifferent to the criticism that his footsie footsieing with the ANC is ill-advised. He also sees nothing wrong with kowtowing to the UDF and other groups which oppose participation in the elections.

As a one-third leader of a party which supports only one-third of the tricameral Parliament elections, Mr Malan might be considered a one-third rate candidate.

Since he won't accept the suggestion that he shouldn't stand, the next best thing is for the voters of Randburg to turf him out.

Come to think of it, that might be a blessing for the DP as well.

Hardening of Black attitudes would be tragic — Buthelezi

ULUNDI. — It would be tragic if, just when the National Party (NP) showed it was ready to negotiate, Blacks so hardened their hearts that negotiations became impossible, KwaZulu Chief Minister Mangosuthu Buthelezi said yesterday.

In his presidential address to Inkatha's Central Committee at Ulundi he announced that the theme for Inkatha's coming 1989 Annual General Conference (AGC) would be "A year of action and organisation for peace and preparation for the future".

He disclosed that recent preliminary talks between his representatives and those of the UDF and Cosatu indicated that there was now the possibility of a new political era emerging: one in which Black co-operation and unity could actually be worked for.

When the reconciliation "which we all hope for" come about, he was sure it would be a reconciliation among the powerful.

"Ironically, in Black unity each organisation would emerge stronger than ever before," the KwaZulu Chief Minister said.

"We should not fear that the UDF and Cosatu would become stronger because we are negotiating with them. Black unity cannot be built on the fear of other organisa-

tions and a desperate desire to crush them."

It was the people who must ultimately decide the "who's who" of Black politics.

"We are only as free to go to the people as we make it free for other organisations to go to the people," he said.

Chief Buthelezi said he had told UDF and Cosatu leaders the whole question of a joint endeavour between the three organisations — and perhaps church groups and other bodies, would be discussed later at this year's Inkatha AGC.

It was also quite clear to him that the NP might well break out of its "crisis position" after the September elections for Tricameral Parliamentary seats.

Inkatha had no illusions about how difficult

it would be for the NP to establish real negotiations. The ANC and all revolutionaries said this was impossible.

But Inkatha believed that if it was at all possible for the NP to begin such proper negotiations, it would be because Blacks had made it possible for them.

"If Mr F W de Klerk started by releasing Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, we would be very much more sympathetic, with a programmed approach in which we can do what we can step by step and accumulate the gains that we finally need," Chief Buthelezi said.

"It would be tragic if we as Blacks so hardened our hearts at a time in which the National Party does develop a preparedness to negotiate, that ne-

gotiation became impossible . . .

"We in Inkatha should, I believe, keep an open mind during these preliminary discussions about negotiations and not attempt to formulate a definitive position for ourselves too far in advance."

The NP had said constantly that there would be no constitutional change until the White electorate had been consulted by referendum or in other ways.

"We, of course, must give Inkatha members the same assurance, he said. "We must go further and say that we are working towards Black national unity and that we must consult Black society generally before we finally commit ourselves to anything." —Sapa.

P W will go down as the 'father of reform'

Citizen - 2 July 1989

IT was fascinating listening to the DP policy being spelt out on Network on Sunday 18, June — as fascinated as is a hypnotised victim of a snake prior to the blow of annihilation. Taken at face value the proposed policies of the DP are what every S African strives towards. . . but. . .

A cursory study of fashionable perestroika spells out the identical ideals for a "new era" Russia under the capitalist inspired Soviet system, ie: In conjunction with Glasnot or so-called "normalisation", the fourth and final stage of the ideological subversion of the world prophesied in each and every religious manual known to me!

Yes, of course SA is in need of further reform — no-one with any sense of human dignity denies this, but this must be achieved in an evolutionary manner if a genuine harmony between our culturally diverse people is to be achieved. Our State President, Mr P W Botha, in spite of the ideological barrage of slander in the media, has set SA firmly on the correct path of reform. The sadness is that he has succumbed to this negative

pressure, instead of allowing his reform policies to continue.

In natural momentum — in an "open-ended" manner, has applied the brakes at the critical moment.

Instead of calling for a referendum on the ideals of a 4th and 5th House to be formed in Parliament to accommodate the aspirations of our Black community, he has called for a general election with all its inherent negative and dangerous electioneering along egotistical party-political lines in White constituencies — most of whom are fearfully determined to derail his inspired vision for a truly united SA.

Mr P W Botha will go down in history as the Father of Reform, whilst many of his dubious advisors as self-seeking moles. These are those in the Cabinet who have advised him to take the wrong fork in the road towards achieving this goal. They are the men responsible for having tilted the balance of power fairly and squarely into the ever-ready arms of the Communist fold.

For instance, the man who stood against him in the original bid for National Party leadership, was also the man party to the sellout of Ian Smith and Rhodesia and is now in the process of doing the same in SWA, with Unita, and in line with glasnost, probably South Africa too!

Simultaneously, the capitalist arm of the capitalist Communist conspiracy has been allowed to run rampant, and our economy is in ruins. Mr F W de Klerk, as successor to Mr P W Botha, should therefore be warned to watch his own back, for his opponent for the NP leadership may well undermine his declared goals for continuing with reform and thus tip the balance of power still further into the arms of the Communist one world order.

2 AND 2 DO MAKE 4

Bertsham

Swapo vow at huge election rally

No one-party *THE STAR* state, and no *3 JULY 1989* communism

By Brendan Seery,
The Star's Africa News Service

Windhoek

No communism, no one-party state, and no large-scale nationalisation. That was Swapo's message when it presented its blueprint for a future Namibia to a huge rally in Katutura Township in Windhoek yesterday.

But the director of Swapo's election campaign, Mr Hage Geingob, made it clear there would have to be a restructuring of the economy to "achieve a measure of national control over the country's resources and a balance between just economic returns for the people and reasonable profits for foreign and local investors".

He said the State would have ownership of a significant part of the economic resources, but added: "No wholesale nationalisation is envisaged of mines, land and other productive sectors."

Swapo saw the future economy as having elements of State ownership, joint ventures and private investment.

Labelling as lies suggestions that Swapo would introduce communism and a one-party state, he released details of the organisation's election manifesto:

Walvis Bay

- Namibia will be a democratic, unitary state which will include the territory of Walvis Bay and the islands off the Namibian coast which are currently in SA hands.
- A Bill of Fundamental Rights which will be radically different from the "bogus" Bills produced by SA-appointed administrations.
- Citizenship will be granted to people born in the country, those who have Namibian parents and those who have married Namibian citizens. Naturalisation will be granted only after 10 years.
- Freedom of religion and speech will be guaranteed.
- Namibia will adopt a non-aligned stance and will express appreciation to those countries — including the socialist bloc and Scandinavia — which have supported the long Swapo struggle.
- Namibia will also follow the Frontline states' policy of offering support and solidarity to "the struggling peoples of southern Africa". Implicit is an unwavering opposition to apartheid.
- Swapo will strive for education and health for all, and special efforts will be made to redress the imbalances, particularly in black rural areas.

16/1/11

ANC talks end ^{Meeting 3/07/89} with 'lift ban' call

LUSAKA: The largest group of white South Africans to meet with the African National Congress ended four days of talks yesterday with a call for the lifting of bans outlawing the ANC and other opposition groups in South Africa.

A joint statement after four days of talks between 117 whites and 50 officials of the ANC said they differed in strategy, but agreed on the need to end South Africa's apartheid system of racial separation.

The unbanning of the ANC and other political organisations so they could participate fully in political life was among conditions necessary to resolve the conflict in South Africa, the statement said.

Both sides recognised the ANC as an important force in the fight to create a non-racial democracy in white-governed South Africa.

"Our conference has enabled the exchange of views and the exploration of common perspectives among South Africans committed to the shared objective of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa," said the statement.

The joint statement said the Lusaka talks, attended by 23 white South African university professors, 20 business people, 16 journalists, five editors and several members of town, or city councils, enabled the ANC "to develop a deeper understanding of the conditions and some of the features prevailing within the white community."

As well as legalising opposition groups, the delegation called for the release of political prisoners, including ANC leader Nelson Mandela and the withdrawal of military forces from black townships.—Sapa-AP