

EMBARGOED_UNTL DELIVERED

AIDE MEMOIRE FOR DISCUSSION WITH MR. DONALD ANDERSON, MP,
BRITISH LABOUR PARTY SPOKESMAN ON FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH
AFFAIRS, BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU,
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE
HOUSE OF COMMONS, LONDON. TUESDAY, 8TH MAY 1984

In very complex political situations there is always a diversity of
opinion about the nature of political problems. There are also
"disputes about how to solve problems even after there is agreement
| on the nature of some of the problems involved. I find during my

travels in the Western world that there is a great deal of sympathy
for the Black struggle for liberation in South Africa. Everywhere
I find people, groups, institutions and governments indignant about
apartheid society in South Africa and the indefensible racism which
has characterised the National Party's rule. All too frequently,
however, those who are indignant are ill-informed about what should
best be done to rectify what is Dblatantly indefensible about
apartheid and the National Party's racist government.

I understand that somebody who genuinely feels righteous
indignation feels compelled to do something about the South African
situation and becomes an actor in the drama by playing the roles
of the first script which comes to hand. A group of sensitive and
honourable people who meet a Black South African pursuing a
particular cause will be led by their sense of indignation to llend
a hand. It is perhaps wrong of Black South Africans to expect such
responsive groups to make an objective and informed assessment of
the South African situation before they take sides and launch
themselves into the South African struggle Support for the struggle
for lliberation in South Africa is in the West as divided as Black
politics is in the country itself. I believe that it would serve a
useful purpose for us to stand back and look at the nature of the
South African political situation in broad terms. If we 'gain
nothing else from doing so other than an understanding that Black
South Africa has elected to pursue a multi-strategy approach, and
that there are numerous ways in which Westerners could exert
positive influences in the struggle, then we will have achieved
something. All too often Western groups, and even at times Western
Governments, become drawn into Black/Black conflicts and do not
understand that their input is but one of many which are needed.

The fact that there are disputes amongst Black South Africans about
what should be done and how it should be done, should be welcomed
â\200\230in the West. Black leaders who vie with each other for public

support in the strategies they favour, should also be welcomed. The years of the struggle for liberation in South Africa should be the years in which a deep-rooted democracy emerges amongst the people. Suffering does not automatically unite people in unity of thought and deed. The depth of our suffering rather underwrites the need for clear thinking and the need for the evolution of viable tactics and strategies.

I am saddened by the fact that so many Western influences, emanating from good hearts and deep commitments to humanity, are stripped of their greatest value as they become bogged down in Black/Black internicine strife. I have always pleaded for a multi-strategy approach in South Africa; I have always argued against Black political forces who want to dictate what they should or

should not do. I have always argued that there is no single organisation in the country or in exile to whom the main thrust of the struggle could be trusted. I have always argued that Black

unity should not depend on each doing what everyone else is doing but on the recognition that each must do what he or she can do in his or her circumstances.

All my life I have campaigned for non-violent tactics and strategies and all my life I have sought to be involved in the politics of negotiation. But I have had to recognise, publicly in Europe and in South Africa, that the threat of violence could exert a beneficial influence in the struggle. I have argued that the threat of international isolation may be beneficial. I have said loudly and clearly that it is foolishness in the extreme for Black South Africans to pin their hopes on armed intervention from abroad. I have said loudly and clearly that the application of sanctions against South Africa will never muster coercive forces to which the South African Government will have no option but to respond. I am, however, not blind to the fact that the pursuit of strategies which in themselves can never bring victory achieve absolutely nothing.

Thus while I understand that Western indignation sometimes seizes on the first available opportunity to express itself in support of one or another Black South African strategy, I lament the fact that in doing so they have counter-productive consequences. I and those who pursue the strategies of non-violence have suffered immeasurably in the hands of those who cannot distinguish between making a contribution to the struggle and taking sides in destructive Black/Black political conflicts.

If I believe that Black/Black disputes are the breeding grounds for

democratic principles and that the process whereby disputing Black leaders vie for public support is a process on which democracy is founded, it does not mean that I regard all Black/Black political conflicts as beneficial. Internicine strife is quite often based on the actions of those who seek only to dominate and to dictate and to indulge in political assassinations in order to leave them free to do so.

I am particularly conscious of these thoughts as I attempt to fathom the future in the new political dispensation which has been thrust on South Africa. The new constitution now being forced on South Africa by the country's minority White Government has changed the nature of South African politics. It has elevated issues to new urgent heights; it has narrowed options; it has hastened the process of polarisation and it has brought nearer the politics of violence and strife.

Black politics has always sought the inclusion of Blacks in the

existing State. Blacks no longer aspire for the kind of constitutional rights which Whites, Coloureds and Indians are now taking for themselves. The new constitution denationalises 22

million Africans in the country and directs their attention to reconstituting the State itself rather than directing them to seek inclusion in it. The new constitution has taken a giant step towards a revolutionary future and by no stretch of the imagination can it be described as a small step in the right direction.

The signing of the Nkomati Accord and the elimination of the African National Congress' Mission in Exile's operational bases in neighbouring States is a watershed event which should make us all stand still for a while to take stock of what we are doing. Above all else, we must now realise that the struggle for liberation in South Africa is an internal struggle and must be waged by the people of the country wherever they are and whatever

they are doing. To continue to hope that the armed struggle and international sanctions will bring about radical changes in South Africa is now more mistaken than it has ever been in the past. It

is more important now than it was ever before to realise that our Black brothers and sisters in exile need to be supported, but not supported at the cost of those of us working within the country to bring about change through non-violent and democratic means.

Whenever I speak to British Members of Parliament, I am conscious of the fact that many of the issues we face now are issues which arise out of issues which their forefathers and my forefathers were involved in. My maternal great grandfather, King Cetshwayo, was

defeated Dby the British at the Battle of Ulundi in 1879. It was the British who dismembered the Zulu empire and it was the British who brought modern South African into being with the enactment of the Act of Union in 1910. It was the British who were the custodians of the early years of the new Union of South Africa and left many indelible marks on the nature of South African society. The British are, in a very real sense, my political kith and kin and I am often assailed by the notion that I have a right to take issue with Members of the House of Commons as one would do with a brother. I have a right to say to Mr. Kinnock that you are wrong, Sir; that you were merely politicking when you issued your statement after Mr. Oliver Tambo's visit here. Successive British Governments, whether they have been Labour or Conservative Governments, have pursued a distinctively British style of diplomacy in South and Southern Africa. I am not impressed by political posturing where matters of life and death are concerned. I am not impressed by those who glibly talk as though young Black South Africans are the kind of cannon fodder which some would have them be. Members of the House of Commons are constituent politicians and I am not impressed when they indulge in flights of fancy on issues in foreign parts which they would not dare do in their own home constituencies.

Black South Africans who came to hear of Mr. Kinnock's undertakings to Mr. Oliver Tambo remembered what the track record of the Labour Party was after Mr. Ian Smith's Unilateral Declaration of Independence. They also remember the kind of political pomposity to which some British Administrators in South Africa were so prone. There is nothing like the British sense of fair play in the world; there is nothing like the British stiff upper lip; and there is nothing like the genuine integrity which so often shines through British behaviour. There is also, however, nothing quite like British hypocrisy as they try to posture in self-importance. Mr. Kinnock knows, and the whole British public knows, that he will not be able to fulfill his promises to Mr. Tambo even if his Party took over the reigns of government.

Mr. Kinnock committed a future Labour Government to assisting Mr. Tambo with military hardware and to extend and tighten the arms embargo against South Africa. It surely must be a prime example of what I was talking about when I said that people in the West who are moved by indignation sometimes seize on the first script to hand and begin acting it out thoughtlessly and careless of the final consequences of what they are doing.

The Presidents of Tanzania, Zambia, Angola and Botswana and the Prime Ministers of Zimbabwe and Lesotho met with President Samora

Machel of Mocambique last week and supported his signing of the Nkomati Accord. I fail to see how British parliamentarians can seriously consider economic sanctions against South Africa as a weapon against apartheid. Now more than ever, sanctions against South Africa are sanctions against the whole of Southern Africa. Neither the Black people of South Africa, nor the people of Southern Africa, support economic sanctions. If President Machel thought the ANC's Mission in Exile could succeed in an armed struggle, he would not have closed down their bases and ordered them out of his country. The struggle for liberation in South Africa is an internal struggle and I plead with those in public life in Britain to mobilise British public support for the struggle

which is taking place inside South Africa. The struggle which Black South Africans are waging will have consequences not only in South Africa but in the whole of Southern Africa. Western vested

interests will be deeply affected by what happens in South Africa. The internal policies of the Nationalist Government are not a domestic affair. Apartheid policies are rightfully the consideration of the international community and I believe that all those who love justice and peace should rally behind those who struggle to establish a just and open society in South Africa.