

CLARION CALL

Volume 2, 1987

President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation.

AFTER THE

WHITE

ELECTION

— WHAT NOW

FOR SA?

President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political

CONTENTS

QUOTES — DR M G BUTHELEZI	1
WHAT WERE THE WHITE VOTES FOR!	4
WHERE FAILURE LIES.....	5
BLACK REACTION	6
PRESIDENT P W BOTHA'S CALL FOR TALKS.....	7
DR M G BUTHELEZI'S REPLY	8-9
DR NELSON MANDELA	10-11
THE KWAZULU/NATAL INDABA.....	12-13
CONSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS	14-15
POWER-SHARING	16
INKATHA AND THE INDABA.....	17-18
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL.....	19
PLEA FOR BLACK UNITY.....	20
DISINVESTMENT.....	21-22
WHAT SANCTIONS HAVE DONE....	23-24
CALL FOR MASSIVE AID	25
THE STATE OF EMERGENCY	26
CONTACT ADDRESSES	27
STOP PRESS	
THE REV. LEON SULLIVAN	27



DR M G BUTHELEZI:

"On the level of constitutional development, the State President can make no gains from doing things which blacks reject. He has to involve blacks in constitutional development. We as black leaders have the ultimate weapon of veto right over what the State President can achieve. He can blunder without us but he cannot succeed without us. The next two to three years is going to be a crucial time in which massive endeavours should be made to stop the State President establishing political circuses in which he can be the ring master. Black leaders such as myself will judge what he is doing in part by those with whom he does it . . ."

"I have not got a hidden agenda . . . I have no double agendas either. I have stated almost ad nauseum the conditions under which I am prepared to consider participation in the National Council of the State President. First of all, the State President must tell us what he wants to talk about. If the State President turns his National Council into a castration chamber then only those who aspire to be political eunuchs will want to go there. Negotiations must add power to the arm of the negotiators. The only thing that adds power to black leaders is movement towards realising a situation in which there is one South Africa, with one sovereign parliament and one universal adult franchise system. Only powerful black and white leaders could negotiate these things into realities. They will only be achieved through compromise solutions and through the give and take between parties who have something to give and are capable of taking something . . ."

"If the State President, through whatever means, drags political small boys into his National Council, he must not expect the black political heavy-weights to be prepared to take their seats beside them. There is a man-size job waiting to be done and if he tries to do it with the feeble, he must not expect me to be prepared to water down my strengths with feebleness. His National Council will fail if he gathers in it the political has-beens or if he gathers in it those who simply do not have the clout that effective negotiation demands . . ."

"The State President will fail utterly if he follows a course of events in which he gives political roles to good boys and expects them to do an impossible job. I would negotiate with the State President tomorrow if the negotiating agenda would include the scrapping of the Tricameral Parliament and would, for instance, make it possible for me to table a final version of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba constitutional proposals. Obviously black democracy must be

unshackled to give black negotiators the prospects of carrying blacks with them. The only blacks worth negotiating with are blacks who would, in fact, increase their own power bases through negotiations. Of what value would I be to Mr P W Botha, to black South Africa and South Africa as a whole, if I was by now located in the South African political rubbish heap because I had prematurely involved myself in discussions with the State President?

AFTER THE WHITE ELECTION



WHAT WERE THE VOTES FOR?

"The first conclusion I draw is that the white electorate is not voting to support what the Government has already done. It is voting to support what the Government promises to do, as the promise is heard by the white electorate.

This raises of course the question of whether the Government has been heard correctly and it poses the alternative question of whether the Government has the wisdom to know that the ambiguities within which it wraps its intentions — as far as reform goes — are ambiguities for

the sake of safeguarding strategic intentions; or whether they are ambiguities designed to solicit a following in a direction which the Government does not intend taking.

If the latter is the case, the backlash will be severe. If the former is the case, there will also be a backlash and the ferment in the National Party which was symptomised by the Independents will deepen."

Dr M G Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha.

WHERE FAILURE LIES

"If the State President attempts to negotiate about that which he put before the electorate at the recent election, negotiations will fail. Because I believe in negotiations, I will not enter negotiations which fail. I call yet again on the State President to tell South Africa what package he will be negotiating.

Is he thinking of the kind of future in which whites remain the final decision-makers over all matters which add up to establishing domestic and foreign policy? Is he interested in negotiating only our acceptance of the de facto power of white South Africans to make unilateral decisions about domestic and foreign

policy?

Is the State President thinking of the perpetuation of a tricameral-type parliamentary structure in which all politics rests on the distinction between own and common affairs where the own affairs of whites include the final controlling right over the country's fiscal policy; over the country's civil service; over the country's police and defence forces and which includes the right for the white chamber to pass laws applicable to millions of blacks . . . ?

Is he putting the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act on the negotiating table?" — Dr M G Buthelezi

A message to South Africa

In time to come, the results of the recent white South African election will be seen to have stimulated an even further radicalisation of black politics.

This is the message the Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha, Dr M G Buthelezi, has given the country.

In statements following the election, Dr Buthelezi said: "I fear for the future. White South Africans have given a substantial mandate to the State President to follow his brand of reform. It is the same brand of reform which black South Africa rejected in 1983.

"The white electorate have given more justification to the arguments of those who say that only escalated violence can bring whites to their senses.

"Black South Africans despair at the evidence that talk about the removal of apartheid takes place as the architects of apartheid continue planning new apartheid structures.

"Even those of us who are committed to non-violence



would rather die than accept the National Party's prescription of a sugar-coated apartheid pill.

"The international community must now hear me when I remind it that the punitive isolation of South Africa is driving white South Africans to put their backs to the wall and stand bloodily-mindedly in support of the State President's political recalcitrance.

"I see white South Africa as having moved substantially to the right.

"I am convinced that one of the factors involved was the efficacy of Government propaganda that it and it alone is capable of bringing about reform in a meaningful way.

"On the face of it, the swing towards the National Party represents a shift to the right — but that shift to the right was a shift towards belief in reform.

"I am totally appalled at what happened (the results of the election) and I see a long, hard, costly political grind ahead.

"The National Party cannot deliver the goods it has promised to the white electorate. There will now be no real negotiations between black and white at the national level and negotiations at regional level will now become of more crucial importance.

"We must negotiate if we are going to avoid violence as the final arbiter of what should and should not be done.

"If the State President persists in obstructing even voluntary regional negotiations because he is bent on

Dr M G Buthelezi's reaction:

ramming his neo-apartheid plans down our throats, then all I can say is we will have to seek mandates for the next step we may need to take from millions of black South Africans.

"Negotiations are going to be tough and it will be extremely difficult to mount these tough negotiations, but I can assure South Africa that solving South Africa's problems by violence will be far tougher — so tough in fact that nobody can triumph through violence.

"The State President will have to maintain his position by employing State violence to oppose revolutionary violence.

"Violent confrontation will continue in South Africa and while it continues, the forces working towards the normalisation of South Africa as a modern, Western-type democratic state will have to do a lot more to gather the momentum that is needed to win the race against time with violence.

"The National Party will yet see a backlash if it does not deliver its promised reforms and if its delivery does not result in the normalisation of South Africa as a country which can be ruled through the normal process of government and law outside national states of emergency.

"We really do not know what the Government's intentions are . . . We do not know whether the Government is a

victim of its own propaganda and whether or not it has deluded itself that it is involved in really meaningful reform just as it has deluded the white electorate that it is so involved.

"The State President really perhaps believes that he is so committed to negotiated reform that he cannot approach Parliament with his own detailed blue-print designed to accommodate the legitimate political aspirations of all South Africa's people.

"I think this is what he believes. It is certainly what he says but I find a very strange anomaly between this statement and the crystal clear political facts.

"If the State President had the boldness to do what is really demanded of him by the historic importance of today's crisis, he would act boldly and test his action against the will of the majority of the people.

"I believe he will negotiate right now only limitations on white domination in the hope that he can get away with keeping white privilege and white political domination relatively intact. That is what he did in the Tricameral Parliament.

"He may be prepared to go a little further than he did in the Tricameral Parliament but he has never given any indication that he is prepared to negotiate the acceptance of a universal adult franchise system in the political circumstances created by the scrapping of the Population Registration Act and rely on presenting a plan of action to the people which they will accept."

A TIME FOR COURAGE

"It is no use the State President hiding behind statements that he is not prepared to prejudge what can be negotiated about and what cannot be negotiated about. Black leaders who are worth negotiating with will not enter into negotiations unless they are persuaded that that which is going to be negotiated is worth

negotiating. If we have not yet reached the stage in which Mr P W Botha has the courage to tell the world what he is going to negotiate about, then there must be negotiations about negotiations before blacks can accept his invitation to negotiate with him."

— Dr M G Buthelezi.

P W BOTHA'S CALL FOR ALL-RACE TALKS

In signed full-page advertisements in South African newspapers, the State President, Mr P W Botha, has made a personal plea for talks with "all leaders who reject violence."

Mr Botha said the white electorate had given him an "overwhelming mandate" to negotiate with representatives of "our black communities and groups about our common future . . ."

The negotiations would not be a struggle for domination and power, he said.

"It will be an honest meeting of men of peace and goodwill — a meeting that must and will produce solutions to our problems.

"I say this with confidence because I am well aware of what the needs and desires of all our peoples are.

"I am also well aware of the specific questions for which we must find answers — questions about education, unemployment, housing, personal security and many more.

"But above all, the question of our political future must be answered.

"My government and I have the power, the will, the desire and the mandate to work out the answers to these questions with all leaders who reject violence.

"A few days ago in Parliament I stated that I will now personally become more involved in this search for peaceful answers.

"That is why I am now extending my hand of friendship to all South Africans of goodwill.

"Join me in talks and negotiations. We will find the

answers to our questions together."

The Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha, Dr M G Buthelezi, has responded in-depth and his views in this regard are expressed throughout this issue.

Meanwhile the Central Committee of Inkatha, which is essentially the national executive of the movement, has called on the Government to declare a moratorium on the introduction of Regional Services Councils (replacing Provincial Councils) — which have been set up without black consultation.

The Government must provide a "breathing space" for the politics of negotiation, the Central Committee noted in resolutions following a recent day-long meeting. (Central Committee meetings are held regularly.)

The committee "yet again" urged the State President to make a declaration of intent with black leaders to establish a common purpose for negotiations.

It further called for the release of Dr Nelson Mandela so that "black democratic forces could then mount their full strength in favour of negotiations."

In a preamble to the resolutions, the committee noted that there was recognition throughout the country that the present South African constitution and its Tricameral Parliament did not provide constitutional arrangements capable of surviving for any length of time.

The Central Committee expressed its "deep concern" that despite this the Government was elaborating

the idiom of the present constitution by developing the reconstituted Provincial administrative systems and going ahead with the Regional Services Councils.

This meant that national negotiations — which were going to get going only with great difficulty — would now "face the added burden of having more to undo each month that passes."

The committee said it was aware that history was poised to bring about change and that, once the process really started, it would move with "awesome rapidity" and that the pace of change would be beyond party-political control.

The Central Committee therefore resolved to call on the South African Government to state clearly where it was attempting to lead the country.

Dr Buthelezi told the Central Committee that he believed the release of Dr Mandela would put victory through revolutionary violence further out of sight than ever before.

Blacks now stood with whites at the South African crossroads.

He said that the ANC could not mount what it called a "people's war" without fanning violence among blacks.

All those involved in supporting the ANC in the pursuit of its kind of success were, whether they liked it said or not, working to further the cause of killing.

There has been a kind of totality to the left of Inkatha which had done everything possible to escalate violence and make the country ungovernable.

Dr Buthelezi said the ANC and those who worked with it had not heard him when he warned of the "extreme tactical stupidity" of attacking the SA Government where it was strongest — on the military level.

WHAT DOES HE WANT TO TALK ABOUT?

"When the State President one day informs us what he is prepared to negotiate about, I will then and then only know whether there is anything I can negotiate with him about. South Africa dare not produce another constitution which needs a State of Emergency to keep it intact. We cannot fall again at the national political level and fuel the hideous flames of violence." — Dr M G Buthelezi

"homelands" and "independent" states.

Until the State President outlines his plans, there can be no utility in Dr Buthelezi participating in what he terms "pseudo-political activity" which clearly will not represent the desires of the majority of black South Africa.

The Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha, Dr M G Buthelezi, is obviously recognised as a key figure in any negotiations about the future of South Africa.

He is a fervent proponent of negotiations but, to date, has been unable to consider various South African Government proposals for him and others to participate in so-called initiatives which have all had a monumental flaw: none have spelled out what the Government wants to talk about.

Dr Buthelezi has made it quite clear that he and his vast constituency will not be a party to any negotiations which fall within the framework of existing apartheid legislation.

He will not, for instance, discuss the future of South Africa if the Government insists on talking within and around the parameters of law such as the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act. The present constitution and tricameral parliamentary system is vehemently rejected as is the balkanisation of South Africa into so-called



In numerous speeches and statements, Dr Buthelezi has emphasised: "I will not be a party to further the suicidal activity (of the Government) in which blacks are expected to seek their political destiny to the exclusion of a destiny in the country's central parliament.

"We need to know what Mr P W Botha has in mind for a negotiating agenda. He must tell the world what his intentions about negotiations are. There will be no negotiations until he does just this."

Dr Buthelezi emphasises he is not turning his back on negotiations, he is merely speaking for black South Africa when he says that to

"My greatest political advantage is that while I fold my arms and do nothing, Mr P W Botha will not be able to take South Africa into yet another constitutional cul-de-sac. He can virtually make no change of any magnitude in the constitutional field unless blacks help him make it. He now sinks or swims on his ability to gather blacks behind what he is doing. That is the bed that he himself has made and it is the bed that he himself now lies in." —

Dr M G Buthelezi

**"WE DARE
NOT FAIL ..."**

to go a little further than he had with the tricameral Parliament but there are no indications that he is prepared to negotiate the acceptance of a universal franchise system in the circumstances which would be created by the scrapping of the Population Registration Act.

"Mr Botha will either be eclipsed by history or he will catch up with me and do the things that simply have to be done and do the things which will gather massive black support."

Dr Buthelezi notes that he is "under pressure" to negotiate with the State President by those who think that Mr Botha "really is earnest in his reform intentions."

He adds: "To them I say I am willing to negotiate with an agreed agenda. I would negotiate with him today if negotiations were about the implementation of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba-type proposals.

"I would negotiate for the direction which the Indaba proposals indicate and I would do so because however they are finally formulated, they are an idiom of what we should be looking for.

"I am therefore not unwilling to negotiate but, as I have said, I will not negotiate in circumstances in which it is patently clear to me that negotiations will fail.

"There is no need for me to enter into desperate negotiations which will fail when I believe so strongly that there are courses of action open to us which can succeed."

Dr Nels

Dr M G Buthelezi's position regarding Dr Nelson Mandela, the imprisoned leader of the banned African National Congress, has never changed.

For more than 20 years he has consistently attempted to apply pressure on successive South African Governments to unconditionally release Dr Mandela, PAC leader Mr Zeph Mothopeng, and other political prisoners. He has also called for the unbanning of political parties.

At the same time Dr Buthelezi's political platform has always been one of advocating peaceful change, national negotiation and reconciliation. He has made it quite clear that black South Africa will settle for nothing less than a multi-party democracy in a free and united South Africa in which power is shared by all.

Dr Buthelezi, the KwaZulu Government and Inkatha have therefore blocked all efforts by the South African Government to foist so-called "independence" on KwaZulu which would strip seven million Zulus of their South African citizenship.

They do not believe that the majority of black South Africa desires the violent overthrow of the Government but are, in

fact, committed to the politics of non-violence and reconciliation through negotiation.

As far as any future constitutional negotiations within the framework of the country's parliamentary system are concerned, Dr Buthelezi is adamant that his participation would be conditional on Dr Mandela's release along with other imprisoned leaders. (See boxes)

"Dr Mandela would not have expected black politics to have come to a standstill during his period of incarceration. That is why I am prepared to be involved in negotiations following the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. That is why I was involved in negotiations with the Natal Provincial Council to establish a multiracial executive authority in the KwaZulu/Natal region of South Africa. I did not demand Dr Mandela's release before I did so. I make the demand for his release at the level of national negotiations for a new constitution for the country . . ." —

Dr M G Buthelezi

In the meantime, Dr Buthelezi has asked the State President, Mr P W Botha, to spell out what his intentions about negotiations are.

In a recent Press statement Dr Buthelezi said: "When one

**"WE DARE
NOT FAIL ..."**

to go a little further than he had with the tricameral Parliament but there are no indications that he is prepared to negotiate the acceptance of a universal franchise system in the circumstances which would be created by the scrapping of the Population Registration Act.

"Mr Botha will either be eclipsed by history or he will catch up with me and do the things that simply have to be done and do the things which will gather massive black support."

Dr Buthelezi notes that he is "under pressure" to negotiate with the State President by those who think that Mr Botha "really is earnest in his reform intentions."

He adds: "To them I say I am willing to negotiate with an agreed agenda. I would negotiate with him today if negotiations were about the implementation of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba-type proposals.

"I would negotiate for the direction which the Indaba proposals indicate and I would do so because however they are finally formulated, they are an idiom of what we should be looking for.

"I am therefore not unwilling to negotiate but, as I have said, I will not negotiate in circumstances in which it is patently clear to me that negotiations will fail.

"There is no need for me to enter into desperate negotiations which will fail when I believe so strongly that there are courses of action open to us which can succeed."

Dr Nels

Dr M G Buthelezi's position regarding Dr Nelson Mandela, the imprisoned leader of the banned African National Congress, has never changed.

For more than 20 years he has consistently attempted to apply pressure on successive South African Governments to unconditionally release Dr Mandela, PAC leader Mr Zeph Mothopeng, and other political prisoners. He has also called for the unbanning of political parties.

A the same time Dr Buthelezi's political platform has always been one of advocating peaceful change, national negotiation and reconciliation. He has made it quite clear that black South Africa will settle for nothing less than a multi-party democracy in a free and united South Africa in which power is shared by all.

Dr Buthelezi, the KwaZulu Government and Inkatha have therefore blocked all efforts by the South African Government to foist so-called "independence" on KwaZulu which would strip seven million Zulus of their South African citizenship.

They do not believe that the majority of black South Africa desires the violent overthrow of the Government but are, in

fact, committed to the politics of non-violence and reconciliation through negotiation.

As far as any future constitutional negotiations within the framework of the country's parliamentary system are concerned, Dr Buthelezi is adamant that his participation would be conditional on Dr Mandela's release along with other imprisoned leaders. (See boxes)

"Dr Mandela would not have expected black politics to have come to a standstill during his period of incarceration. That is why I am prepared to be involved in negotiations following the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. That is why I was involved in negotiations with the Natal Provincial Council to establish a multiracial executive authority in the KwaZulu/Natal region of South Africa. I did not demand Dr Mandela's release before I did so. I make the demand for his release at the level of national negotiations for a new constitution for the country . . ." —

Dr M G Buthelezi

In the meantime, Dr Buthelezi has asked the State President, Mr P W Botha, to spell out what his intentions about negotiations are.

In a recent Press statement Dr Buthelezi said: "When one

on Mandela

talks about negotiation it is all too easy to confuse negotiations about negotiations with the final kind of negotiations which would have statutory status. It is in the latter kind of negotiations that I am adamant about the need for Dr Mandela's release."

In this respect he adds that it is essential that national negotiations be between leaders mandated by the people and as long as leaders like Dr Nelson Mandela remain in jail, no blacks are free to choose their own destiny.

"I reiterate that when it comes to talking about the constitutional future of the country in a formal statutory body, I will continue to demand the unshackling of black democracy and demand the release of Dr Mandela and others as an essential step in that direction.

"South Africa will never be free until black democracy is unshackled and it cannot be unshackled while important leaders remain in jail for political reasons. My position about Dr Mandela has not changed. It is because it has not changed that I continue working for the prospects of negotiation."

Dr Buthelezi will have nothing whatsoever to do with any future dispensation which does not include blacks in the central government of the country. This is undoubtedly the position of the vast majority of black South Africans.

"This is our country and we will never ever relinquish our

"When one talks about negotiation it is all too easy to confuse negotiations about negotiations with the final kind of negotiations which would have statutory status. It is in the latter kind of negotiations that I am adamant about the need for Dr Mandela's release. We can negotiate about negotiations to get to that point with or without him. I do not speak for Dr Mandela. I speak for the millions of black South Africans who support me and that is what I understand their position to be . . ."

Dr M G Buthelezi

demand for our full participation in it," he says.

Dr Buthelezi recently told the internationally renowned author and philosopher, Sir Laurens van der Post, that "all and sundry" were now speaking in the name of imprisoned black leaders.

Consequently, millions throughout the world believed that Black South Africans en masse supported the pro-violence external mission of the ANC.

They actually believed that blacks overwhelmingly supported the need to overthrow the Government by violence as well as action to bring about South Africa's punitive isolation by sanctions and disinvestment.

Black South Africans, he said, were unable to correct this false impression because they

were unable to choose their own leaders or to choose whichever strategies and tactics they preferred.

In such circumstances it was not possible for any leader who went to negotiate with the State President to demonstrate that he or she had support.

Dr Buthelezi said that he would serve under Dr Nelson Mandela if the masses were really free and told him to do so.

Likewise, he would expect Dr Mandela to serve under him if that was what the masses were able to tell him to do.

In other words, he would serve under anyone else who was democratically elected in a free election by all the people of South Africa.

Alternatively, he would expect the same acceptance were he the people's choice.

"Dr Mandela has been in jail now for more than a quarter of a century. He must be released and he must be released unconditionally. I have lobbied for his release right from the outset. I have applied pressure on the South African Government consistently for many years. South Africa will never be free until black democracy is unshackled and it cannot be unshackled while important leaders remain in jail . . ."

Dr M G Buthelezi

SUPPORT FOR THE KWAZULU/NATAL INDABA

**"The only hope on our dark horizons ..."
Author Alan Paton**

***"The politics of negotiation must ultimately triumph and it is time now to commence on that triumphant journey by taking local and regional steps towards final national goals . . ."* —**

Dr M G Buthelezi

The election results have shown the "total historic necessity" for KwaZulu/Natal Indaba-type proposals to establish the region within South Africa as a united, non-racial democracy.

In speeches throughout South Africa, Dr M G Buthelezi says he believes that the time has come to take local and regional steps towards final national goals.

"Reform which is dictated from above can never be acceptable to the majority of South Africa's population," he said.

"Only consensus politics can solve our problems and not Mr Botha's prescription politics."

He told the Central Committee of Inkatha at a recent meeting that "statesmanship" demanded that the Indaba must go on.

It "looked good" to him and that was why "I have jammed my foot in the door." He said he would "not walk through

the door" unless the whole of Inkatha walked through with him.

The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba flowed from the recommendations of the Buthelezi Commission and represents a broad spectrum of black, white, Indian and Coloured parties and interest groups.

There is ample evidence that support for the Indaba is growing.

Late last year the Indaba produced, by consensus and compromise, its constitutional proposals and Bill of Rights for the KwaZulu/Natal region. (See following pages for brief details.)

Dr M G Buthelezi, Inkatha and the KwaZulu Government have always maintained that KwaZulu and Natal should be accepted as one region within South Africa and, further, that given the opportunity to prove that a united, non-racial, system of government in KwaZulu/Natal is generally desired and workable, could

act as an example for the rest of the country.

"I am not saying that the Indaba is perfect," Dr Buthelezi said recently. "I'm saying that it's the best we've got at the moment. The only hope for a peaceful future is if the Government sees fit to authorise some form of legislature for Natal/KwaZulu which could be gradually extended to other parts of the country.

"I believe Federalism is the only way out for us."

The Indaba's high-level support also includes author Dr Alan Paton and international author and philosopher Sir Laurens van der Post. The Oxford Union, the prestige debating forum of Britain's Oxford University, has also recently come out in support of a motion by KwaZulu's Dr Oscar Dhlomo that the Indaba provided the best hope for a democratic South Africa.

"The Indaba is the only hope on our dark horizons," Dr Paton said in a recent interview.

The Indaba group is aware that much has to be done to increase the public's knowledge of the proposals and the director of the Indaba, Professor Dawid Van Wyk, is confident that this can be accomplished.

"We are busy expanding our information campaign and we will continue to ask the Government for a referendum among the people of the

region," he says.

"Nobody can afford this initiative being destroyed."

The Indaba accepted that the region is a single unit and that its second tier government should reflect this reality in its political structure.

Furthermore, that society in the region should be founded upon a free economic system and the provision of equal opportunities for all people. The draft proposals provide for the protection of the rights of individuals and groups.

One of South Africa's leading independent research organisations, Markinor, has investigated public attitudes towards the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba and its results were recently published.

The large sample used consisted of 3 500 adults of all races randomly selected throughout the KwaZulu/Natal region. The sample included people from rural as well as urban areas.

International aid needed

In a recent address to the Central Committee of Inkatha, Dr Buthelezi said international aid of "Marshall aid magnitude" would be needed to make the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba a real instrument of improved living standards.

He said that the Indaba would have to find a formula in which international aid could be translated into the kind of community, local, regional and KwaZulu/Natal-wide mechanism capable of utilising international aid.

"It must give rise to massive job creation, education, training, community upliftment and housing programmes — among others," he said.

	Sample	Heard or seen Indaba
Whites:	1 200	80,6%
Blacks:	1 500	36,3%
Indians/ Coloureds:	800	53,5%
TOTAL:	3 500	42,7%

Overall the research indicated very positive attitudes to the Indaba amongst people of all races.

The following, for example, was a response to various statements about the Indaba by respondents who had heard or seen anything about the Indaba.

"The Indaba proposals deserve to be supported by people of all races living in KwaZulu and Natal."

	Total	Whites	Blacks	Indians/ Coloureds
Totally agree/ somewhat agree	75,9	67,5	82,9	55,0
Totally disagree/ somewhat disagree	9,7	17,0	6,2	16,2
Neither agree nor disagree	12,7	12,6	9,4	28,4
Don't know	1,7	2,9	1,5	0,4
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Analysis of the research showed clear evidence that the Indaba and its proposals have strong support amongst National Party, PFP and NRP supporters.

As with any sophisticated research project, the results of the Markinor survey of attitudes of the voting age population of KwaZulu and Natal were subjected to a wide variety of tests for validity (size and quality of sample, answers to similar or opposite questions, and a number of statistical techniques). All of these were designed to determine the quality of the responses at the time they were made by members of various racial groups.

Because the research was conducted prior to the May 6 white election campaign it was possible to gain insight into the current relevance of the survey by comparing political party support in March and actual votes cast in the May election.

First, the breakdown of Natal whites expressing "strong support" for the various political parties contesting the election:

	NP	PFP	NRP	CP/HNP	TOTALS
Percentage	53,4	27,7	8,7	10,2	100,0
Representing X voters	110 000	57 000	18 000	21 000	206 000

Second, the actual results of the election (excluding 1 519 spoilt ballots and 2 531 votes for Independent candidates) in Natal:

	NP	PFP	NRP	CP/HNP	TOTALS
Actual votes polled	119 299	66 885	23 327	25 505	235 016
Percentages	50,8	28,5	9,9	10,8	100,0

It is clear from this that there is little correlation between support of political parties and attitudes toward the Indaba. In fact, all evidence available to the Indaba provides very powerful indications that there is strong support for the Indaba and its proposals amongst National Party, PFP and NRP supporters.

Constitutional Proposals

GOVERNOR

The new Natal will be headed by a provincial Governor, appointed by the State President on the advice of the Natal Legislature.

LAW-MAKING

A law will have to be passed by a two-thirds majority of a Standing Committee (11 out of 15 members) and a simple majority in the First and Second Chambers before it can be signed by the Governor.

In addition, any law affecting the special interests of a minority will need the support of a majority of members (6 out of 10) of the relevant background groups in the Second Chamber.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE

The Legislative (law-making body) will consist of a First Chamber of 100 members and a 50-member Second Chamber. Every adult will have two votes, one for each chamber.

FIRST CHAMBER

Elections to the First Chamber will be based on proportional representation. This is much fairer than the winner-takes-all Westminster system we have at present, since a party or a group would have representation in the First Chamber in direct proportion to its percentage of electoral support.

SECOND CHAMBER

The structure of the Second Chamber is unique and the ingenuity with which the universally accepted democratic principle of majority rule has been balanced with the protection of minority rights has won high praise around the world.

Members will represent the following background groups:

- the African background group (10 members)
- the Afrikaans background group (10 members)
- the Asian background group (10 members)
- the English background group (10 members)
- the South African group (10 members)

Voters taking part in a Second Chamber election must belong to the group whose candidate he or she intends voting for. This will not, however, apply to the South African group, which will represent voters who prefer not to vote according to "background".

Any legislation affecting the special language, religious, cultural and other rights of any one of the background groups will need the support of the majority of that group (6 out of 10) before it can become law.

THE EXECUTIVE

The Provincial Government will be headed by a Prime Minister and a Cabinet of 10. The Prime Minister will be the leader of the party which gains an outright majority in the First Chamber in an election.

Should no party or coalition of parties secure a majority, the Prime Minister would be elected by the First Chamber.

The Prime Minister will have the right to appoint half the Cabinet. The other five members will be elected by an electoral college consisting of the minority parties in both chambers. Each background group represented in the Second Chamber will be guaranteed a seat in the Cabinet.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing Committees will have 15 members and there will be a Standing Committee for each executive portfolio.

Each background group in the Second Chamber will elect one member to each Standing Committee, the remaining 10 members being elected by proportional representation by the First Chamber. No party will be entitled to more than 9 members of a Standing Committee. Every political party in the First Chamber will be entitled to representation on every Standing Committee. All proposed legislation will have to be passed by a more than two-thirds majority of a Standing Committee (11 out of 15). Draft legislation can only be debated in the First Chamber after it has been passed by a Standing Committee.

CULTURAL COUNCILS

Cultural Councils will protect and promote the religious, language and cultural rights

and interests of the principal segments of the population in the Province. The Councils will be constitutionally entrenched and will have the right to be consulted and kept informed by all branches and levels of government of action taken or intended to be taken which may affect the rights and interests of the groups they represent. Cultural Councils

will be entitled to apply to the Supreme Court for an order pronouncing upon the validity of any legislation not yet signed into law by the Governor. This right will also apply to subordinate laws or executive action which the Council believes would detrimentally affect the cultural interests of the group it represents.

BILL OF RIGHTS

The Bill of Rights forms a cornerstone of the Indaba constitutional proposals. It will be constitutionally entrenched and enforceable against the Governor and all organs of government at provincial level. The Bill of Rights has already been published and widely distributed in Natal/KwaZulu.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

THE GOVERNOR

CABINET

**Prime Minister and
10 ministers**

**50% majority party
50% minority parties**

THE LEGISLATURE

1st Chamber	Standing Committees	2nd Chamber
100 members from 15 constituencies	15 members each 10-1st Chamber 5-2nd Chamber	10 African background group 10 Afrikaans background group 10 Asian background group 10 English background group 10 South African group — 50 —

VOTERS

**18 years of age resident in Natal and KwaZulu
2 votes each**

Footnote: A Bill of Rights forms part of the Constitution; the Supreme Court has power to enforce the Constitution; Cultural Councils have access to all levels of government and the Supreme Court; an Economic Advisory Council reports to the Cabinet.

POWER-SHARING

How it could work

"Power-sharing is achieved not by any single constitutional mechanism but by a system of interlocking checks and balances which make it impossible for any group to rule on its own. These power-sharing mechanisms are constitutionally entrenched and cannot be changed without the consent of all concerned . . . The (Indaba) formula is uniquely suited to Africa and to conditions in KwaZulu/Natal with its diversity of cultural and other interest groups. It is a system in which everybody works together — there are no losers."

KwaZulu/Natal Indaba information pamphlet.

In its efforts to inform the public about the proposals, the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba is producing literature aimed at explaining how its power-sharing mechanisms would work. *For comprehensive information it is suggested all those interested write to the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba at P O Box 2925, Durban 4000, South Africa.*

The constitutional proposals, which have been accepted in principle by the 1.5 million-strong Inkatha national liberation movement (see story following), have no less than eight power-sharing mechanisms.

These power-sharing mechanisms are listed as follows:

1. Proportional representation. This principle is applied throughout the constitution. Whether in deciding the membership of the two chambers or the Legislature or the composition of the Cabinet and Standing Committees, it means that minorities are fairly represented, in proportion to their numerical strength.
2. Composition of the First Chamber. Proportional representation means that each party has seats in direct proportion to the votes cast in its favour. There can be no unfair delimitations or loading of constituencies.
3. Composition of the Second Chamber. The region's four major "background" groups are equally represented, together with a fifth "South African" group for people who prefer not to be categorised. This form of representation will result in minorities controlling the Second Chamber. Voting within each background group is also by proportional representation, which means that even small groupings have the opportunity of representation.
4. Passage of legislation. Laws have to be passed by BOTH chambers — the majority-controlled First Chamber and the minority-controlled Second Chamber.
5. Standing Committees. Before any law can be debated by the two chambers of the Legislature, it has to be passed by a Standing Committee (there will be one for every portfolio of provincial government). Standing Committees have 15 members, 10 from the First Chamber and five from the Second (elected by proportional representation). Any law requires a MORE-THAN-TWO-THIRDS majority (11 out of 15) in a Standing Committee. NO party is allowed more than 60 per cent membership of any Standing Committee. This means that the support of minority interests will be necessary before any new law can even be debated in either chamber. All background groups from the Second Chamber will be represented on all Standing Committees. In addition, all political parties represented in either chamber will be entitled to representation on every Standing Committee. Thus all background groups and political parties participate in the decision-making process.
6. The minority veto. Any law affecting the language, cultural, religious or other rights of any background group has to be agreed to by a majority of that particular group in the Second Chamber. This means that five members of that group voting against the law have an EFFECTIVE VETO which can prevent it from being approved.
7. Amendment of the Constitution. The Constitution cannot be amended by the majority party. Amendments have to be

passed by two-thirds majorities of the First Chamber and the Second Chamber. This means that minority and background groups could present changes to the Constitution. In addition, if the amendment of the Constitution affects the specific rights of any background group, it would have to be agreed to by a majority of that group (6 out of 10). Again, five members of that group have an EFFECTIVE VETO.

8. **Composition of Cabinet.** The Prime Minister (leader of the majority in the First Chamber) appoints half the Cabinet. The other half is appointed (by proportional representation) by the minority parties in both chambers. Every background group is entitled to at least one Cabinet post. All ministers will be part of the decision-making process in the Cabinet and will head Government departments. The Cabinet will operate on a consensus-seeking basis.

In addition to the eight main mechanisms power-sharing is reinforced by:

- **Cultural Councils** (including a Council of Chiefs). These will represent the cultural interest of the various segments of the population and are entitled to view all draft legislation (new laws not yet enacted). They have the right to give evidence before any Standing Committee, to demand information from government and to apply to the Supreme

Court to have any Bill set aside before it becomes law.

- **The Bill of Rights** defines and protects the rights of every individual irrespective of race, colour, language, sex, etc. The Bill of Rights is interpreted and enforced by the Supreme Court.
- **The Economic Advisory Council.** This ensures that the Government is responsive to the views and advice of knowledgeable business and labour leaders on whose expertise the economy depends.
- **The Education Council.** This will be composed of representatives of teachers, parents and others involved in education. It is designed to ensure that the Provincial Government is responsive to the education needs of communities and the Province as a whole.

The proposed effect of those interlocking power-sharing mechanisms is that any government of KwaZulu/Natal would have to rule by consensus.

Any attempt by any group or party to impose its will would immediately be checked. The only way to govern would be with the consent and participation of all affected.

The Supreme Court operates independently of Government and ensures that the Provincial Government observes the power-sharing and other provisions of the Constitution.

Inkatha backs Indaba proposals in principle

The 15 000 Inkatha delegates and members (representing 1 544 609 paid-up members) who attended the annual general conference of the national liberation movement held at Ulundi in July, unanimously accepted a resolution to support the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba proposals in principle.

The conference praised the services which the Secretary-General, Dr Oscar

Dhlomo, and the National Chairman, Dr Frank Mdlalose (who participated in the Indaba deliberations) had rendered to the politics of negotiation. The Conference pledged its

support for every effort to be made to make the proposals "household knowledge in every town, village and hamlet in the KwaZulu/Natal region . . ."

The resolution, as passed, resolved:

- (1) To record our acceptance of the Indaba proposals in principle.
- (2) To instruct the Secretary-General to set up regional mechanisms through which the Indaba proposals could be got to every Inkatha

branch and to be tested in every branch throughout the country.

- (3) To instruct the Secretary-General to get the Indaba proposals to every AmaKhosi Council in KwaZulu and to test their acceptability in these Councils.
- (4) To instruct the Secretary-General to submit ongoing reports to every member of the Central Committee about the progress being made in these endeavours.

KwaZulu Natal



Indaba

In his Presidential address to the annual general conference of Inkatha, Dr M G Buthelezi made it clear to delegates that he believed there must be ongoing debate regarding the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba proposals.

He moved that they be accepted in principle.

A recommendation by a special Inkatha committee asked that the Indaba proposals be accepted in all their detail as they stand. After two nights and a day of debate, the full conference resolved (as noted above) that the

Indaba proposals be accepted in principle.

"As I stand here today I am not yet persuaded that the people want me to support the Indaba proposals in all their details," Dr Buthelezi said.

"There must be definitive debate on this issue . . . I will have to be very satisfied that the people want me to endorse the Indaba proposals in detail before I do so."

Dr Buthelezi reiterated a previous address he had made to Inkatha's Central Committee when he noted: "The Indaba looks good to me. That is why I have jammed my foot in the door. I will, however, not walk through that door unless the whole of Inkatha walks through with me . . ."

Although the proposals were a "shining example" of what the politics of negotiation could achieve in South Africa, the fact remained that they still had to be "popularised".

"If I have any respect for the Indaba proposals at all, I must do nothing which will interfere with the democratic right of the people of this region to accept or reject the proposals. It is only the people who can legitimise the proposals," he said.

The Indaba was attempting to draw together individuals and organisations throughout KwaZulu and Natal — including many who had not been a party to the proposals.

Dr Buthelezi told the conference that he did not think Inkatha (by accepting the Indaba in all its detail) should give "pretexts" to black and white ideologues in organisations and elsewhere to say that they had been presented with a "take it or leave it option".

"We still (may) want to emphasise our open-mindedness in any discussions we may have with them on what we have accepted in principle," he added.

"I know that there may be fears that we are encouraging upsetting these very finely tuned proposals of the Indaba, by anyone including those who do so purely for ideological

reasons.

"Do we say that we are not prepared to talk to anyone about every one of these proposals, once the lines are opened between us and those who did not participate in the Indaba, for whatever reason?"

"I think we owe it to the Indaba proposals themselves not to be accused of slamming any doors in front of anyone.

" . . . It is only those committed to the armed struggle and to the politics of hideous violence which eschew the need for compromises to the solution of our country's problems.

"If there are no compromises there will be killing.

Compromises, however, are like great cannons of war which must be fired at the right time and in the right circumstances. In compromises one gains as much as one gives. Without this balance, compromises amount to capitulation."

Dr Buthelezi made it clear that he was not prepared to move away from "our time-honoured goal of establishing a one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary state in South Africa" if it meant "capitulation to racism."

"Every regional negotiation we undertake bears on national negotiation we will yet undertake. Do delegates today want me to go to national negotiations and there be faced with compromising from an already compromised position?"

"To me it is a question of tactics and strategies. It is a question of timing.

"The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba has always been very careful not to present itself as tackling a national question. They have never once said that the accord reached in KwaZulu/Natal is an accord which must become prescriptive for the rest of the country.

"I ask delegates to lend strength to the President's (of Inkatha's) power in negotiations by agreeing with the Indaba proposals in principle. Please avoid tying my hands in the politics of negotiation."

The National Council

The President of Inkatha also informed delegates of why he had taken his "very firm stand" not to become involved in the State President's National Council unless certain conditions were met.

Dr Buthelezi said the first and obvious condition was that the National Council would have to be a recognised mechanism for dismantling the tricameral parliament.

"If the National Council is not mandated to work for a new South African constitution then the State President must count me out," he said.

"... I would start negotiating with the State President tomorrow if he was serious about addressing the fundamental issues of black constitutional rights in our country. If he wants to go it alone in the National Council then he is welcome to try with whomever is prepared to sit with him on it.

"I must warn, however, in the clearest possible way that the wrong representatives on it will table the wrong agenda and there will be even yet more to dismantle than there now already is to dismantle.

"The mounting up of one *fait accomplis* after another is treacherous for a non-violent political settlement to our country's problems.

"It is now that black and

white must get together. It is now that we must produce an agenda which both black and white accept."

"When we talk about the very constitutional future of South Africa we are talking about things which demand the unshackling of black democracy. We can begin negotiating at the local level about local things or at the regional level about regional things.

"But when we come to negotiate about the very destiny of our country, black democratic forces must be as free as white democratic forces are. Unless Dr Nelson Mandela, Mr Zeph Mothopeng and other political prisoners are released from jail, I cannot see how any black leader could agree to negotiate in the National Council about the future of the country."

In a resolution, the conference of Inkatha resolved to call on the State President not to proceed with the National Council unless it had both the agenda to bring about real changes to the SA constitution and if it had in it "blacks politically important as the President of Inkatha."

The conference also exhorted the State President to recognise that the President of Inkatha spoke as a "national patriot" when he called for the release of Dr Nelson Mandela, Mr Zeph Mothopeng and other political prisoners and the unshackling of black democracy as a prerequisite for the commencement of real negotiations about the constitutional future of SA.



"To me it is totally irrelevant whether Dr Nelson Mandela agrees or disagrees with those who use his name and his martyrdom to further internecine black-on-black confrontation.

"The only relevant factor to me is that while Dr Mandela is incarcerated in jail any political idiot can make any use of his name.

"I have always been very careful not to make any predictions about what Dr Mandela will or will not do when he is released from jail. He himself must decide that at the time of his release.

"I will neither say that he will or will not reject the National Council.

"I say release him and let us see. He is our brother. He is not some ogre from a far off planet. Black democracy is not afraid of Dr Mandela. It is his prerogative to endorse himself into black democracy or out of it . . ."

— Dr M G Buthelezi

PLEA FOR BLACK UNITY

White political recalcitrance and the inability of the National Party Government to get meaningful constitutional changes off the ground, must necessarily have the final effect of driving blacks together, Dr M G Buthelezi told the Inkatha conference.

"It would be totally tragic if that only happened when it was too late and the black unity which was then produced was ineffective to establish a government for the people which would govern the way the people want to be governed," he said.

"Why must we wait until the house actually burns down over our heads before we turn to work with each other to put out the fire? That is precisely what the position is right now.

"Black unity is a matter of national urgency and I appeal yet again for all black organisations to recognise the need for unity within a framework of a multi-strategy approach.

"Let us not tear each other apart like a pack of dogs over a meatless bone; fighting over who will take Mr P W Botha's seat, before we have won the race. It is so stupid to count our chickens before they are hatched."

Dr Buthelezi added that the strength of what each organisation could do best in its own circumstances must be joined so that they formed an "invincible political unity."

No one black organisation would ever win the South African struggle for liberation.

"It is time this is recognised," he said.

"People are dying in the vain hope of some that their organisation could end up the only organisation on the day of victory.

"Just look in particular in those parts of

Southern Africa where the armed struggle was used to liberate some of the countries. The divisions between black organisations have outlasted the toppling of oppressive regimes in those countries even after liberation.

"Look at the wars that are going on in Angola and Mocambique between black organisations long after liberation was achieved in those countries . . .

"We in Inkatha have never been aggressors even though friends of other organisations in the media twist facts and put us in a bad light. We have resisted intimidation by the South African regime for more than a decade now. We will resist to the last member any efforts to intimidate us.

"I, however, make the appeal to black organisations to smoke the pipe of peace from a position of formidable strength which Inkatha has demonstrated again and again."

Dr Buthelezi said he was making this plea in the interests of all the people of South Africa.

"How can we hope to negotiate successfully with whites, if we are incapable of burying the hatchet as black brothers and sisters and start negotiating amongst ourselves?

"The black struggle for liberation in South Africa has always been about the liberation of all its people and all its groups. We will eventually move together. Why not start now?

"You will see that it will be the white-owned Press or white-established Press that will pooh-pooh this appeal I make in earnest for peace among black forces for change.

"If blacks do not learn that threats to their unity come equally from the left as much as the right within the white establishment, we will never get anywhere in achieving any black unity."

Inkatha's membership soars

In his annual report to conference, the Secretary-General of Inkatha, Dr Oscar Dhlomo, revealed that Inkatha's membership has risen from 1.3 million to more than 1.5 million paid-up members.

"The rate of growth in our membership has been phenomenal," he said.

The movement now has a

total of 1 544 609 paid-up members and remains the largest membership-based movement in South Africa.

Membership is comprised of the following:

YOUTH BRIGADE:	586 951
WOMENS BRIGADE:	556 060
GENERAL MEMBERSHIP:	401 598

DISINVESTMENT

the ferment grows

After many years of exhorting American companies in South Africa to be a force for change from within, the Rev. Leon Sullivan has now called for a corporate exodus.

Two years ago he issued an ultimatum: Unless apartheid ended by May 31, 1987 he would call for tough sanctions.

True to his threat, the Rev. Sullivan recently abandoned his 10-year-old employment code — the "Sullivan Principles" — and called for total US disinvestment from South Africa and a complete trade embargo.

The Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha, Dr M G Buthelezi, said he deeply regretted that the Rev. Sullivan had "endorsed himself out of the course of events which are going to lead to the realisation of things he himself has set as ideals . . ."

His timing, said Dr Buthelezi, was "all wrong."

"However good his intentions are, he has erred very grievously in his judgement . . ."

"However much I understand his position and however high my regard has always been for him, I must now say that he is abandoning what can be done in favour of courses of action which could well undo that which has been done.

"The Rev. Sullivan gave the South African Government 24 months to eliminate statutory apartheid and he then threatened to call on companies to leave South

Right intentions — wrong move

"The Reverend Leon Sullivan could not possibly have known what South Africa in 1987 would be like when he set his time limit in 1985.

"There is now deep ferment taking place among black workers about the disinvestment question . . . at a time when the Rev. Sullivan has endorsed himself out of the course of events which are going to lead to the realisation of things he himself has set as ideals.

"His timing is all wrong, however good his intentions are. He has erred very grievously in his judgement . . ."

Dr M G Buthelezi

Africa if it did not do so in that time period.

"That 24 months has passed

and he is now doing what he said he was going to do.

"The point I want to make is

Poverty — the enemy of democracy

"It has been calculated that something like a staggering R12 billion is now needed to cope with the immediate shortage of housing and thereafter the annual demand for housing will run to something like R6 billion per annum . . ."

"Meanwhile, across all population groups, only R1 billion per annum is utilised for the erection of new homes.

"Apartheid will eventually be torn apart by the homeless and the destitute — if necessary with their bare hands. Those same bare hands will tear everything apart which did not provide a remedy for the terrible circumstances in which millions live.

"When therefore I choose between political philosophies; when I set political aims and objectives and when I devise tactics and strategies, I aim to follow a course most propitious for the reduction of mass poverty.

"Mass poverty throughout the Third World is now the proven enemy of any kind of democracy.

"Any democrat anywhere in the Western world ignores this fact at the peril of the future of South Africa." —

Dr M G Buthelezi

that no force on earth could even now ensure that statutory apartheid will be eliminated in the next 24 months.

"The armed struggle has been waged now for more than a quarter of a century. The best that could be done through an armed struggle, supported by the best that could be got from the Soviet bloc and some other quarters, has not done what the Rev. Sullivan wanted done in 24 months.

"I and other black leaders have waged a war against apartheid for the whole of our adult lives and what the Rev. Sullivan wanted done in 24 months we have thus far not been able to do in our lifetime.

American indignation at apartheid is something I deeply respect but it is rank foolishness to put a 24 months limit on courses of action."

Dr Buthelezi added that the

Race against time

***"There is a race against time between democracy and violence in South Africa and if the United States put the Rev. Sullivan's demands into action, democracy would not have a snowball's hope in hell of winning that race. To demand the total economic isolation of South Africa and to demand the severing of diplomatic relations with South Africa is to demand the circumstances in which violence overtakes democracy . . ." —
Dr M G Buthelezi***

would be a dictatorship in South Africa tomorrow and then Americans would sleep easily because we would be just another dictatorship in the world."

"We must do everything now that can humanly be done to foster economic development wherever it can be fostered in South Africa. If we smash the South African economy now, we will smash the free enterprise system in South Africa for ever . . ." — Dr M G Buthelezi

black South African struggle was not only a struggle to dismantle statutory apartheid, it was also a struggle to replace bad government with good government and a struggle to replace a racist dictatorship with a race-free democracy.

"There was no word in Rev. Sullivan's statement (about his withdrawal) about the political outcome of the course of action he is advocating . . .

"Americans do not have sleepless nights because there are dictatorships in the world. That for them becomes a concern of international diplomacy.

"It is sad to comment that if America pursued the demands of the Rev. Sullivan now, there

Dr Buthelezi said there was a "race against time" between democracy and violence in South Africa and if the United States was to put the Rev. Sullivan's demands into action, democracy would not have a "snowball's hope in hell" of winning the race.

"To demand the total economic isolation of South Africa and to demand the severing of diplomatic relations with South Africa, is to demand the circumstances in which violence overtakes democracy.

"It is revolution that is encouraged by real mass poverty. The United States is in

a position to take the kind of action which would smash all prospects of economic growth in this country.

"Every businessman and businesswoman knows that economies are not turned on and off at political will."

Dr Buthelezi said there had been a "ferment of thought" among Black South Africans on the disinvestment issue which would in due course work its way out into the open.

Black workers had been subjected to "very powerful lobbyists demanding that they substantiate what high profile celebrity leaders have said about black workers supporting sanctions . . ."

Ultimately, however, these leaders needed back-up from the workers themselves.

There had been a ferment among trade unionists and this was now beginning to see the light of day.

The media, for instance, was now reporting the existence of a study document prepared by economists and researchers for the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU).

"Even if by powerful connivance this report is now suppressed, the ferment will go on," Dr Buthelezi added.

The issue of disinvestment and sanctions could well split COSATU "down the middle and split again . . ."

"The issue could well re-align black trade union forces and worker forces.

"American industrialists know that every time they post vacancy notices on their factory gates, hordes of black workers clamour for the jobs they advertise.

"Trade unionists should be representing those hordes of workers and no amount of celebrity leader manipulation will redirect the real aspirations of workers.

"They aspire to work first and then they aspire to do other things. There is now a greater clamour for work among black South Africans than there has ever been before.

"The harder the economic recession bites, the greater that clamour will become."

WHAT SANCTIONS HAVE DONE

"The struggle to dismantle apartheid cannot be waged by remote control in company board rooms in New York, London, Paris or Bonn. Those who wish to be our allies in this struggle must be physically involved in the front line which is South Africa . . ." —

Dr Oscar Dhlomo



In recent visits abroad, the Secretary-General of Inkatha and KwaZulu's Minister of Education and Culture, Dr Oscar Dhlomo, has made it clear that blacks do not support anti-apartheid "moral indignation that wants to feed on black unemployment and starvation in South Africa . . ."

In an address to the US Council for International Business (Task Force on South Africa) at the Harvard Club in New York, Dr Dhlomo said apartheid could not be destroyed by "remote control" in the board rooms of New York, Paris, London and Bonn.

He said sanctions and disinvestment had pushed blacks back into the dark ages of SA politics.

Dr Dhlomo said blacks were "fully aware" of the pressures which were brought to bear on US companies — calling on them to withdraw from apartheid South Africa and

accusing them of propping up the system by remaining involved in the country.

"The expectation is that if American and other foreign companies withdraw from South Africa, the South African economy will be crippled and this will force the Government to dismantle apartheid and grant political rights to the black majority."

While blacks sympathised with this viewpoint and wished that the problem were as simple, the fact was that crucial considerations were ignored.

The first was that if sanctions and disinvestment did cripple the country, there would be no strong and vibrant post-apartheid economy capable of redressing the disparities caused by decades of apartheid neglect.

The second was the importance of distinguishing between SA ("the country black South Africans wish to govern in future") and apartheid ("the evil policy that must be destroyed if those black political aspirations are to be realised").

Dr Dhlomo said simple logic dictated that those who supported the aspirations of the black people should help them destroy apartheid — and not South Africa.

The advocates of disinvestment had to be asked: "How do you expect to free prisoners from a cell by bombing the cell itself?"

Disinvestment lobbyists should be told: "We want to be liberated on our feet — not as corpses."

Dr Dhlomo said Inkatha could not support any anti-apartheid moral indignation which fed on black unemployment and starvation.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED:

Dr Dhlomo said an examination of developments inside South Africa since some American companies had decided to withdraw, and since sanctions were imposed, clearly showed that disinvestment and sanctions had retarded the black liberation struggle.

The South African Government had become even more intransigent and the white electorate had withdrawn into the so-called laager.

The following were some examples:

... The ruling National Party had brutally suppressed the revolt in the townships by imposing a State of Emergency and detaining thousands of black South Africans, including children. There were no signs that the State of Emergency would be lifted.

... Stringent measures had been taken against the Press in general and numerous foreign correspondents had been expelled from South Africa.

... The Government had called a "whites only" election and won convincingly on an anti-disinvestment, anti-sanctions, anti-foreign interference and anti-insurgency ticket. On this same ticket the National Party also won overwhelming support from English speaking voters who would have traditionally supported the

"American companies presently involved in South Africa must (realise) that their involvement will have to be a long term one because there are no easy victories and no "quick-fix" strategies in the struggle to dismantle apartheid. There will be numerous and sometimes serious setbacks. These will have to be squarely faced, calmly analysed and overcome . . ."

— Dr Oscar Dhlomo

Progressive Federal Party and the New Republic Party.

... The more liberal PFP was dethroned as the official opposition and was replaced by the ultra-right Conservative Party.

Immediately after the election the Government began to adopt a hard line against the Group Areas Act offenders by sending them evacuation notices and

"In the absence of any impending revolutionary overthrow of the existing political order in South Africa, we must accept that the dismantling of apartheid must be regarded as a process and not an event, and that our task in this regard is to have mechanisms in place that would hasten and facilitate this process. Regional constitutional experiments like the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba which seek to challenge the foundations of apartheid should therefore be viewed in this light and supported by all those who are involved in the struggle."

— Dr Oscar Dhlomo

threatening to sell their properties by public auction.

... Cross border raids had been launched against three Frontline States.

... The price of gold had risen appreciably and the

Government was overcoming its international debt problems.

... On the factory floor, almost all American companies that

have withdrawn have been taken over by South African interests — virtually overnight.

Some of these interests immediately announced that

they would not be signatories to the Sullivan Code and would

do business with everybody —

including the SA Defence Force and the SA Police. Once

again it was the black worker who had to pay the price for

this irrational moral indignation by American companies.

"The door that had opened to a life of equal opportunity on the factory floor and on-the-job training was suddenly slammed on the black worker's face without even the decency of prior consultation."

"The first people to complain that departing companies were selling to South African interests were the very same advocates of disinvestment, who had previously toured the world calling for the withdrawal of foreign companies from South Africa . . ."

Dr Dhlomo said the confusion deepened when the trade union, COSATU, severely chided a group of black South African businessmen who attempted to form themselves into a consortium that would buy out foreign companies withdrawing from South Africa.

Clearly, withdrawal from South Africa had not proved to be a viable and acceptable alternative for American companies.

"Post-apartheid South Africa will not miraculously rise from the ashes of a destroyed

CALL TO TARGET MASSIVE AID

"Many South Africans, including myself, have called on Western governments and/or businesses which have an interest in the peaceful resolution of the South African problem to consider launching a massive aid programme carefully targeted to assist the victims of apartheid and equip them for the post-apartheid era.

"Simultaneously, Western Governments would have to collectively seek an undertaking from the South African Government that apartheid would be dismantled in terms of a clearly defined programme and within a clearly defined time scale and that negotiations with blacks would be started.

"The end result of such negotiations would be the establishment of a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa."

"It is encouraging to note that some European business organisations are beginning to consider these suggestions more seriously. US business is also invited to consider them.

"The future of US companies in South Africa is assured but they will have to continue to stand with us and expedite the dismantling of apartheid and the improvement of the quality of life of its victims.

"They will have to temper their moral indignation with reason and accept that tackling an injustice is far more meaningful than walking away from it in disgust.

"Should they decide to walk away from apartheid and abandon its victims, we will regret their decision, and it will be difficult for us to forget that they left millions of defenseless black workers in the lurch in their hour of need."

KwaZulu/Natal Indaba — would have to be supported by business.

"It will no longer be acceptable for business to protest that it cannot support political parties even if those parties are involved in the same non-violent struggle to dismantle apartheid," Dr Dhlomo added.

"Those who share a common commitment towards the destruction of apartheid, be they businessmen, politicians or community workers, must stand together in South Africa.

"American companies must carefully identify their true allies in South Africa and stop being ambivalent by strengthening the very same forces that call for their withdrawal from South Africa.

"Many American businesses establish Trusts and Foundations, supposedly to assist victims of apartheid and then nominate administrators of these Trusts and Foundations from among the ranks of people who advocate disinvestment and are against the free market, capitalist, economy!"

Dr Dhlomo said Sir Winston Churchill was right in warning against "pleasing the crocodile in the hope that it will eat you last."

It was in this vein that Inkatha had consistently warned American Foundations and Government Aid Agencies against nominating politically biased people as administrators of scholarship and aid programmes. The result was that some students and communities who were meant to benefit from these programmes were discriminated against either on ideological or regional grounds.

"We cannot afford to play petty and sectarian political games with the plight of our people in South Africa."

economy," he added.

"On the contrary, a strong, vibrant and growing economy should be the foundation on which post-apartheid South Africa should be built."

Dr Dhlomo said American companies working in South Africa should expect to face more challenges in the future.

"We shall expect greater and more visible involvement on their part in the struggle to dismantle apartheid."

Greater solidarity with the victims of apartheid would have to be visibly demonstrated. For instance, employers whose employees became victims of detention without trial in South Africa would have to consider assisting them with legal costs and paying their salaries until they were released.

Positive constitutional experiments aimed at destroying apartheid — like the

THE STATE OF EMERGENCY

The "vicious circle" in which SA finds itself

The State President, Mr P W Botha, has extended the national State of Emergency declared on June 12 last year.

In a statement following Mr Botha's announcement, Dr M G Buthelezi said it was "inevitable" that the Government would do so because it had failed to negotiate with blacks "around the core issues" which were generating political unrest.

"It is a vicious circle," he said. "Unrest sweeps the

country and despite the appearance of curtailed violence, the base of violence is actually being extended."

States of Emergency could address some of the consequences of unrest but they could not address the reasons for the unrest.

"Last year I warned that "violence is a wanton thing which rapidly spreads out of control, and violence out of control is totally antagonistic to meaningful negotiations . . ."

"The extension of the nationwide State of Emergency is a clear indication that

violence is still out of control and there are still circumstances antagonistic to meaningful negotiations.

"States of Emergency are actually violent responses to violence and I for one cannot see how I can be drawn into real negotiations if States of Emergency disrupt normal political life and I cannot back my negotiating positions up by my democratic behaviour on the ground among the masses.

"All of us who are really committed to the politics of negotiation lament obstacles to it. We lament the fact that there is now yet another year of emergency regulations ahead."

Dr Buthelezi said the more difficult negotiations were, the more prone the SA Government would be to commence whatever negotiations they could within "terrible restrictions."

This would mean that the Government would be prone to negotiate ineffectively with the "wrong people about the wrong issues . . ."

He added that had the State of Emergency been applied as rigorously to whites as it is to blacks, whites could not have had a general election on May 6.

The mandate that the State President sought from whites demanded the kind of meetings which blacks could not hold to give their leaders mandates to enter negotiations.

"Once again discrimination spreads everywhere and what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. White South Africans now really must take this point I am making.

"I ask for no more as far as seeking mandates from black South Africans is concerned than the State President provided for himself to hold an election."

Mandela belongs in a free SA

"I am sad that the State President in his announcement of the extension of the State of Emergency saw fit to present the incarceration of Dr Nelson Mandela as being the responsibility of the ANC because the ANC did not allow Dr Mandela to disavow violence.

"It is the South African Government which keeps Dr Mandela incarcerated in jail. I say I am sad because the reasoning of the State President yet again discounts the historic importance of the fact that the majority of black South Africans really want non-violent solutions to our country's problems and will back leaders like myself in the politics of negotiation.

"Let ordinary black South Africans become the keepers of Dr Mandela's freedom. He belongs in a free South Africa. His release is crucial to the normalisation of black politics and alone can ensure that States of Emergency are not necessary.

"The extension of the State of Emergency is a declaration of a lack of faith in black democracy, and black democracy is the only thing in our country which can save our country from the awful fate of political degeneration which drives the State President to declare States of Emergency." —

Dr M G Buthelezi

Clarion Call is published quarterly as a permanent document of record and reference and as such is printed in this format. Individuals, companies, institutions and others are welcome to subscribe. A R100 P/A subscription fee is requested to assist in defraying publication and postage costs. Cheques should be made out to the Bureau of Communications, KwaZulu Government, and addressed to P O Box 650915, Benmore, 2010, RSA. Please clearly print the sender's name and address.

Editor

Suzanne Vos, P O Box 650915, Benmore 2010, RSA. Telephone: (011) 783-3280.
Telex: 4-25664

Additional information regarding KwaZulu and Inkatha and movements committed to non-violence, peaceful change and a negotiated future for South Africa can be

obtained from:

Inkatha Institute:

P O Box 2415, Durban 4000, RSA.
Telephone: (031) 3049305/6/7

Inkatha Office — Ulundi:

M Z Khumalo, Personal Assistant to the President of Inkatha, Private Bag X9, Ulundi, KwaZulu 3838, RSA. Telephone: (0358) 9330

Inkatha Office — London:

Ben Skosana, 6 Wells Rise, St. John's Wood, London NW8, England.
Telephone: (01) 4832842

Information Centre on SA

P O Box 70425, 1007 KK Amsterdam, Netherlands. Telephone: 0 20 769757

KwaZulu/Natal Indaba:

P O Box 2925, Durban 4000, RSA.
Telephone: (031) 3041932

STOP PRESS

The Rev. Leon Sullivan has replied to a letter written to him by Dr M G Buthelezi on the disinvestment issue. (See Pages 21-25).

Rev. Sullivan wrote (his letter has been abridged): "You know by now I have taken my position and called for the withdrawal of American companies, until statutory apartheid has been abolished and . . . agreements reached with

authentic and representative black South African leaders such as yourself.

"I took this position after deep, deep concentration and much prayer. I thought it was necessary for me to take the next step with Corporate Force to help, hopefully, along with other efforts, to move the South African Government to meaningful changes . . .

"I will never turn my back

on your efforts in South Africa, and one way or another will remain in the struggle with you. I admire you so very, very much, and one day all of South Africa will benefit in much broader ways from your historic and extraordinary leadership.

" . . . Although we seem to be going in different directions, we are both converging on the same goals . . ."

President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners must be released. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. President P W Botha's call for negotiation. What does the Government want to talk about with black leaders? The white swing to the right. Will whites share power? Dr M G Buthelezi speaks out. What black South Africa wants. Why Dr Nelson Mandela and other political

INHLABAMKHOSI

Bureau of Communications — Dept. of the Chief Minister
Registered as a newspaper at the Post Office

1987