



FILE

cy

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

24 October, 1985

Thank you for your letter of 23 October to Charles Powell, conveying a letter from President Nyerere.

I shall ensure that the Prime Minister sees this on her return from New York as soon as possible.

(Mark Addison)

Mr. A.V. Magere.



TANZANIA HIGH COMMISSION

Telephone: 01-499 8951
Telegrams: TANZANREP LONDON

43, Hertford Street,
London, W1Y 7TF.

*All OFFICIAL communications must be addressed
to His Excellency, The High Commissioner,
and NOT to individuals.*

In reply please quote our Ref. No. TZLC/C.170/25

23rd October, 1985.

Mr. C.D. Powell,
Private Secretary to the Prime Minister,
10 Downing Street,
London, SW1.

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am sending herewith a letter from my
President to the Prime Minister the The Right
Honourable Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, M.P. regarding
the problem of apartheid in South Africa.

I understand, the contents of the attached
letter have already been communicated to the
Prime Minister through diplomatic channels by your
Mission in Dar es Salaam i.e. before the Prime
Minister left for the Commonwealth Conference. I
am sending you an extra copy for your perusal and
appropriate action.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Magere'.

A.V. Magere,
Ag. High Commissioner.

Encl.

SOUTH AFRICA CLUB.

Address by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha and
Chairman, The South African Black Alliance

SAVOY HOTEL, LONDON

23 OCTOBER 1985

The South Africa Club is a prestigious organisation. It gathers together people of great significance who are important opinion-makers. Their perceptions, and their actions based on their perceptions, have far-reaching consequences. I speak tonight with this awareness and the theme of what I have to say will be woven around realities as I perceive them. I only have perceived realities. We all only have perceived realities and history itself is the final arbiter of whose perceptions are right and wrong. I make this point at the outset because so much of what is said about South Africa is said as a consequence of attempts to apply moral principles or political principles or philosophical principles to a very complex situation.

We have seen again and again how South African realities have scattered idealist perceptions or ideological perceptions to the four winds. The ideology of apartheid made assumptions which are now clearly shown to be untenable, and there is in some South African quarters, and some international quarters, the perception that this fact gives credibility to another set of ideological perceptions, namely those flowing from ideologies revolving around the use of violence for political purposes. In our situation the foremost protagonists of the ideologies of violence are the African National Congress Mission in exile, supported by the United Democratic Front in South Africa, who have committed themselves simply, publicly and openly, to making South Africa ungovernable.

Because the ideology of classical apartheid is untenable, and stated to be so by the South African Government itself, ever increasing credibility is being given to the programmes in which the ANC Mission in exile and the United Democratic Front promote the armed struggle and internal violence. The failure of apartheid is being perceived more and more to be the gain of the ANC Mission in exile and the gain of the United Democratic Front. More and more Church groups and semi-government agencies in the Western world are throwing their weight behind the UDF in South Africa and

giving the ANC Mission in exile the spin-off benefits of this moral support for what are in fact programmes of political violence in South Africa.

I would like to make some observations about the ANC Mission in exile/National Party political polarity, and I will argue that the South African alternatives are not monopolised by these two alternative poles. I will argue further that these two poles in fact establish the centre ground where political reality really is at work.

The media is painting a picture which looks something like the following. The forces of violence have spread. 23 South African Black townships are controlled by the forces of violence. States of emergency have been declared in 36 magisterial districts. The combined efforts of the South African Police and defence forces are unable to bring violence under control. Everywhere Black anger is unifying people in concerted action which is developing a momentum which will bring the South African Government to its knees in the foreseeable future. Time periods like five years and ten years are being bandied around as the limits of the South African Government's survival. The South African economy is in tatters. International pressure is mounting. Prospects of a real armed revolution in the face of Government unwillingness to hand over power to majority rule are becoming very real. There is a real need to talk to the ANC in brackets as the ultimate victors before it is too late.

This kind of picture, which has been dramatised by foreign correspondents, is given and TV viewers across the length and breadth of the Western world are given visual images to support this representation of South Africa. Everywhere Black forces working for the politics of negotiation are being downgraded in importance, and Western governments and governments of the Commonwealth, believe that combined punitive efforts against South Africa of varying degrees of intensity must now be made because changes, whether they result from these pressures or whether they result from internal developments, will prove them prophetic. President Reagan was manoeuvred into adopting limited sanctions against South Africa. Mrs. Thatcher found it necessary to join her EEC partners in limited sanctions. Heads of State like them are under pressure to increase the severity of the sanctions they have announced. The international banking fraternity have withdrawn their support for government actions and South African programmes. Everywhere the lack of confidence in the future of South Africa is being dramatised. Everywhere the forces of violence are being dramatised.

This is the media image. Let us now look at some of the realities which are being obscured in this dramatic reporting on South

Africa. One of the realities is that if the forces of violence end up overthrowing the South African Government, they will do so only after the South African Government and the whole of White South Africa, has resorted to scorched earth policies in the face of scorched earth policies of the forces of violence which will make any victory a horribly empty victory in a destitute South Africa. The image being created that the forces of violence in South Africa can lead to constructive change fly in the face of all realities.

If violence serves a political purpose, it has already served that purpose. If South Africa is to turn away from a violent future, there must now be no more violence. If the threat of violence has any value, its value has already been demonstrated. Violence beyond the present levels of violence will destroy all prospects of violence leading to constructive change. That is a harsh reality I face. Continued escalating violence will destroy the prospects of a negotiated future and anybody, any government, or any organisation in the world which now accepts the need for increasing violent pressure on South Africa, is tragically mistaken.

It is only political propaganda which states that Black South Africans are drawing together to make the country ungovernable and drawing together to use violence constructively. The truth of the matter is that Blacks employing violence are using violence against Blacks more than they are using violence against apartheid. Stay-always flop unless there is very substantial intimidation. This intimidation is ugly and in it people are stoned, their houses are burnt down and they are beaten and hacked to death with bush knives and axes. Violence is dividing Black South Africa. Blacks are not uniting under the banners of violence.

The media image represents Blacks as uniting in democratic action and being prepared to die for democratic ideals, and being prepared to use violence to sustain the movement towards a future democratic South Africa. This is a media lie. It is more than a distortion. The ANC Mission in exile is exhorting Black South Africa in radio broadcast after radio broadcast to kill Blacks who refuse to become party to the escalation of violence. Children are being exhorted to murder Black Town Councillors and to murder any whom the Mission in exile stigmatise as a collaborator - and they stigmatise all who are not working within their framework of violence as collaborators with the system. When a mob is informed that a particular Black in their midst is a collaborator, they indulge in acts of unspeakable brutality. They pour petrol over people with tyres tied round their necks and set them alight alive to run screaming and burning to death. Families of people stigmatised as collaborators have been barricaded in their houses and whole families have been incinerated. There is no room in the thinking of the ANC Mission in exile for Black democratic opposition to their tactics and strategies. Elements in the United Democratic

Front are the frontline actors of this ANC Mission in exile butchery of those who oppose them in their tactics and strategies. This butchery is glorified by the media. The repugnance of all this burns fiercely in my very soul.

The media paints a picture of the South African Government being incapable of ending the violence in South Africa. In this they may be telling the truth, but it is only a fraction of the truth. Only a fraction of the potential lethal power available to the South African Government has thus far been used against the perpetrators of mob violence. The killing capabilities which the South African police and army can unleash are awesome and are too horrible to contemplate. The ANC Mission in exile is driving towards a position in which this awesome White retaliation could become a reality. My soul revolts against a South Africa destroyed by South Africans brutally killing South Africans.

The media paints a picture in which the present levels of unrest could escalate and force the South African Government's hand to move towards opening South Africa's democracy to all. They paint a picture of democratic victories just around the corner. The ANC Mission in exile and the United Democratic Front are not interested in a democratic future South Africa. The Mission in exile regards itself as a government in exile. It is clearly intent upon doing everything in its power to return to South Africa to form a socialist/Marxist military government which will nationalise South Africa's industries and exercise total State control over the economy.

The ANC Mission in exile is not struggling to establish my right to compete with them at grass roots level for political support. They are not struggling to give every Black leader an open and equal opportunity to gather the support necessary to form a government. They are fighting for a socialist/Marxist future and as far as they are concerned, they have already written the script which democracy demands the people write. The media does not present these realities.

Successive National Party Governments have passed one Draconian law after another and executed one brutal act after another to destroy the development of Black democratic opposition to apartheid. Popular organisations have not been able to survive until recently. Many Black leaders have been banned or jailed. Apartheid has created a Black leadership vacuum in South Africa. It has created the circumstances in which self-acclaimed leaders, celebrity leaders, and media-acclaimed leaders have a field day in saying whatever they like in the name of Black South Africa. The image that the media paint, and this particularly applies to foreign correspondents in South Africa, is one in which Black South Africans favour the use of violence, favour the use of boycotts,

and favour the use of stay-aways and strikes. The media does not reflect Black realities. Successful strikes are not held unless there is Black on Black violence to support them. Millions of Black South Africans go to work every day because they need their jobs, even if it is for the minimal survival needs of their families. Every foreign company operating in South Africa has only to send the word out and dozens of jobless Blacks are at their factory gates clamouring for employment. In all the turbulent history of South Africa, on no single occasion has a genuine open mass meeting of Black South Africans endorsed disinvestment as a strategy that we as Blacks accept. There has in the whole turbulent history of South Africa been no successful national stay-away or strike. If intimidation stopped tomorrow, the boycott of White-owned businesses in places like Port Elizabeth, East London, Queenstown and elsewhere will come to an immediate end.

Inkatha is the largest Black political movement ever to have emerged in the history of South Africa. Tom Lodge of the University of the Witwatersrand has specialised in research into the old ANC and the ANC Mission in exile. I disagree a great deal with what he says because he says what he does say within the confines of his own political agenda, but he himself as a widely recognised scholar in his field, estimates that there is something like 2 000 members of the ANC in South Africa and he estimates that there are something like 9 000 Black South Africans outside of South Africa in ANC camps. Against this figure of something like 11 000, Inkatha has now over one million card-carrying paid-up members. No Black leader has ever gathered the constituency support in Black South Africa which I today enjoy. This massive membership of Inkatha is dominated numerically by peasants and workers. It has branches scattered across the length and breadth of the country and it is as representative of Blacks in urban areas as it is of Blacks in rural areas. It is as representative of the old as it is of the young. Inkatha's Youth Brigade is the largest youth organisation ever to have emerged in the history of the country. Its Women's Brigade is the largest women's brigade ever to have emerged in the history of the country.

Inkatha is intensely democratic. Its supreme authority is the Annual General Conference where policies are determined and where tactics and strategies are accepted and rejected. Inkatha's leadership is elected by its ordinary members. At branch, regional and national levels Inkatha's representatives are chosen by the people, and its Annual General Conference is a conference of representatives chosen to be there by the people. I never ever speak for myself on public issues. I reflect only that which Inkatha's membership has endorsed. There is nothing that I have said this evening which does not have the solid endorsement of Inkatha. The point I am making is that when Black South Africans are given the freedom to choose and are given democratic machinery

through which to exercise their choices, and through which to determine tactics and strategies in the Black struggle for liberation, choices are made which make a mockery of the media representation of South Africa.

Because Inkatha is the massive Black political reality that it is, it is vehemently opposed by the forces of violence. Every Black initiative which succeeds in Inkatha is an initiative which spells out just how wrong the ANC Mission in exile is to justify the armed struggle on the basis that democratic opposition cannot succeed. They claim to be exercising a Black South African last-resort option in which they have no alternative but to rely on violence. Every move towards success in the politics of negotiation is a threat to them. They and the UDF have declared war on Inkatha because it exercises real power in Black South Africa.

Never before in the history of South Africa has the country been nearer to a situation in which non-violent means of bringing about change and a situation in which the politics of negotiation can author really meaningful fundamental changes. This is what the media should be dramatising. Let us pause here and look at this statement. Mr. P.W. Botha, the State President, is tragically under-achieving in the business of bringing about meaningful reform. He spearheaded the new constitution which lies so deeply at the root of the current unrest in the country. He has pandered to the right wing. He refuses to sign a Declaration of Intent with Black leaders which would mobilise a massive force in favour of non-violent change. He has to be carried, struggling and kicking, to the point of bringing about really fundamental change. He continues to insist that racial divisions are fundamental political divisions which should be retained in South Africa. He continues to act as an Afrikaner leader and continues to regard Afrikaner communities-felt requirements as synonymous with what is good for the State. That and more is all true. My assessment, however, is that whether it be he, or whether it be another, the forces demanding non-violent negotiated change in South Africa will force the hand of the Government to make meaningful moves in the right direction. The State President has pointed his feet in the direction of statesmanship. Within the totally unacceptable limitations in which he has placed himself he has been bolder than any South African Prime Minister before him.

It is under his leadership that the ruling National Party has scrapped the Prohibition of Political Interference Act, has scrapped the Mixed Marriages Act, and has scrapped the racial provisions in the Immorality Act which prohibited sexual relations between Black and White. It is under his leadership that a minority of Blacks have been promised freehold title in urban areas in so-called White South Africa. It is he who has declared that

Blacks in urban areas are entitled to be there, and will be given freedom of movement. It is under his leadership that Blacks were given full trade union rights, and it is under his leadership that the Government has accepted that South Africa is one country, even if this acceptance is qualified by his insistence that the country cannot have a single electorate. It was he who announced common citizenship for all South Africans. It is under his leadership that Cabinet Minister after Cabinet Minister is now saying that if apartheid is what the Western world understands to be apartheid, it must be scrapped. They are saying that we must work towards Black participation in all levels of government, even though this participation is qualified by the continued insistence that the South African political system must be a system of minorities in which fundamental distinctions have to be made between own and general affairs. All these moves, all these attitudes would have been regarded as hideous National Party political heresy during the terms of office of all the Prime Ministers of the country who preceded him since 1948. Mr. P.W. Botha however nullifies these little glimmers of hope when in the same breath he says that the Group Areas Act will not go. In his effort to be all things to all shades of Nats, he makes even those of us who try to give him credit for the little steps which he has announced, quite skeptical when he talks of retaining one of the main pillars of apartheid, which is the Group Areas Act. There are people who find it fashionable to describe these small positive steps as no more than "cosmetic." Mr. Botha arms them to the hilt against himself when he talks of retaining the Group Areas Act in the same breath as he talks of "reform."

The State President is fighting a rear-guard action against the forces in the country which made these kind of moves imperative for Government. Firstly, there are forces which emanate from the total rejection of apartheid by Blacks. The attempt by National Party Government after National Party Government to get Blacks to agree to participate in their own oppression has failed. The South African Black body politic is now recognised as a reality, even if that recognition is still somewhat distorted. Reform which has been introduced has in large measure been introduced because of Black opposition, and they were introduced prior to the present levels of Black violence which now characterises South Africa.

Reform has also been necessitated by economic reality. The historical recognition that Blacks are irradicably present in so-called White South Africa as permanent citizens was demanded by economic reality. The mobility of Blacks was demanded by economic reality. Improved industrial relations demanded Black trade unionism. The need for skilled Black workers demanded that the Government stabilised urban Black society and accept that Blacks need to have unrestricted opportunities of developing skills and of climbing the ladder of job success. Economic realities determined

that regional economic planning no longer can take cognisance of apartheid's racial boundaries. More than anything else, economic realities have dictated that the South African Government can no longer follow economic policies aimed primarily at maintaining apartheid.

There is a vast array of potent economic forces at work demanding real change. That is why it is so important not to destroy South Africa's economic growth in such a way that the first levels of job creation are affected. In South Africa, half the Black population is 15 years and younger. Because of that population growth, we need to have a sustained economic growth to get anywhere near meeting the demand for jobs to cater for that kind of population bulge. The interdependence of Black and White in the economy is, for me, the soft under-belly. In the past we had job reservation in South Africa which reserved certain jobs for Whites only. Economic realities destroyed that completely and job reservation was shed because of these economic realities. Today both Government and industry accept that more and more Blacks need to be trained in order to service the growing South African economy. I believe that participation by Blacks in the trade union movement has been one concrete step which represents change which even the most cynical cannot describe as "cosmetic." Increased bargaining power on the factory floor means that such bargaining power, when fully developed, will be used by Blacks also for political bargaining. The increasing dependence of the economy on Blacks makes such political bargaining inevitable and just a matter of time. That is why I sincerely believe that any efforts to retard or destroy the economy of South Africa sets back the clocks of liberation by many decades.

I also wonder, taking into account the thoughtlessness that is so characteristic of the actions of those who advocate economic sanctions, whether they ever pause to think of what kind of society should emerge in South Africa after liberation. We are the last in Africa to be liberated from minority rule. I believe that this gives us an advantage of learning through the experience of Africa. We have learnt the hard way that we should not conduct our struggle in such a way that we destroy the foundations for the future development of the country. When I see how many countries in Africa have not got enough to eat for their populations, I often wonder whether those who advocate the destruction of the economy of the only country in Africa which has achieved such a measure of self-sufficiency, is aimed at reducing South Africa to a state of economic ruin so that we also can look forward to depending on crumbs of charity from the West after liberation.

Mining, commerce, industry and banking have now become politicised in a way in which they were never politicised before. The Associated Chambers of Commerce (ASSOCOM) commissioned and accepted

a report which clearly spells out the disaster of apartheid and the need for fundamental change. The Human Sciences Research Council has produced a far-reaching report which, while it is rejected by Black hardliners and contains a great deal with which I myself cannot agree, fundamentally challenges the status quo and more recently, it has produced a report which in effect demands the movement towards a form of consociation in government. English and Afrikaans intellectuals are ever-increasingly giving weight to the arguments for power-sharing between Black and White. The South African White population seems to be in need of more bold leadership than the leadership they have at present at the helm of power.

I have been in correspondence with something like 6 000 prominent South Africans, included amongst whom are Afrikaner politicians, academics, clerics and leading industrialists. Their response to the need I spelt out for movement towards meaningful power-sharing between Black and White was overwhelmingly positive. The Churches of South Africa demand fundamental changes. There is a strong South African groundswell beyond the forces of violence working more strongly than the forces of violence demanding change, insisting that we change in the here and now; demanding that the State President effectively leads the country, and demanding that he does so in partnership with Blacks. That is what makes it so tragic that the State President seems more afraid of the lunatic fringe on the right than of his White constituency in the whole country.

This groundswell of demand for meaningful change is taking place in a current South Africa where there is now a total White dependence on Blacks in the economy. There is of course the reciprocal Black dependence on Whites. It is this reciprocity of dependence which is ever-increasingly creating Black bargaining advantages as Black bargaining power increases. Black advantages increase and the prospects of successfully negotiating fundamental change increase. The change process in South Africa is ever-increasingly becoming a people's thing, not a government thing. The State President will ever increasingly only be tolerated in the State's driving seat if he leads as South Africans want him to lead. The hey-day of yesteryears' dictator Prime Ministers is gone, unless of course violence escalates to the point where government becomes a military and police operation in scorched earth situations.

The international community must not be stampeded into precipitous action when the fate of South Africa hangs in delicate balance between the forces of violence and the forces of non-violence. South Africa's future must be decided by South Africans inside South Africa. The struggle for liberation must be won by forces at work on the ground in the country. Whatever else is done, the international community should support that which is positive; that

which is democratic; that which preserves the foundation of the future, and above all, that which maximises the country's productive base. Increased prosperity will accelerate the rate of change. Decreased prosperity will retard it. Prolong real depression could well destroy the politics of negotiation.

I hope no one misunderstands me to mean that there should be no pressures by the international community on South Africa. My message is that while pressures do serve a purpose in the liberation struggle, the international community should not apply just any pressures, regardless of how they affect the very victims of apartheid. Decreasing prosperity as a strategy does not increase the arm of the oppressed Blacks in South Africa. The reason why President Reagan's partial sanctions are plausible is that he has applied these with quite some restraint and he has further balanced this by giving increased humanitarian aid to Black South Africa. The strategy of decreasing prosperity can only be a good strategy for those who believe in the dictum of "The worst the better" because they have other agendas than only the liberation of Black South Africa from the shackles of oppression.

It is imperative that Blacks and Whites now talk to each other seriously about things that matter, and enjoin with each other in implementing real reform. Real reform cannot be foisted on the country by Whites only and if Black revolutionary forces had in the end to take over the country, they will also not introduce reform. We are faced either with reconstructing the country now in harmony or with reconstructing the country after revolution. This is why I applaud Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's wisdom in withstanding pressures at the Commonwealth Conference to join with the rest of the Commonwealth in mounting sanctions against South Africa. The notion which arose in the Commonwealth discussions of the need for a Council of Statesmen from the Commonwealth to play a constructive role in furthering negotiations between Black and White leaders in South Africa, is consonant with my views that the West should now use its considerable diplomatic clout to push the minority regime in South Africa to move towards meaningful negotiations to normalise South Africa.

-----O-----