

Mr. Bates

PRIME MINISTER

INTERVIEW WITH BLACK SOUTH AFRICAN JOURNALISTS

You are to see four black South African journalists on Monday, to supplement the written interviews which you have given them.

I attach in the folder:

- copies of the written questions and answers
- biographical notes from Sir Robin Renwick on the four journalists
- additional briefing from Robin Renwick and further questions which he thinks the journalists may ask,

I think the best line to take on whether you will meet the ANC is to say that you would be very glad to meet Nelson Mandela once he is released from prison. You hope that the ANC itself will accept the EPG concept of negotiations against the background of a suspension of violence.

On the Urban Foundation, the main point to get across is that it must be for white South Africans to take the lead in providing better housing and other facilities for black South Africans. Our role has been encouragement and pump-priming and there has been a very positive response.

C. D. POWELL

29 September 1989

C:\WPDOCS\INTERVIE\slh



PRESS
OFFICE

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

YFI

From the Private Secretary

28 September 1989

Dear Richard,

**PRIME MINISTER'S INTERVIEW WITH
BLACK SOUTH AFRICAN JOURNALISTS**

I enclose the written answers to the questions submitted by black South African journalists in the form approved by the Prime Minister. They can now be handed over to the journalists concerned before their meeting with the Prime Minister on Monday.

Yours sincerely,

C. D. POWELL

Richard Gozney, Esq.,
Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

MS MOMAVENDA MATHIANE: "FRONT LINE" MAGAZINE

QUESTION: I personally will not consider the South African Government legitimate until I am a one hundred percent citizen. Why should black people collaborate with reforms designed to give us improved part-citizenship?

ANSWER: But the process of change in South Africa is precisely that - a process. Complete transformation is not going to take place instantly in South Africa. It is a long a difficult struggle. When you make gains in that struggle it is sensible to accept them and make good use of them to achieve further progress towards your goal. What we have to do is try to help accelerate the pace of change. That includes acknowledging the value of real reforms when they do take place. The legalisation of black trade unions, scrapping of the pass laws and ending of job reservation were real reforms. There are difficulties in the attitudes of both left and right in South Africa. What some opposition leaders seem to be suggesting is that there is nothing to negotiate: all that is required is a transfer of power and, meanwhile, nothing less will be worth having. But that is simply unrealistic. A new South Africa is not going to be achieved in one step and anyone who pretends that it will be is misleading you.

Q: If we accept your premise that sanctions are ineffective then we need to know what alternative is more effective. Would you tell us what you are doing to stimulate effective change, noting that it is common in South Africa for the anti-sanctions position, however intended, to be perceived by whites as being fortification for the status quo?

A: Economic sanctions do have an economic effect. They can depress the economy and thereby deprive people of jobs. They rarely if ever have the desired political effect and I

do not believe that making people poorer will stimulate positive change. As for what we are doing to promote change, you will be aware of the role we have played in helping to secure and above all hold in place the Namibia settlement. We did so in support of Dr Crocker who also believed that you are more likely to achieve results by talking to the South African Government than by simply trying to ostracise it. We use the channels we have got to the South African Government, including my own meetings with them, to exert all the pressure we can for change, for internationally recognised independence for Namibia and for attempts to improve the situation in Mozambique. We believe that we have some results to show for our efforts and if anybody in South Africa, white or black, believes that opposition to sanctions represents support for the status quo, they are deluding themselves.

Q: There is a view among South African blacks that Western tolerance of racial minority rule would be different if the disenfranchised majority were white people. What are your views?

A: I will always support people who do not have the opportunity freely to choose their own leaders, whether they are in Eastern Europe, Africa, or any where else. That includes the majority of people in South Africa. My whole philosophy is based on political freedom and equality of opportunity and those are concepts that are colour-blind.

Q: The experience of liberated Africa has been discouraging. It would seem that there is an urgent need to develop political systems to ensure that a liberated South Africa would be a truly free and prosperous South Africa. In fact the message to the whites from the outside world is merely that they must change, and despite all the large amounts of foreign pressure one never hears the whites being told how or why they can change all the way to a common country and survive. Would it not be helpful if outside inputs, and

particularly the uniquely powerful and widely heard input of Mrs Thatcher, should address such issues?

A: I agree that the experience of many independent African countries has been disappointing. I do not think it is any accident that two of the most successful African countries - Botswana and Mauritius - are multi-party democracies: which are not hostile to free enterprise. Other countries which have been doing pretty well have sought to maintain a degree of openness and tolerance in their societies. The failures, and I do not need to name them, are those that have suffered from the excesses of state control in both political and economic life which have led to governments which are simply not accountable to their own people. We are concerned about what happens in Namibia after independence, as well as before. If there is a reasonably open political system there, the chances of economic development and a worthwhile future for all Namibians will be maximised - if not, they will be minimised. This is a point we have made to the leaders of all the parties in Namibia. It is not for us but for the Namibians to decide who they want to represent them. Whoever they choose, we will try to help them. But the ability of the outside world to help effectively will depend on what policies then are pursued. There are signs in Africa that people are learning from the mistakes of the past and we want to see a success in Namibia - not least because that will have a very important bearing on the prospects for change in South Africa.

MR KHULU SIBIYA: "CITY PRESS"

QUESTION: Prime Minister, you are on record condemning apartheid and all its ills. You have consistently called upon the South African Government to abolish these laws, especially the Group Areas Act, the Separate Amenities Act and the Population Registration Act. But President F W de Klerk, whom you met recently, still believes in "group protection and identity" and he still believes in the principle of "own" affairs - in short he still upholds apartheid laws. Are you going to do something to make him change?

ANSWER: President de Klerk is in no doubt of my views and those of other Western leaders about racially discriminatory legislation. The terminology of "group rights" is not used in any other part of the world. It is not for us to lay down what the new constitutional arrangements should be for South Africa - that has to be worked out in negotiations between black and white South Africans. Some form of protection will be required for minorities That is a perfectly normal concept, enshrined in other constitutions. But a future constitution must also do what the present one manifestly does not - that is to say safeguard also the rights of the majority.

Q: You're a strong believer in negotiations. In South Africa, black political organisations and their leaders agree that the negotiation is necessary but they also believe that it would be futile at this stage to negotiate with the Government when the state of emergency still exists; their organisations still banned and political prisoners including Mr Nelson Mandela are still in jail. What do you think should happen in order to break this deadlock?

A: Of course I am a believer in negotiations. They are always better than violence. I can well understand that black leaders in South Africa feel they would enter negotiations from a position of weakness if they were not able to consult freely. That is why we have called on the South African Government to release Nelson Mandela and other prisoners, unban the ANC, PAC and other political parties and lift the state of emergency. But steps will also be necessary on the other side. We support the proposals by the Commonwealth Eminent Persons' Group, which called for a suspension of violence while negotiations take place. We will not support attempts to lay down conditions going well beyond those laid down by the Eminent Persons' Group. You break the deadlock by both sides moving towards each other. You worsen the deadlock by setting impossible pre-conditions or by increasing repression and violence.

Q: Without prescribing to South Africans how they should run their own affairs and what future constitutional arrangements they should come to, the white minority is scared still of losing their privileges and possibly being thrown out of the country. What formula could you suggest that will remove these fears?

A: You have asked the most difficult question. I agree that white anxieties are the most formidable obstacle to reform and the main form behind the rise of the extreme right wing. They look at many countries in the rest of Africa and are not encouraged by what they see. But the reassurance they are seeking can only be found in negotiations. It cannot be found in attempts at repression which may succeed for a while but are bound to fail in the end. Safeguards for minorities will have to be enshrined in a future constitution. But they will only really be respected if they are freely negotiated: and the longer that day is put off, the more difficult it will be. Most of the black South Africans I have met do see that white South Africans have an indispensable contribution to make to the future of your

country. Despite all the antagonisms brought about by apartheid, white and black South Africans are locked into a partnership with each other. You are condemned to work something out together.

Q: The majority of blacks in South Africa believe in one-man, one-vote. Do you think they are unreasonable with this demand?

A: I believe in one-person, one-vote! I do not see how you can have stability otherwise. Any solution has to be based on universal adult suffrage. A good constitution and the rule of law must then protect individuals and minorities against discrimination.

Q: Because of your close relationship with the South African Government - confirmed by your meetings with white South African leaders - and your attitude towards sanctions and your restrained relationship with the ANC, many black South Africans don't count you among their friends. Do you think they are unfair and how do you hope to change their attitudes?

A: I also have been meeting black South African leaders including Mrs Sisulu, Mr Mabuza and Chief Buthelezi, for all of whom I have a high regard. I want to ensure that all South Africans are aware of what my policy towards South Africa is. I oppose absolutely political violence and terrorism from whatever quarter. Nor do I believe in deliberately making people poor: that is why I oppose sanctions. Nor do I believe in obstructing democracy: that is why I oppose repression and the state of emergency. You cannot influence people without talking to them. That is why I saw President de Klerk and Mr. du Plessis. I impressed on them the need to bring independence to Namibia and progress in South Africa. I frequently see Helen Suzman and Dr. Slabbert whose efforts I admire. I want to meet Mr. Nelson Mandela once he is free

and can freely express his views. I want to help South Africa become democratic and prosperous and avoid descending into further violence and poverty. I have no doubt that a great many black South Africans want the same.

Q: Now that you know President F W de Klerk reasonably well, do you think he is sincere when he says he wants to create a new South Africa, free of domination by one group over another? Are you going to give him a chance to prove his sincerity in the next five years?

A: I do think Mr de Klerk is sincere in wanting to achieve a better South Africa. The new South African Government has made some very positive statements which I welcome. But of course it will be judged, like the rest of us, by what it actually does and what it can achieve. We are not going to condemn people when they make reformist statements. We are going to urge them to get on with reform.

Q: You recently said that you were in favour of the restoration of hangings in your country. How do you defend the pressure you put on South Africa over the Sharpeville Six?

A: I was very pleased that President Botha reprieved the Sharpeville Six and I did indeed urge that on him. In that case six people were condemned to death for a crime in which they were convicted of a common purpose - and this despite the fact that not all of them were proven to have been present at the crime or to have contributed directly to the death of the victim. What we were concerned about were not the convictions but the severity of the sentences given the circumstances of the case. I am very glad that they were commuted.

Q: You're unwavering in your stand against sanctions, but some blacks will tell you that the South African Government would not have moved an inch without sanctions. What other forms of pressure would you suggest should apply to force the South African Government to move faster?

A: I am well aware that some believe that only sanctions will provide a solution. No doubt they are all sincere in those beliefs. I am equally sincere in my belief that they will not. I am also aware that virtually every single opinion survey shows that most black South Africans do not support sanctions if they would be likely to result in job losses or job damage. There are various measures we support and enforce a good deal more rigorously than some others do. Foremost among these is the arms embargo which does hit a specific target. We are also committed to the Gleneagles Agreement which discourages sporting links. Other sanctions have been extremely ineffective. But we have pointed out to the South African Government that they will not be able to attract the new inflows of capital which South Africa needs to develop its economy unless there is an end to apartheid. We also have been criticised for talking to the South African Government. Since my meeting with Mr de Klerk, he also has met Presidents Kaunda and Chissano and various other African leaders. I do not see how you can hope to influence the situation in South Africa without talking to the Government, urging it to move ahead with reform and the release of prisoners, as we have been doing. The fact is that South Africa is under constant pressure, both externally and internally. We will do our part, but the most effective pressures are internal. Enormous social and economic changes are taking place within South Africa and they have led to the practical breakdown of many aspects of apartheid, especially in the major cities - Johannesburg, Cape Town and Durban. The worst mistake of all is to create the illusion that the outside world can somehow solve South Africa's problems for it. We cannot. They can only be solved between black and white South Africans. The outside

world can help or hinder the process of change and that does mean exerting what influence we have with the South African Government. That has led to results over Namibia and I hope it will lead also the results inside South Africa.

INTERVIEW WITH THE RT. HON MRS MARGARET THATCHER MP

MR AGGREY KLAASTE: "THE SOWETAN"

QUESTION: What are your views on the Population Registration Act, Group Areas and all the structures that underpin the policy of apartheid and the possibility that these policies will continue to help keep power in the hands of white people?

ANSWER: I have made very clear my strong opposition to all racially discriminatory legislation. Such legislation is profoundly repugnant to us. People's futures must not be determined by their race and of course they should be able to live where they want according to their means. What we want to see in South Africa are equal rights and equal opportunities for all South African citizens. When the Group Areas were abolished in Namibia, that had a very positive effect on race relations. Many of the amenities in South Africa are now open to all races: surely the time has come for them all to be. So long as the Population Registration, Group Areas and Separate Amenities Acts remain, South Africa will not be regarded as a normal society. We hope that every one of those Acts will be reviewed and that a stop will be put to attempts to restore petty apartheid by some municipalities. Those attempts must not succeed.

Q: What, if you are able to tell, are the arguments against policies based on group rights and nations as expressed by the National Party? And what could the solutions be to this problem after the apartheid Acts have gone?

A: I think everything depends on what precisely is meant by "group rights". It is not the terminology used in any other part of the world. The future constitutional arrangements must be worked out in negotiations between black and white South Africans. It is not for us to lay down what they

should be. It is a perfectly normal concept, which is enshrined in other constitutions, that minorities should be protected. But a future constitution must also do what the present one manifestly does not - that is to say provide ~~for~~ the rights of the majority.

Q: More important is to get an understanding as to what can be done to turn developing countries into first world countries - not only in terms of the resources available but concepts about a future world in which these countries can stand on their own?

A: I have read your own statements about this and the emphasis you have placed on the development of self-reliance. I could not agree more about that. I think there is much to be done, even under the existing difficulties, to develop the self-confidence, organisational strength and self-reliance of the black community in South Africa - what you call "nation building". South Africa has the possibility to move to an entirely new political system and regain its rightful place in the world not as a developing country in a state of dependence, but as a country with the economic strength to provide a decent future for all its people.

Q: In other words, do you believe that if apartheid goes there are workable possibilities of averting or at least alleviating socio-economic and political problems so graphically seen in other independent countries? How do we overcome this?

A: That will depend on neither the Government nor its opponents wrecking the economy meanwhile. With the population of South Africa increasing by three quarters of a million people a year, economic progress is essential to provide food, jobs and housing for them. We do not want to see a future Government which really does represent the majority of South Africans inheriting a wasteland and a

situation in which no one could cope because the economic circumstances would be hopeless. In far too many countries in Africa "liberation" has been followed by economic disaster and has brought few practical benefits to ordinary people. This can and must be avoided in South Africa.

Q: What is there for us to hope for in democracy, in capitalism, taking into account the centuries of suffering that have caused not only hatred but suspicion of Western ways of doing things? What can we learn from Mikhail Gorbachev's new Russia, or Communism etc? Has that era come to an end and if so is that good for the world?

A: What we can hope for from democracy and capitalism - or rather from free enterprise - is economic progress for ordinary people. The free enterprise system is based on freedom of choice and equality of opportunity: that is the antithesis of apartheid. The only way in which the South African economy can be freed to realise its full potential is by abolishing many of the restrictions which stem directly from the apartheid system. In fact, I am told, many of those regulations are simply being side-stepped anyway through the development of the informal sector. The black taxi operators have virtually taken over the transport industry. As for democracy, two of the most successful economies in Africa at present are those of Botswana and Mauritius and it is no accident that those two countries have multi-party systems and a belief in free enterprise. As for what can be learned from Mr Gorbachev, what he is saying is that the communism which has existed in the USSR - and far too often been exported - simply does not work. State socialism has led to economic decline in all those countries which have sought to follow that model. That is as true in Africa as it is in Eastern Europe. That is why there is a world wide movement away from it.

Q: Is it possible or necessary to think of a new world order, a new way of getting those who have suffered from oppression, colonisation and apartheid to advance towards their goals?

A: A new world order is emerging. Look at the developments in Poland, and in Hungary, and in the Soviet Union. People in those countries have found out that the stifling of enterprise and freedom of expression leads to economic stagnation. They are adjusting and trying to move away from an over-centralised and regimented system. That does create hope for the future.

Q: What are the British administrations fears about a united Europe, a question that is incidentally used by those who speak of partition and group rights here in South Africa? Is this a somewhat ridiculous or even far fetched analogy?

A: We play a leading role in the European Community and there is ever closer cooperation in Europe. There are many fields where, working together, we do better than by working alone. That does not mean the British people are ready to surrender control over our affairs to a federal government in Europe. The analogy with partition or group rights in South Africa is absurd. We are a separate country. South Africa is one country. Partition would be like trying to unscramble an omelette and I simply cannot see how it could work.

Q: How do we tell the people in South Africa that the building of structures and institutions must come before the getting of the political kingdom? Is this a fair question to ask of oppressed people and how should the pragmatic route be made attractive to them?

A: Well, you do have to tell people that rewards can only come through the efforts they make themselves. There is a tendency in South Africa to believe that everything must be

achieved at once and that nothing is worth having until there is a total transformation. But a total transformation will only come about progressively. South Africa will have to go through the sort of stages in its development that other countries have done. The pragmatic route has to be made attractive to those who want to change, because there is no other route to achieving it.

Q: Having answered those questions how then do we get the suspicion out of peoples' minds that Great Britain is perhaps involved in a great conspiracy between Western leaders to keep whites in power? In the same way, how do we get the thinking straight that the refusal to impose sanctions is therefore part of that conspiracy?

A: I would simply point out that the British Government since 1945 has granted independence on the basis of one-person one- vote to our former colonies comprising together nearly 20% of the worlds population. We have not sought to perpetuate white domination anywhere else. Why on earth should we seek to do so in South Africa? A South African Professor said recently that continued domination of the majority by a minority is "practically and morally unsustainable". Those are my sentiments exactly. One of the first tasks of my time in office was to bring Zimbabwe to independence on the basis of universal suffrage. We are striving today for a similar result in Namibia. As for sanctions, we apply the arms embargo very rigorously. We are also committed to the Gleneagles Agreement which discourages sporting links. But we shall continue our opposition to economic sanctions. They would destroy the livelihood of thousands of black South Africans and result in a collapse of the neighbouring countries, which are far more vulnerable to economic warfare than South Africa, without achieving the objective of bringing down apartheid.

Q: Is South Africa so important to Great Britain and to the world and if so, why? What do we say about the arguments that Britain is only worried about this country and the continent to safeguard its people and self-interest?

A: South Africa is important to Britain because of the long historical connections and the number of British citizens and people of British origin who live there, but also because a peaceful solution to the country's problems is crucial to the future of the rest of Africa. Of course we are concerned to safeguard British interests.

But I do not believe that sacrificing our exports would bring down apartheid. Nor, when it comes to the point, do many other people.

Q: What type of help will there be to future governments in post-apartheid South Africa?

A: Obviously there will be a great deal the world can do to help. But our ability to help will depend on the circumstances in which the country gets to the post-apartheid stage. External aid will be of very little use unless South Africa is able to get to that stage with its economy still in good order. All the experience in the rest of Africa has shown that, once there has been an economic breakdown, it is very difficult to retrieve the situation. What is needed in South Africa is to change the politics while preserving the economy, not to destroy the economy while making the politics worse.

Q: If as we expect de Klerk might be unable to move too fast, will Britain think of using the stick to pressurise change?

A: What we are concerned about is that it should move in the right direction and start really to deal with South Africa's fundamental problems. Mr. de Klerk has said that he wants to do this and we most earnestly hope that he will do so. I do not believe in threatening people or governments. I think that never has the desired result. If South Africa does move in the right direction, it will reduce its isolation. If not, it will risk finding itself further isolated and I do not see how that can possibly be in South Africa's interests - or help the process of change. What the country needs is opening up to the outside world. The last thing it needs is to close in on itself even more.

MR SIPHO NGCOBO: "BUSINESS DAY"

QUESTION: Most black South Africans do not regard President de Klerk as a reformer. Why do you?

ANSWER: During the South African elections President de Klerk campaigned on a reform programme against opponents on the right who want to try to put the clock back in South Africa. He has made a lot of statements emphasising his commitment to work for change and a new South Africa "in which all the people would be fully represented". He has said he wants to discuss with black leaders ways to achieve progress. These are declarations of intent. He spoke similarly to me when we met earlier this year. Obviously the South African Government, like all the rest of us, are going to be judged not by what they say but by what they do. But we have welcomed some of the early decisions that have been taken - in particular to allow the large peaceful demonstration which took place in Cape Town on 13 September. That is a welcome break from the past.

Q: A good many South African blacks see your attitude to South Africa as supporting apartheid. What has your Government to show for its Southern African policies over the past ten years, including its opposition to sanctions?

A: It is certainly true that some people in South Africa like to interpret opposition to sanctions as support for apartheid. That is simply nonsense. Your own paper has published on many occasions opinion polls which show that the majority of black South Africans, for very understandable reasons, do not want actions to be taken that would cost them their jobs and inflict suffering which neither we nor anyone else would then be able to do anything about. As for my Government's record in Southern Africa, when I became Prime Minister almost our first task was to

try to achieve a Rhodesia settlement - a task which had defeated our predecessors. We did manage to bring an end to the war in Rhodesia and to achieve a settlement based on universal suffrage and free elections held under our supervision and control. We are today engaged in trying to help achieve a similar result in Namibia, also based on free elections and genuine majority rule. I visited Namibia to show our support for the UN plan and we were able to help salvage it when it very nearly broke down on the first day of implementation. In terms of practical achievements we have a good record.

Q: President de Klerk has asked for five years to get negotiations going with black people for a new constitution - which excludes majority rule. Will Britain give him his five years and, if not, by when would you expect to see what specific results?

A: The South African Government certainly does not have five years to get negotiations with black leaders going. They have said that they intend to open negotiations on a new constitution. The National Party has set out its ideas but the ideas of others will have to be taken into account in any genuine negotiation and the outcome will depend on the negotiation. I am not going to set some arbitrary time limit but the South African Government obviously will be judged by what it can achieve and it does not have unlimited time to get results. That is true at least as much for internal reasons as for external ones.

Q: What effect will the recent South African elections have on Britain's attitude to sanctions at the Commonwealth Conference this month? Is Britain willing to risk a break with countries like Zimbabwe and Zambia on the sanctions issue?

A: I certainly do not think that it is appropriate to impose further sanctions against South Africa when we have just achieved the Namibia Agreement, for which the international community has been campaigning for the past ten years, and a new South African Government has been elected which says that it is committed to change. Our priority is to see the Namibia process through to a successful conclusion. There are a great many ways in which the Commonwealth can help an independent Namibia and we shall be discussing that in Kuala Lumpur. There is no question of a "break with countries like Zimbabwe". We played the leading role in bringing Zimbabwe to independence and have given a great deal of help to Zimbabwe since independence. I have recently visited Zimbabwe and seen all that for myself. The neighbouring countries would be the first to suffer from more general sanctions against South Africa and, for very understandable reasons, have not imposed them themselves.

Q: Do you plan to ask the Commonwealth Conference to send a new Eminent Persons' Group to South Africa, including representatives from Zimbabwe and Zambia to give it credibility? Wouldn't this be an exercise in futility?

A: I do not think it is the moment to send a new Eminent Persons' Group to South Africa. The Eminent Persons' Group has done its work. It put forward conditions for a negotiation which we strongly support. They include the release of political prisoners, the lifting of the state of emergency, unbanning of the political parties and negotiations in which all parties can participate in the context of a suspension of violence. It seems to us that this concept, based on reciprocal and simultaneous commitments by both sides, still presents the best opportunity for getting a dialogue underway. What we have to do is to try to influence the South African Government on the one hand and the ANC and other black movements on the other towards negotiations on that basis.

Q: When do you expect Nelson Mandela to be released and what other immediate steps does your Government consider necessary?

A: I do not know when Nelson Mandela will be released. That is a question which can only be answered by the South African government. But I hope it will be very soon. I have made it clear that I do not believe that there will be a real normalisation of the situation in South Africa or in South Africa's relations with the outside world before Mr. Mandela is released. I also have made clear my hope that other prisoners will be released.

RESTRICTED
FM PRETORIA
TO IMMEDIATE FCO
TELNO 420
OF 271000Z SEPTEMBER 89
INFO IMMEDIATE UKMIS NEW YORK

UKMIS NEW YORK FOR SECRETARY OF STATE'S PARTY

PRIME MINISTER'S INTERVIEW WITH BLACK JOURNALISTS

1. THE FOLLOWING ARE PERSONALITY NOTES ON THE JOURNALISTS WHO WILL BE INTERVIEWING THE PRIME MINISTER.

AGGREY KLAASTE

2. AGGREY KLAASTE IS THE LEADING BLACK EDITOR IN SOUTH AFRICA AND IS WIDELY RESPECTED AS A COMMUNITY LEADER AND GENERATOR OF NEW IDEAS. HIS LATEST CONTRIBUTION TO THE ANTI-APARTHEID CAUSE IS THE THEME OF ''NATION-BUILDING''. HE DOES NOT BELIEVE THE OUTSIDE WORLD CAN SOLVE SOUTH AFRICA'S PROBLEMS: BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS HAVE TO FIGHT THEIR OWN BATTLES. HE KNOWS THAT FUNDAMENTAL POLITICAL CHANGE WILL BE A PROTRACTED PROCESS. THEREFORE HE HAS TRIED TO DEVELOP ''NATION-BUILDING'' AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS INTERMEDIATE STRATEGIES DESIGNED TO DEVELOP THE SELF-CONFIDENCE AND ORGANISATIONAL STRENGTH OF THE BLACK COMMUNITY AND TO SHOW THEM THAT THEY CAN BECOME MASTERS OF THEIR OWN DESTINIES. HE HAS MOBILISED SUPPORT FOR MANY COMMUNITY PROJECTS OF THE KIND WE HELP THROUGH OUR AID PROGRAMME. HE AIMS TO HELP REGENERATE THE SCHOOLS, IMPROVE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND ENCOURAGE MORE BLACKS TO TAKE ON LEADERSHIP ROLES IN THE COMMUNITY AND IN THE ECONOMY. THIS APPROACH PUTS HIM MORE IN THE BLACK CONCIOUSNESS THAN IN THE TUTU/BOESAK CAMP, BUT HE IS HIGHLY REGARDED ACROSS THE SPECTRUM. ON FIRST IMPRESSIONS, KLAASTE COMES ACROSS AS NERVOUS AND INTELLECTUALLY DISORGANISED. BUT HE IS AN ORIGINAL THINKER AND HAS SHOWN A GREAT DEAL OF COURAGE. IN A REMARKABLE EDITORIAL LAST YEAR HE ARGUED THAT IF BLACKS COULD NOT STOP THE INTRA-BLACK KILLING IN NATAL THEN WHITES WOULD BE JUSTIFIED IN QUESTIONING WHETHER BLACKS WERE CAPABLE OF GOVERNING SOUTH AFRICA.

3. THE ''SOWETAN'' HAS A DAILY CIRCULATION OF OVER 150,000 COPIES, AND A READERSHIP OF ABOUT ONE MILLION. IT IS REGARDED BY BLACKS AS (NEXT WORD UNDERLINED) THEIR PAPER AND IS THE LARGEST CIRCULATION DAILY PAPER AIMED AT THE BLACK MARKET. IT IS PART OF THE ARGUS GROUP

WHICH INCLUDES THE MAIN AFTERNOON PAPERS IN SOUTH AFRICA, THE JOHANNESBURG STAR AND THE CAPE ARGUS WHO WILL BE SYNDICATING KLAASTE'S INTERVIEW WITH THE PRIME MINISTER.

KHULU SIBIYA

4. SIBIYA IS THE EDITOR OF CITY PRESS, TAKING OVER THAT ROLE FROM KLAASTE WHEN THE LATTER MOVED TO THE SOWETAN IN 1987. SIBIYA WAS FORMERLY A PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALLER WITH SOWETO'S ORLANDO PIRATES, ONE OF THE TOP CLUBS IN SOUTH AFRICA. HE STARTED HIS JOURNALIST CAREER AS A SPORTS WRITER. HE IS A SOFT-SPOKEN AND MODERATE MAN WHO WAS UMPRESSED BY BRITAIN DURING HIS OFFICIAL VISIT LAST YEAR.

5. ''CITY PRESS'' APPEARS ONCE A WEEK, ON SUNDAY. IT TOO HAS A LARGE CIRCULATION. IT IS PART OF THE NASIONALE PERS GROUP WHICH INCLUDES THE MAIN AFRIKAANS NEWSPAPERS WHO WILL SYNDICATE SIBIYA'S INTERVIEW.

NOMAVENDA MATHIANE

6. NOMAVENDA IS A BRIGHT AND VERY INDEPENDENT SOWETAN LADY WHO WRITES FORCEFULLY AND PUNGENTLY ABOUT POLITICS AND LIFE IN BLACK SOUTH AFRICA. SHE WAS THE FIRST BLACK WRITER TO EXPOSE WINNIE MANDELA'S BEHAVIOUR IN SOWETO WHICH INITIALLY PUT HER LIFE IN DANGER, BUT EVENTUALLY LED TO WINNIE'S DOWNFALL EARLIER THIS YEAR. SHE WILL BE PRODUCING ARTICLES FOR THE NEW AFRIKAANS WEEKLY, VRYE WEEKBLAD, AND FOR HER OWN MAGAZINE, FRONTLINE, WHICH HAS A REPUTATION FOR INDEPENDENT THINKING, CRITICAL OF THE HYPOCRISIES OF BOTH THE GOVERNMENT AND THE LEFT.

SIPHO NGCOBO

7. SIPHO NGCOBO IS THE LEADING BLACK JOURNALIST ON ''BUSINESS DAY''. IN 1987 HE MANAGED TO OBVERVE A ''PEOPLE'S COURT'' IN ACTION AND WROTE A STRONGLY CRITICAL ACCOUNT OF THE PROCESS. HE WAS SUBSEQUENTLY UNDER THREAT FROM THE LEFT AND WAS ALSO DETAINED BY THE POLICE AND INTERROGATED ABOUT THE IDENTITIES OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED. HE SPENT SEVEN MONTHS IN THE UNITED STATES TO ALLOW THE HULLABALOO TO DIE DOWN. LIKE MANY BLACK PROFESSIONALS, NGCOBO LIVES ILLEGALLY IN THE WHITE AREA OF HILLBROW IN JOHANNESBURG.

8. ''BUSINESS DAY'' IS THE NEAREST EQUIVALENT TO THE FINANCIAL TIMES. IT IS PART OF THE TIMES MEDIA GROUP WHICH INCLUDES THE CAPE TIMES AND THE SUNDAY TIMES WHO WILL ALSO CARRY NGCOBO'S STORY.

9. ALL FOUR ARE DETERMINED OPPONENTS OF APARTHEID AND SCEPTICAL AS TO HOW FAR THE GOVERNMENT WILL GO WITH REFORM. WE HAVE ENCOURAGED THEM TO ASK SOME TOUGH QUESTIONS, BUT NONE OF THEM IS A MINDLESS ADVOCATE OF SANCTIONS AND, AS THEIR QUESTIONS SHOW, ALL ARE CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE REST OF AFRICA AND HOW TO AVOID ALL THE SAME MISTAKES BEING REPEATED HERE.

RENWICK

YYYY

DISTRIBUTION

24

MAIN 20

MINIMAL
SAFD

INFO D

ADDITIONAL 4

NO 10

NNNN

CONFIDENTIAL
FM PRETORIA
TO IMMEDIATE FCO
TELNO 421
OF 271000Z SEPTEMBER 89
INFO IMMEDIATE UKMIS NEW YORK

UKMIS NEW YORK FOR SECRETARY OF STATE'S PARTY

M.I.P.T.: PRIME MINISTER'S INTERVIEW WITH BLACK JOURNALISTS

1. IN THE INTERVIEW ONE OF THE JOURNALISTS MAY ASK WHY, SINCE WE CONTEND THAT THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT SHOULD TALK TO THEM, WE DO NOT HAVE MORE CONTACT WITH THE ANC.
2. IF THIS IS RAISED, THE PRIME MINISTER MIGHT WISH TO POINT OUT THAT WE CONSISTENTLY HAVE CALLED FOR THE UNBANNING OF THE ANC IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROPOSALS MADE BY THE COMMONWEALTH EMINENT PERSONS GROUP, INCLUDING THE SUSPENSION OF VIOLENCE ON ALL SIDES. WE CERTAINLY DO NOT APPROVE OF METHODS WHICH HAVE BEEN USED BY THE ANC, INCLUDING BOMB EXPLOSIONS IN PUBLIC PLACES AND OTHER ACTS OF VIOLENCE. BUT WE RECOGNISE THAT THE ANC IS AN IMPORTANT POLITICAL MOVEMENT AND BELIEVE THAT AN EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE TO BRING THEM INTO NEGOTIATIONS, TOGETHER WITH OTHER BLACK POLITICAL ORGANISATIONS. WE ARE IN TOUCH WITH THE ANC, AS WE ARE WITH OTHER BLACK SOUTH AFRICAN PARTIES. AS TO THE PRIME MINISTER'S OWN ROLE, SHE WOULD BE VERY GLAD TO MEET MR NELSON MANDELA, ONCE HE IS RELEASED FROM JAIL, AND WILL GO ON WORKING HARD TO SECURE HIS RELEASE AND THAT OF OTHER PRISONERS.
3. THE PRIME MINISTER MIGHT ALSO WISH TO REFER IN GENERAL TERMS TO THE URBAN FOUNDATION SCHEME FOR LOW-COST HOUSING WHICH WILL BE ANNOUNCED ON 5 OCTOBER (THE DAY THE PRIME MINISTER'S INTERVIEW WILL BE PUBLISHED HERE). WE ARE DETERMINED TO HELP BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS IN PRACTICAL WAYS. BY NEXT YEAR WE WILL BE SUPPORTING ABOUT 1000 BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS AT UNIVERSITIES AND OTHER INSTITUTES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN BRITAIN AND SOUTH AFRICA. ANOTHER MAJOR PROBLEM FACING BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS IS THE DIFFICULTY IN GAINING ACCESS TO LOW-COST HOUSING. IN RESPONSE TO APPROACHES FROM THE URBAN FOUNDATION AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN PRIVATE SECTOR, THE PRIME MINISTER TOLD THE FOUNDATION THAT BRITAIN WOULD BE PREPARED TO ASSIST PROVIDED OTHER WESTERN COUNTRIES ALSO HELPED AND THAT THE MAJOR CONTRIBUTION WAS MADE BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN PRIVATE SECTOR. IT IS FOR WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS TO TAKE

THE LEAD IN HELPING TO PROVIDE BETTER CIRCUMSTANCES AND BETTER HOUSING FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS. THERE HAS BEEN A VERY POSITIVE RESPONSE AND AN ANNOUNCEMENT WILL BE MADE LATER IN THE WEEK ABOUT A MAJOR NEW SCHEME WHICH WILL GREATLY INCREASE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS TO GAIN ACCESS TO LOW-COST HOUSING. WE DO NOT SEE EDUCATION AND OTHER HELP TO BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS AS ANY SUBSTITUTE FOR POLITICAL RIGHTS BUT AS A WAY OF INCREASING THEIR STRENGTH AND SELF-CONFIDENCE IN INSISTING ON EQUAL RIGHTS.

RENWICK

YYYY

DISTRIBUTION

29

MAIN

25

MINIMAL

SAFD
INFO DADDITIONAL

4

NO 10

NNNN