

SELLOUTS HAVE NO FOLLOWING

But what is significant about this array of 'leaders' that De Klerk has assembled is that he (and Pik Botha) have carefully groomed the homelands/Bantustan/tricameral collaborators over the extended negotiations period to the point where all (or most) of them came in response and support of his initiative, even though most of them have no real or democratically elected followers/membership in the so-called political parties in their 'constituencies'. Politically they have been spurned, rejected and constantly boycotted by the freedom movements and the people whom they now claim to represent. Many of the organisations mentioned in their profiles are of very recent vintage! About eight of these bodies were formed as recently as this year, last year or the year before. Two of them are 'military councils' that had come to rule after a coup in the Transkei and the Ciskei. Most others had no real membership since the chiefs autocratically largely outlaw any kind of progressive peoples' organisations, the most notorious being Boputhatswana under Mangope.

An example of how the Labour Party of tricameral Hendrickse is representative can be gained from the December 1990 conference they held in Cape Town. The story was related (together with a front-page colour picture) in "The Sunday Times" newspaper of how busloads of elderly pensioner ladies were tricked into believing they would be given a Christmas treat for the day. Instead, they were taken to a not very full hall at the Goodwood Showgrounds to applaud De Klerk when he came to address the conference. Hungry and angry, the women recounted how they were told to vote by raising their right hands, even though they were not members of the Labour Party, and had never been even its supporters.

Also among the tricameral rump is A. Rajbansi, shameless sellout of the tricameral circus, who was booted out of the leadership because of corruption and dishonesty. But he got back into 'parliament' despite his track record. In any event, both in the case of the 'Coloured' and the Indian dummy elections, most of the largely unopposed candidates obtained around 5 percent of the possible votes, some as few as less than 10 people voting, thanks to the nationwide boycott of the farcical elections. For De Klerk, time apparently is of the essence. The National Party lost a very significant by-election in Virginia in the OFS. In 1989 the Nats had a majority of 43 but in this last by-election the Conservative Party of Treurnicht had a majority of over 3 000, meaning that the Nat voters were joining the CP and deserting De Klerk. The

usual experts with their computers have come up with the projection that at this rate the CP and rightwing Afrikaners would get a majority of 10 in the white parliament if there is an election; and that the whites would vote 55 percent in favour of the CP and its allies in a De Klerk referendum.

COMPROMISE AND CONSENSUS TO BE REACHED

This has very crucial bearing on the negotiations of De Klerk, since he has once again promised that in the referendum scheduled for early 1992 the white vote will be counted separately. This would give the white and rightwing the victory. In such a situation, De Klerk would most likely push his ideas of a compromise much harder and get the ANC and others to accept that whites were entitled to self-determination. As Patrick Laurence, assistant editor of *The Star*, said in Harare recently, when he and Vincent Maphai and William Breytenbach tried to sell the idea of the CODESA affair: "However, the major players at the conference, the ANC and Mr de Klerk's National Party, realise all too well that they have to reach a consensus as far as possible, on a sufficient and pragmatic consensus."

Well, De Klerk has categorically declared that he and his Nat Party are against any form of majoritarianism and that community interests (read: white minority interests) would have to be taken into full account.

A significant aside: US AID has given the ANC R12,5 million and Inkatha R7 million for their "negotiations" expenses.

STATE'S POLICY OF DECEPTION

Rejecting any participation in the negotiations meetings of 29 November and of 20-21 December 1991, the New Unity Movement says in its latest statement that the conference has nothing to do with the promotion of the struggle for democracy, except to confuse it and destroy it. "The De Klerk government has created this forum to secure the collaboration of certain sections of the political movement of national liberation; the sole purpose of this is to strengthen the hold of the ruling class upon the political, economic and other machinery of the State, with the help of these willing collaborators . . ."

The statement says further: "It is being made to seem as though the IFP, the ANC and the PAC are co-sponsors of this Conference. That is only part of the State's deception policy and part of the self-deception which, regrettably, has become a feature of the political posturing of a section of the leadership among the disfranchised. It is in fact a glaring