

I wasn't with STAR Inkatha, Trust 4 March 1992 Feed trial told

Own Correspondent

MARITZBURG — Trust Feed trial accused and former SAP special constable, Kehla Ngubane, denied yesterday that he was a member of Inkatha and said he and the other special constables were trained not to associate with politics.

Mr Ngubane is one of seven policemen and former special policemen charged with 11 counts of murder and eight of attempted murder in connection with an incident in which men, women and children were shot dead while attending a funeral service in a house at Trust Feed during the night of December 2/3 1988.

During his testimony yesterday, Mr Ngubane alleged that former New Hanover station commander Captain Brian Mitchell instructed him and three other special policemen to attack a house with "terrorists" at Trust Feed on the night in question. He denied evidence by Captain Mitchell that he instructed them to attack and kill members of the United Democratic Front.

Mr Ngubane admitted he was resident in an Inkatha stronghold, Woody Glen at Hammarsdale, but said he had never been a member of Inkatha.

He said that during training as special constables in the SAP, he and his colleagues were taught not to associate themselves with "political matters".

Mr Ngubane has testified that he and the other special policemen joined the KwaZulu Police after leaving the SAP as a result of the Trust Feed incident.

During cross-examination he denied he and the other special policemen had ever discussed the Trust Feed incident.

He has told the court he personally fired two shots "blindly" into the house. He could not see inside because it was dark.

Survivors of the massacre testified during the State case that some of the attackers had entered the house with torches.

Describing events leading up to the shooting, Mr Ngubane said he and co-accused, Dumisani Ndwane, were awakened at about 1.30 am by an "aggressive" Captain Mitchell.

He instructed them to get their firearms and follow him. He dropped them at a junction near Mbongwe's Store, telling them to wait, and later returned with special constables Thabo Sikhosana and David Khambule.

Captain Mitchell had pointed out the "terrorists' house and said we should shoot".

Mr Ngubane said he, Mr Ndwane and Captain Mitchell went to the back of the house.

"I heard a knock ... then I heard a voice asking 'Who is that?' Another voice responded: 'We are the police.' The lamp was then put out. A gunshot went off, then gunshots went off all over, also in front."

Mr Ngubane said Captain Mitchell fired a shot through a window into the house, then handed the gun back to Mr Ndwane and left.

"I fired two shots through the back window. Mr Ndwane also fired at the same window ... I don't know how many shots."

Afterwards they picked up the cartridges as instructed.

During cross-examination, Mr Ngubane said that before he and his colleagues were sent to Trust Feed, he could not recall being told why they were going there. His impression was that they were being sent to do guard duties.

Captain Mitchell on Monday amended his plea from not guilty to murder to guilty of culpable homicide.

At the close of the State's case, counsel for Captain Mitchell, Etienne du Toit, told Mr Justice Wilson and two assessors that according to new instructions, he was amending the plea to guilty to 11 counts of culpable homicide.

The change of plea was not accepted by the prosecution.

Captain Mitchell said the attack was a mistake.

The hearing continues.

F.W. de Klerk winning hearts and some curses

By Bill Schiller
TORONTO STAR

JOHANNESBURG — It was a gesture full of ill will and foreboding — a chilling start to a day of presidential campaigning.

As F.W. de Klerk alighted from his car on a South African university campus here yesterday, a young conservative student approached to within striking distance of the president and pointed an accusing finger in his face.

"F.W.!" he shouted. "A curse be upon you and upon your government!"

The curse — and further conservative sentiments — seemed to fall harmlessly away as de Klerk moved confidently through a second day of whistlestop touring through the country, asking for a mandate to continue his reforms.

During the rest of the day, most students on the conservative campus and even skeptical pensioners welcomed de Klerk.

Even those who cannot vote for him in the whites-only March 17 referendum wished they could.

"If I could, I would vote for him," said 23-year-old east Indian student, Hinten Goshalia.

"The country needs reform. It's of absolute importance for the nation and for our future. The vote can only be 'yes' (to reform). It's the only way to go. We can't look back."

Goshalia was standing in a hallway in the students' centre speaking to a friend on a pay telephone when de Klerk's entourage walked by.

"I turned around and I just shook his hand — and it felt good," Goshalia said.

De Klerk moved across the campus of Rand Afrikaans University, one of the country's more conservative schools, to spontaneous ap-

plause, which exceeded the expectations of his closest advisers.

A 62-year-old pensioner, Margaret Souter, who lives in the low-income neighborhood of Vrededorp, in inner city Johannesburg, said meeting de Klerk had changed her mind on the referendum.

She had already told South African national television, in an earlier interview, that she would vote 'no' on the referendum's question of whether or not she approved of de Klerk's reforms.

"He answered my questions today," she said, sporting an "I love F.W." sticker on her lapel. "I'll be voting 'yes.'"

Souter and her disabled husband live on his paltry disability pension of 268 South African Rand (about \$112) per month, close to R100 (\$42) of which is taken up by rent for a subsidized apartment.

She was won over by de Klerk's responses to her concerns about the faltering economy.

The key, he said, is a "yes" vote.

"If we can find anything (we can do), we'll do it," he promised. "But we need growth to be able to do that."

A "yes" vote, he said, would mean more international acceptance and more export markets — in short, more growth.

Not everyone was won over. Law student Anton Alberts, 21, balked at de Klerk's agreement with the African National Congress that any new South Africa must be a unitary state.

He said the multi-ethnic cultures of South Africa need a federation or confederation of autonomous states.

"If you throw a lot of cultures into one pot, the thing will just blow up in the end," he said.

The Star 4/3/92

'Who would start a bloodbath?'

By Patrick Laurence

THABAZIMBI — Conservative Party leader Andries Treurnicht last night denied that CP policy was racist.

Addressing a packed hall at the local showground, Dr Treurnicht described CP policy as "the love of a people of itself and not hatred of other people".

He said the CP stood for self-government of whites, by whites, but recognised the right of black nations to govern themselves.

He accused the National Party of spreading "scare stories" about what would happen if the CP came to power, and was particularly scathing about its warnings that a CP triumph would precipitate a bloodbath.

Who would start the bloodbath, he asked, adding that if the ANC tried to incite people to violence it would meet the strongest resistance.

The CP leader pointedly asked what the NP would do if the ANC tried to initiate a bloodbath. "Will you stand with your ANC allies against your own people?" His question was greeted with cries of "skande".

He warned that transitional government would lead to the replacement of Mr de Klerk's administration by a black communist regime.

(Report by P Laurence, 47 Sauer Street, Johannesburg)

The Star 4/3/92

Codesa being hampered - Labour

Political Reporter

The Labour Party has formally objected to the whites-only referendum "interfering with progress" at Codesa.

The working group on transitional arrangements yesterday decided to meet on Monday but not to meet on March 16 or March 17 — the day of

the referendum.

LP spokesman and representative at the working group, Peter Hendrickse, said that at last week's meeting of the group — the first since the announcement of the referendum — assurances were given by the Government that the referendum would not

have an impact on Codesa's work.

The LP then formally objected to the decision that no meeting would take place on March 16 and March 17, in terms of Codesa's standing rules.

(Report by G. M. van der Merwe, 11 March 1992, Johannesburg)

The Star 4/3/92

PAC chief no longer required at inquiry

Pan Africanist Congress president Clarence Makwetu will not be required to appear before the Goldstone Commission of Inquiry into Public Violence and Intimidation, commission chairman Mr Justice R J Goldstone said yesterday.

Instead, the commission is considering whether the issue which led to Mr Makwetu's highly publicised refusal to appear before the commission should itself be the subject of an inquiry.

"Until a decision is taken and the terms of reference for such an inquiry have been finalised, the commission considers it would be inappropriate to enforce the attendance of a witness from only one group which may have relevant evidence.

"To do so could give rise to a perception of partiality on the part of the commission," Mr Justice Goldstone said.

But he gave notice that, should such an inquiry be held, the commission would not hesitate to use its power to compel the attendance of anyone considered by it to have information and who refused to appear voluntarily.

"The primary endeavour of the commission is to put an end to the violence which is plaguing our country. It is a cause for regret that the PAC is unwilling to join in that enterprise on the pretext that the commission has no legitimacy," he said.

In reference to Mr Makwetu's refusal to appear before the commission, he said an informal approach had been made to Mr Makwetu.

"Informal discussions have been held with other parties. The PAC chose to make a public issue of the approach made to it." — Sapa.

The Star 4/3/92

'Transitional executive necessary'

Political Reporter

A transitional executive structure should initially be appointed by Codesa.

This is one of the resolutions in a draft document, currently before the Codesa working group on transitional arrangements, which is to be discussed by the principals of the 19 delegations.

In terms of the working document, the group agreed that there was a need for transitional arrangements.

"An important aspect of such arrangements will be the creation of a transitional executive structure," the document said.

The discussion document will be used as a point of departure for further discussion.

Codesa agreements would have to be legislated by Parliament through amendments to the existing constitution and relevant legislation.

The document said other aspects of the interim arrangements still needed to be discussed. The committee is to meet again next week.

● 'Sunset clauses' could be a boon — Page 14

The Star 4/3/92

Freeing the air

THE SPECTACLE of the Government scurrying to protect the SABC from precisely the "interference, manipulation and intimidation" which the Government employed down the years is richly ironic. Nevertheless, the protection is necessary. No government, now or later, should be permitted to treat a public-service broadcasting system as a propaganda machine.

Until the promised legislation to "introduce negotiated standards, norms and codes" is tabled, and until the proposal for a monitoring tribunal is fleshed out, it is by no means clear whether the NP plan goes far enough. However, it is clear what the problem is. Generations of cabinet ministers blithely ignored the so-called "independence" of the SABC. When President P W Botha disliked TV's version of events, he actually phoned the director-general to dictate the content of a national news bulletin.

A truly impartial and knowledgeable tribunal would go a long way towards keeping the SABC honest. But it would almost certainly fail if it had to deal with broadcasting's "old guard", who are steeped in a tradition of subservience. Not all SABC employees are like that, of course. But those who are will have to go. We await with interest the specific proposals from the Government on that score.

'Sunset clauses' could be a boon

WITH all the drama over the referendum and South Africa's up-down performance in the World Cup cricket, insufficient attention has been given to the ANC's interim government proposals tabled at Codesa last week.

There has been comment on the first two phases, to set up an all-party Interim Government Council and then to elect an Interim Parliament which can also serve as a Constituent Assembly to draft the new constitution. This proposal, as some commentators have noted, narrows the gap between the ANC and the Government on the transitional arrangements.

But the feature that caught my eye was the proposal for a third phase based on so-called "sunset clauses" in the final constitution. Apart from a few misplaced wincing cracks about the phrase, this imaginative concept has failed to attract any attention at all.

Perhaps the plan would have been more readily understood if the term "fade-out clauses" had been used — in other words clauses in the constitution that apply for a limited period of time and then fade out automatically.

The ANC's idea is to use such clauses to provide for an additional transition period even after the final constitution comes into effect, so as to cushion the impact of a changeover to majority rule for the whites and other minorities. It is a way of building in gradualism.

As Thabo Mbeki, who presented the plan to Codesa's constitutional working committee, explained it, one example of a "sunset clause" could be an agreement that the winner of the first election under the new constitution will appoint a coalition Cabinet, or a "government of national unity", that includes all the major parties for a given period — say three or five years.



Allister Sparks

At the end of that time the sun would set on the clause and it would fall away. Unless, of course, the participating parties decided the coalition system was working so well they wanted to renew it.

Other "sunset clauses", the ANC has explained, could build in guarantees that no major changes would take place in the civil service, or that no affirmative action or other economic restructuring programmes would begin for a specified period.

The ANC has stressed that it has not worked out any specific proposals in detail, that it is simply putting the concept on the table and that the specific "sunset clauses" should be the subject of negotiation.

What strikes me is the flexibility of the concept. The Government has indicated that it wants whatever transitional arrangement is agreed upon to remain in place for about 10 years before a final constitution is decided, to give whites time to adjust.

That is clearly unacceptable. To keep South Africa in such a prolonged state of suspense would be to invite mounting instability and turmoil, which would drive away investment, so causing greater unemployment and thus greater instability in an intensifying vicious circle.

But the ANC's "sunset clause" idea enables one to reach a decision on the constitution and still have a gradual transition without any uncertainty.

Once the principle is agreed the detail is of little consequence. The Government wants a 10-year transition period, the ANC is suggesting three to five years. It's a matter for negotiation and the difference in time is minute in any historical perspective.

Equally important is the introduction of the idea of agreements additional to the basic constitution. Both Mr Mbeki and Netshitenzhe Joel, another member of the constitutional working committee, have pointed out that the "sunset clauses" could be either fade-out clauses in the constitution itself or contained in separate agreements between the political parties.

The latter idea has much to commend it, for it enables agreements to be renewed or left to expire, and even for new agreements to be reached in the light of changing circumstances, without incurring the national trauma of amending the constitution.

This is the real secret of the Swiss political system, which has been misrepresented here for partisan political purposes. The impression has been given that the Swiss constitution provides for a system of compulsory coalition government involving all the major parties — much the same as the National Party is proposing for South Africa.

This is untrue. The Swiss constitution, introduced in 1848, makes no provision for coalition government of any kind — and in fact makes no mention of political parties whatsoever.

The system of coalition that is followed in Switzerland is set out in a political agreement between the major parties that was reached only 33 years ago. It has nothing to do with the constitution and can be changed at any time by the parties themselves — even

by just one of them which can choose to pull out of the deal.

In what is known colloquially as "the magic formula", the major Swiss parties — the Christian Democrats, the Radicals, the Social Democrats and the smaller National People's Party — which jointly control between two-thirds and three-quarters of the seats in the United Federal Assembly, decided in 1959 to apportion the seven Cabinet seats between them on a ratio of two, two, two and one.

They also try, by unwritten agreement, to ensure that the French and Italian minorities are always represented in the seven-person Cabinet. But again, there is no constitutional requirement.

Should the relative strengths of the parties change significantly, if for example a minor party should suddenly emerge larger than one of the big four, then obviously the agreement would be changed.

In any event the Social Democrats have from time to time given serious thought to pulling out of the coalition agreement and setting themselves up as an opposition in parliament. So far they have decided against that, but they can do it at any time. The agreement is no more binding than any other coalition deal — and that is its strength.

It is the compulsory nature of the National Party's constitutional proposals that renders them unworkable. Parties will work together satisfactorily only if they choose to do so. If the constitution requires them to, the system is sure to break down and then there will be a constitutional crisis.

The ANC's idea of agreements outside the constitution provides the formula for a workable compromise. It deserves consideration.

Negotiation or violence?

04/03/92
South Africa

Opinion

NATAL WITNESS

by Hermann Giliomee

FOR the first time white South Africans will vote in a referendum for a process rather than a new state form or constitution. A process is, of course, an abstract, even obscure thing. Much more than in 1960 or 1983 voters will have sharply contrasting views about what they are voting for. Let us see if we can disentangle the process somewhat.

The first and the most tangible part of it is the negotiations taking place in Codesa and other forums. People will be asked to pass an opinion on whether negotiations are the most suitable way (rather than, say, violence) of resolving conflict.

About this issue there is clarity. Several surveys have found that the vast majority of South African whites, like blacks, prefer negotiations to violence as a way of settling our conflict. Particularly significant is a study of white elites in the world of business, politics and the

civil service. It was undertaken by the Centre for SA Politics in late 1989 — even before the ANC was unbanned.

It found that 83 percent believed that the conflict could be solved by way of negotiations while only 1,8 percent was sure that violence could. A full two-thirds of the Conservative Party/Herstigte Nasionale Party respondents supported negotiations against more than 90 percent for respondents for the NP and DP. More than 60 percent of the CP/HNP supporters indicated that they did not consider violence as an acceptable alternative to negotiations.

Although it must be borne in mind that this study was restricted to elites, it confirms impressionistic evidence that a considerable segment of the CP supporters detest the idea of violence and vigilantism. They want to be *ordentlik*, seeing themselves as law-abiding people who would not take action without legal

backing. Once violence is ruled out only negotiations remain. I believe the CP will get a thorough thrashing in the referendum simply because it does not propose a credible process as an alternative to that of the NP/DP.

The second element of the process is the establishment of a new central government that could provide a new base for political stability and economic growth. This part of the process is still blurred despite all the talk of an increasing convergence of NP and ANC positions.

The NP still believes that it can tie any majority party down through a constitution which imposes power-sharing and the unspoken assumption that the military will intervene as soon as the letter or spirit of the constitution is violated. Cynics may criticise the NP's proposal on the grounds that it makes hard-fought elections superfluous for there is very little difference between the spoils of the party winning the election and the one coming second.

Now this may be what the great majority of yes voters in the referendum would be happy to assume. However, they need to take into account that the NP's electoral strategy may be the Achilles heel of its game plan. The whole idea of a NP-Inkatha alliance seems considerably less credible than a year ago. On its own the NP does not seem to be able to gather any significant support from Africans.

Indeed the NP's electoral machinery headed by Dr Stoffel van der Merwe seems totally inadequate as a vote-catching machine. Had the NP been serious about successfully competing in future inclusive elections it would have appointed at least ten non-Afrikaner secretaries and Africanised Dr van der Merwe's post.

One possible explanation is that the NP does not really envisage actually fighting the ANC in the future. According to this interpretation the NP and ANC are actually fighting this referendum together and will formally do so in the first post-apartheid election.

But this scenario is not very likely unless the ANC act out of considerations which are

not apparent at this stage. The ANC is assured to win at least 60 percent of the votes in a future election. This will give it enormous clout when the tough bargaining takes place in the constituent assembly.

The potential for conflict will considerably increase if the NP, with the support of only 20 percent of the voters behind it, makes demands which will be seen as quite disproportionate to its electoral strengths. It is on this issue that the NP should be closely questioned in the referendum campaign.

The third element in the process is the potential dismantling of the highly centralised state in favour of a constitutionally-protected regional devolution of power. Here the NP has, according to all accounts, been getting its way and a strong yes vote will be a resounding endorsement of this process.

Ultimately regionalisation (if one is to avoid the F-word) may be more important than the elaborate attempts to construct a power-sharing system. South Africa is in fact comprised of two large regions: a western, non-African one, and an eastern, African one. Seen from a very long perspective, the Great Trek may soon come to be seen as an over-extension of the white/coloured base. From this perspective the only real question is this: how orderly can the retreat to the home base be?

But even if it is easy there can be little doubt that in the next decade to come the two western federal regions will unofficially become the home base of the non-African part of the population. If the power-sharing arrangements in the centre does not work out, investment and skills may steadily flow to these southern federal regions.

Nevertheless, despite the doubts a strong yes vote is called for. If confronted with a possible disaster and a definite disaster (the consequences of a no vote) the choice must always be the former. And who knows, the forced marriage of the NP and the ANC may still work out much better than one could hope for.

• Hermann Giliomee is Professor of Political Studies at the University of Cape Town.

2 582 'killed in political violence last year'

Citizen Wed. 4 March 1992

THROUGHOUT

South Africa in 1991, 2 582 people died through politically related violence — an average of 215 deaths every month.

However, security force implication in such deaths compared to previous years dropped dramatically to 3,9 percent, while "vigilante-related" causes accounted for 77,9 percent of fatalities.

These statistics were released yesterday by the Human Rights Commission (HRC) in its annual review of politically related violence in the country for the year 1991. Saying the figures

showed vigilantism in political violence was gripping South Africa, the HRC said it had recorded 2 011 deaths and more than 2 500 injuries judged to be perpetrated by vigilantes.

"The highest death rates (caused by vigilante action) were recorded in May 1991 (292) and September (274) where there were major explosions of violence in the PWV region.

"The PWV accounted for 50,4 percent of all vigilante-related deaths,

with Natal following closely behind on 44,3 percent."

During 1991, 100 deaths resulting from security force action were recorded, the HRC said, adding that it was a substantial reduction from the more than 300 deaths the previous year.

"Similarly, the number of persons injured dropped dramatically from over 3 000 in 1990 to around 700 in 1991.

"Whilst the deaths and injuries inflicted by the security forces are still at an unacceptable level and are to be deplored, nevertheless it is clear that the censure of their methods by various commissions of enquiry has had its effect," said the HRC.

Turning to alleged hit squad activity, the report said 60 political activists were "eliminated" in 1991 compared to 21 the previous year.

Outbursts

"The number of those injured also tripled but this must be regarded as incidental, since the intention of such hit squads is not to maim, but to kill," it charged.

Right-wing actions in 1991, the report continued, were again a mixture of organised pre-

meditated attacks and impulsive and irrational outbursts of violence against innocent victims.

"The number of deaths caused decreased slightly from 26 in 1990 to 21 in 1991, but injuries inflicted increased substantially from 138 to 178."

104 killed in January

THE Human Rights Commission (HRC) said it had recorded 104 deaths in politically related violence during January.

The statistics are contained in its January assessment of political violence.

Ninety-two people died through "vigilante" action, while a further nine were killed by alleged hit squads, the HRC said in its "Human Rights Update — January 1992".

"Only three deaths were attributed to Security Force action in January, compared with an average of 8,3 for the last 12 months. Also, the number of arrests, 287, is well below that of last year's average of 772," the report said about security force activity.

Insofar as the number of deaths was concerned, the HRC said, the right-wing was relatively insignificant, being responsible for 0,8 percent of fatalities last year. — Sapa.

R170 000 grab: Policeman, two robbers killed

Citizen Reporter

A POLICEMAN and two robbers were shot dead in an attempted robbery at Olivier's Hoek and Bergville near Ladysmith in Natal at noon on Monday.

Members of the Durban Police managed to retrieve R170 000 and a Cortina bakkie which was delivering pension money to the Obonjaneni Store, the distribution point in Olivier's Hoek.

The store was being guarded by four KwaZulu policemen and three clerks were present to handle the money, according to Durban police spokesman, Captain B Naidoo.

"Without warning, one of the policemen, Constable N Zwane, was shot dead.

A number of men robbed the policemen of their pistols and two R1 rifles, and made off in the bakkie, Capt Naidoo said.

A Durban police patrol spotted the bakkie near Bergville and gave chase.

Two of the suspects were shot dead in a shoot-out, one was wounded and taken into custody and another five were arrested.

40 000 Zim farmworkers 'to lose jobs'

BULAWAYO. — More than 40 000 Zimbabwean farm-workers are expected to lose their jobs in 1992 because of the severe drought that has ravaged most commercial farms and sugar plantations in the country.

Mr Phillip Munyanyi, secretary-general of the General, Agricultural and Plantation Workers' Union of Zimbabwe, yesterday said that more farm labourers would also lose jobs due to the government's resettlement and Economic Structural Adjustment Programmes.

Mr Munyanyi said already 45 000 farm workers were on a short-time basis — 12 days a month instead of the traditional full month.

"We expect more than 40 000 farm workers to lose their jobs this year because of the effects of the drought and the resettlement programme," he said, adding that the figure could be higher.

The unionist said workers most affected would be on maize farms, cotton and sugar plantations. — Sapa.

Business Day Wed. 4 Mar 1992

Likely dates for Codesa II mooted

CODESA II was likely to take place between April 9 and 16, Codesa delegates said yesterday following a management committee meeting where the issue was discussed.

Although the exact date had not yet been finalised, delegates expressed the hope that Codesa II would take place between the start of the parliamentary recess on April 6 and the Easter weekend which started on April 17.

Meanwhile, Codesa working groups have substantially scaled down their activities during the week of the referendum, despite assurances that Codesa would not be affected by the March 17 poll.

At least two of the five Codesa working groups have cancelled their meetings for March 16 and 17 and others might follow, delegates said yesterday.

The decisions of the groups drew stiff opposition from the Labour Party, which said the NP had firmly stated that Codesa would not be affected by the referendum.

Labour Party spokesman Peter Hendrickse said despite reassurances, the NP was being allowed to interfere with the workings of Codesa.

Other parties had also voiced their

TIM COHEN

unhappiness at the NP's unwillingness to attend Codesa at full strength during the week of the poll, he said.

After the date of the poll was announced, the transitional arrangements working group agreed that the referendum should not interfere in its work and that all delegations would continue to participate meaningfully in the period leading up to the referendum, he said.

Welcome

ANC management committee member Mac Maharaj said ANC members had not objected to the delay, pointing out that only one week of Codesa's work would be affected.

Inkatha chairman Frank Mdlalose said he felt Codesa was moving at too fast a pace and that any decision to slow it down would be welcome.

Parties were not often able to get the minutes of previous meetings in time to discuss the issues raised properly with their principals in time for the next meetings.

Mdlalose said there were recommendations before many of the working groups that meetings should take place fortnightly, instead of weekly, as is currently the case.

Treurnicht keen on confederation

Political Staff

CAPE TOWN — Inkatha leader Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi was giving very serious consideration to the concept of a confederation of separate states in SA, CP leader Andries Treurnicht said yesterday.

He did not get the idea from his discussions with different black leaders that they wanted to govern the white man.

"They are looking for opportunities — job opportunities, living space and so on," he said at the launch of the CP's "no" vote campaign in Worcester.

"I found that the concept of self-determination had a serious, responsive accord with these leaders.

"They are only not clear whether they want a federation, which means there is still one state with different regions and regional governments but with one central parliament, or whether it should be a commonwealth."

He said he had told Buthelezi he wanted an association of independent states.

"I think that they are very busy giving serious consideration to that."

The CP wanted to hold discussions with black leaders on the basis of co-operation, not power-sharing, because power-sharing was a loss of authority, he said.

It was unacceptable that there be one government which ruled over his people, Treurnicht said.

Report by B Streek, TML, 122 St Georges St, Cape Town.

Hit squad evidence 'hearsay'

PRETORIA — A witness to the committee of the Goldstone Commission investigating allegations made by the Weekly Mail admitted yesterday he had no first-hand knowledge of hit squad training or activities by Inkatha members.

Mbongeni Khumalo, one of the main sources for the Goldstone Commission of Inquiry setting up a committee to investigate allegations of possible SADF involvement in training an alleged Inkatha hit squad, said under cross-examination by Louis Visser SC, for Inkatha, he had heard about training from members of a group who had spent six months in the Caprivi Strip to become bodyguards.

He had never seen the men trained in any skill that would define them as a hit squad member nor had he seen any activity that could be linked to a hit squad.

He had heard about the evidence of the training of 200 people for special guard duties when he gave the group lectures in political education.

Earlier yesterday Inkatha president Mangosuthu Buthelezi's former personal assistant M Z Khumalo said he knew one of the Caprivi trainees had been involved in the killing of a student. He said he did not

know the victim was a member of the PAC.

Another of the trainees, Daluxolo Lithuli, was in the employ of Inkatha. His salary had been paid by Richard's Appointments, an alleged front for the SADF, up to 1989 and Inkatha had paid him since then. □ Mr Justice Goldstone said yesterday that PAC president Clarence Makwetu would not be required to give evidence.

Instead, the commission is considering whether the issue which led to Makwetu's highly publicised refusal to appear before the commission — violence by trained and armed people — should itself be the subject of an inquiry.

"Until a decision is taken and the terms of reference for such an inquiry have been finalised, the commission considers it would be inappropriate to enforce the attendance of a witness from only one group which may have relevant evidence.

"To do so could give rise to a perception of partiality on the part of the commission," Mr Justice Goldstone said.

But he gave notice that, should such an inquiry be held, the commission would not hesitate to use its power to compel the attendance of anyone considered by it to have information. — Sapa.

BUSINESS DAY - WED MAR 4 1992

B. Day Wed. Mar 4 1992

Treurnicht's big lie

THE Conservative Party faces an uphill struggle to convince voters that a "no" vote in the referendum will not have consequences as dire as have been predicted by rational political and business leaders. In a throwback to Piet Koornhof's famous — but 15 years' premature — statement that "apartheid is dead", the CP has set out to dress up its blatantly racist policies in new clothing. It is an attempt to trick white South Africa into believing the party has a serious and workable plan for the future. Andries Treurnicht and his henchmen should not be allowed to get away with it.

Whatever new words the CP uses, the truth is that it offers nothing more than a minor refinement of Verwoerdian apartheid — the equivalent, perhaps, of the late Vorster or early P W Botha years. It is fallacious to equate Treurnicht's grand vision of a commonwealth of independent states with that of Boris Yeltsin.

For one thing, Yeltsin's commonwealth consists of substantial states with defined geographical boundaries. South Africa, as successive prime ministers and presidents discovered as they struggled to make apartheid work, is no such animal. In regional and economic terms, and increasingly in terms of residential areas, South Africa is an integrated society.

The repeated CP undertaking that the party will continue negotiations but in a restructured Codesa also deliberately ignores the basic

facts of life discovered by the NP over the past decade. P W Botha spent a great deal of time and energy attempting to "negotiate" with leaders chosen by him, mostly homeland leaders and town councillors, in forums he himself designed. Even then, it was difficult to get them to go along with everything the NP wanted.

Treurnicht would have two serious additional problems. First, no negotiating forum whose structures and terms of reference were not negotiated would be acceptable to any self-respecting black leader of the 1990s. That is why Codesa took so long to materialise.

Second, the identity of the country's real black leaders is now clear, and it would be impossible for a new apartheid government to choose others in their place. Treurnicht would have to choose between imprisoning those he does not like or negotiating with them on terms similar to those accepted by President de Klerk.

The first option would mean civil war. With or without this, Treurnicht would be forced eventually to negotiate. He would come face to face with the same realities which forced the NP in 1990 to abandon the path it had travelled for four decades.

The truth is that Treurnicht and his allies have nothing to offer South Africa but more pain and suffering, ending in violent overthrow or, at best, an attempted repeat of the survival strategy now being offered to white South Africans by President de Klerk.

No, Minister

GOVERNMENT's affection for independent broadcasting is increasing as it faces a loss of power. It has abused the SABC and fears the ANC will do the same, yet it shirks from steps which would prevent control by either.

Its position paper on the regulation of the electronic media is just that: a statement about regulation, not about freedom and independence. The emphasis, by both government and ANC, is on control.

The ANC wants a political lackey like the NP has had. Until it can form a government it wants Codesa to have charge of broadcasting. A government which can describe the SABC as "neutral and independent" obviously likes what it sees and hears. If democracy is to be served, both should be kept unhappy. Unless

the government of the day finds the major local broadcaster intrusive, uppity and insistent on getting answers to embarrassing questions, that broadcaster is neither independent nor doing its job.

The proposed independent regulatory commission is one step in that direction, provided its task is to ensure competitors easy access to radio and TV broadcasting bands, not to keep newcomers out. The next must be a neutral authority enforcing an independent code.

The last and essential step would be to dismiss the entire SABC board and ensure that no government, present or future, has any say in its reappointment or replacement. That is the only guarantee of independence.

B
u
s
i
n
e
s
s
D
A
Y
—
M
A
R
4
1
9
9
2

BUSINESS DAY - MAR 4 1972

LETTERS

'Yes' vote not dependent on hypocritical US

Dear Sir,
SIMON Barber's article ("Americans trying to ensure that the new SA succeeds", Business Day, February 25) begs a response — not because "white South Africans are bound up in their loathing of Americans" but because he fails to appreciate perceptions of America's track record.

Quoting a Citizen editorial is akin to using the gutter Press as a university literary reference work. However, in defence of that newspaper, perhaps the editorial writer was in Angola in 1975 when our "American allies" pulled out from that campaign and he was left high and dry to race against the advanced military equipment the Soviets had rushed in in support of their allies.

Perhaps he is a little more advanced in years, or had a father who watched the American GIs pigging out on ice-cream, Coke, coffee and cream doughnuts in the killing fields of Europe during the Second World War, while their allies' soldiers went hungry. This after the Americans had made a fast buck out of the war in Europe and entered the fray only when they absolutely had to.

Perhaps he actually recalls that when it suited them the Americans

dropped their long-time ally in Nationalist China (Taiwan) because it made better business sense to tap the billion possible consumers on the communist mainland.

Perhaps he is Jewish and does not like to see the Americans regularly holding the Jewish state to ransom so America can achieve some dubious political New World Order in which only they make the rules.

In our referendum there will be a majority "yes" vote, Mr Barber, and it will be no thanks to the Americans but rather due to the fact that most of us, of all colours, have been moving in the correct direction anyway for some time.

Our belief in the trustworthiness of the Americans has been nurtured over many years of observing and experiencing the hypocrisy of successive American government foreign policies. This has absolutely nothing to do with "uitlanders" or Yank-bashing. If anything, it is the US that does the bashing of anyone who does not fall into line with their concept of a New World Order.

E M BAUMGARTNER
12 Henny Street
Birchleigh North
Kempton Park

PO Box 1138
Jo'burg 2000
Fax: (011) 836-0805

□□□□

Dear Sir,
I RECENTLY attended Dr Edward de Bono's outstanding course on creativity and lateral thinking for management, in Pretoria and was amazed to see the lack of interest from so many major companies.

There was no one from companies such as Anglo American, Anglovaal, Barlows, Rembrandt, Sanlam, Rand Mines, Gold Fields, Times Media, government departments, and several hundred public companies.

Progressive companies were represented by teams from M-Net, Radio 702, Fedics, Johnson Matthey and a host of less fashionable but get-up-and-go companies.

Does this mean the management of the "big battalions" are so moribund that they do not need to know anything about creativity and new ways of thinking and managing? Is

their financial muscle so great that even in a depression their management teams do not need to be progressive? If this is so, surely SA companies are being badly managed and we are in for a tough time when the international companies return.

ANDREW INGRAM
Braamfontein

□□□□

Dear Sir,
IN A CAPTION to a photograph of Civil Aviation director, Mr Rennie van Zyl (Business Day, February 6) you say "... SA's light aircraft accident rate had reached an unacceptable record high last year, with more than 180 crashes being reported". This is completely out of context.

The word "crash" implies that aircraft flew into the ground, or collided with something, which is completely incorrect. The 180 "accidents" as reported by Mr van Zyl included so-called "crashes", as well as wheels-up landings, accidents on the ground and others.

Mr van Zyl also reported that although the number of accidents appear to be high, it is not higher than

in other countries if expressed in passenger kilometres.

W J SEYMORE
President, Aircraft Owners and
Pilots Association

□□□□

Dear Sir,
THE poster, "Vote Yes for F W", which is springing up all over Johannesburg, is making me crosser and crosser. The "yes" vote is for the continuation of the reform process, not for the NP or its leader. The Nats should respect the seriousness of the occasion, and not try to snatch cheap party-political advantage.

SUE SPARKS
P O Box 701
Rivonia

□□□□

Dear Sir,
THE single most compelling reason why F W will lose the referendum is that we do not want our country to be ruled and ruined by Mandela and the ANC.

J A BIRKENSTOCK
P O Box 10329
Vorna Valley