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INTRODUCTION

The Buthelezi Commission on the Future of Natal and KwaZulu, material on which is contained in this issue, is of seminal importance in the political evolution of Southern Africa.

It is an effort by a formally constituted black government to examine the future of a major part of South Africa. In this it differs from the various African groups that have throughout this century proposed various orderings of political authority. Probably the most famous of these was the so called "Freedom Charter" of 1955, which probably represented the high-water mark of the African National Congress and its largely Communist Party dominated allies legally to present their views. The presentation of that charter to a tremendous crowd at Kliptown marked the last major gathering of the ANC and allied organizations.

The Buthelezi Commission must also be considered in relation to the Constitutional Committee, chaired by Dr. Dennis Worrall, of the President's Council established by the white parliament. The Council, which does not presently contain provisions for any black members, does differ from previous official bodies and commissions in its representation of Coloured and Asian interests by their respective representatives.

The significance of the Buthelezi Commission of the KwaZulu Government (a government that is constituted under the so-called "Homelands" legislation, but has nevertheless refused to opt for "independence," as did the Transkei, Bophutatswana, Venda and the Ciskei) is that the adoption of a constitutional plan for KwaZulu and Natal cannot help but have a major impact on constitutional planning in the Republic of South Africa as a whole.

The thrust of the "Lombard Report" — that is, to have Natal Province as three geographic areas with citizenship and voting rights in one part regardless of race — has already stimulated extensive discussion regarding the Republic as a whole.
Natal Province, which is interested in consolidating the areas constituting KwaZulu, the subject of the recent van der Walt report to the South African government, is being opposed by the sugar producers. They underwrote the analysis by Professor Lombard suggesting a "white," "black-KwaZulu" and "multi-racial" zones. Underlying all these studies is a recognition of the need for change.

In discussion with Mr. Harry Oppenheimer, Chairman of the Board of the Anglo-American Corporation, the most powerful business conglomerate in South Africa, and himself a Buthelezi Commissioner, Mr. Oppenheimer told me that in philosophical terms, the Commission was proceeding under a very broad reference to the future of all of South Africa, if not all of Southern Africa.

Thus for the first time a legally constituted body, a majority of them Africans, will be sitting throughout 1981 to make recommendations on the future constitutional arrangements of the Republic of South Africa.

If the President's Council has a serious flaw (and many observers consider it a fatal flaw) in not having African representation at this stage, the Buthelezi Commission suffers from the lack of official South African Government representation. However, individual National Party members of government are participating in personal capacities.

The South African Government was invited to participate officially. Although it had some doubts as to the technical propriety of a national government being represented in the constitutional deliberations of a body itself created by the national government, the considerations could have been overcome, though they are given as the official reason for nonparticipation.

In fact, the South African Government was prepared to be represented officially and asked for an assurance that the banned African National Congress would not have official members of the Commission. This assurance was not forthcoming from Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu because, in fact, invitations had already gone to the ANC. There are no official ANC members of the Commission, but the possibility that testimony by ANC members might be heard by the Commission in a venue outside South Africa -- Swaziland or Lesotho, for example -- cannot be ruled out.

The favorable attitude of the Afrikaans Press may be seen in the column translation on the opposite page.
Buthelezi-kommissie verdien geesdrif

Buthelezi-Commission Deserves Enthusiasm

The Transvaler - November 2, 1980

There are people who are reacting in an unpleasant manner towards developments like the Buthelezi-Commission, which is examining the future of Natal, and the earlier Lombard-plan, which presented interesting possibilities in this regard.

Where the critics get the right to react in this manner, is difficult to comprehend. If there is one guarantee that is fast becoming essential, it is the assurance that rational thought concerning common (collective) problems in the country, should be actively encouraged.

If this type of consciousness is embraced by the average authority (not political, but authorities in the field) and by those interested as in the case of the Buthelezi-Commission, or by a team of selected academics who are not afraid to violate (exceed) the existing way of thought, as in the case of the Lombard-commission, it should be welcomed enthusiastically.

It seems that many whites will have to free themselves more quickly from doing things in a stereotyped manner.

Maybe they are so conditioned through practice that they accept without question that a minority decides for a majority and they find it difficult to free themselves from this practice.

It is sometimes said that the policy of separate development, in its design, was far broader and far-sighted that has been applied in practice, and that the dynamic pace, as a result of this difference, has been retarded for at least a decade.

But even now that the policy is showing its elasticity and built-in progressiveness, it still does not mean that each of its pillars have been consolidated ad infinitum. It must be considered a plan that could be changed and even re-written.

One would hope that if indeed the Buthelezi-Commission can come forward with a plan that is acceptable as a solution to the majority in KwaZulu and Natal, it would be judged upon its merits by the wider/broader society.

deur Bert Ferreira
The whole approach of the Buthelezi Commission toward a peaceful solution to the constitutional challenge of South Africa is, as Oscar Dhlomo the Secretary General of Inkatha and Minister of Education in KwaZulu, pointed out to me recently, in marked contrast to that of the banned African National Congress:

The ANC has often been irresponsible with the lives of our young men in the liberation struggle. Among our recently enrolled members of Inkatha are men who at the age of 18 were sent by the ANC to fight against the Smith government in Zimbabwe. Not only were they poorly trained, but there were only eight rifles for fifteen guerrillas. Our young men were soon captured and have spent seven years in jail. Inkatha respects the lives of our young people.

Inkatha does include a number of people who have served time on Robben Island for political offenses. Several of those recently released have said that they had been encouraged by Nelson Mandela, imprisoned leader of the ANC, to join Inkatha.

Gibson Thula, who heads Inkatha in the Johannesburg area, told me over luncheon that the organization must not only strive for justice in South Africa, but that, "We must prepare our people for the new society we see coming. We must bend every effort to educate our young people. We would like to establish an Inkatha Foundation in America to provide scholarships for our young scholars. This will be separate from our Inkatha offices."

I asked Thula when these offices would be open? He replied: "That is uncertain. We will be opening offices in Europe and America where the ANC has been operating. However, it is extremely expensive to have offices overseas. We are dependent on the small dues we can ask our ordinary members to pay, and the 10 percent tithe we ask from our professional people."

The thrust of the Buthelezi Commission extends beyond Natal for many reasons, not least of which is the national membership of Inkatha. Oscar Dhlomo told me: "We have 700 branches with an average membership in each branch of between thirty and five hundred."

Gibson Thula is opening an average of three branches a month in Soweto and on the Witwatersrand. Political writers in Johannesburg continually ask him whether or not Inkatha will contest the elections in 1981 or 1982 in Soweto now that the sprawling African city of one million people will be given a measure of autonomy. His shrewd answer: "It is some time until the elections. Why should we give our opponents the advantage of knowing what our plans may be?"

In fact, Inkatha really controls the present Soweto Council, though the council's influence in the community is limited
by the fact that only 6 percent of those eligible actually voted for it.

From the other camp, I do know that the Committee of Ten, headed by Dr. Motlana, and the African National Congress's surrogates in Soweto, are worried that Inkatha would sweep an election and that a poll of more than about 40 percent would appear to give such a council a substantial measure of legitimacy in speaking for the citizens of Soweto.

Too often American observers of South Africa think of it as a palimpsest. As Prime Minister Wilson once said in Washington: "The Americans are always discovering Africa de novo." Not only do white politics in South Africa have roots which are critical to an understanding of it, but this is just as true of so-called 'black politics'.

Inkatha, ostensibly only a cultural movement, was reborn by Gatsha Buthelezi from a Zulu movement that antedates contemporary South Africa.

On the cover of this issue we have reproduced the only "signature" we know of by Cetewayo. The Zulu King was illiterate, to be sure, but he was a shrewd man.

He was the King and Buthelezi's great-grandfather the military leader of the Zulu impi when they defeated the British at the battle Isandhlwana on January 22, 1879. Many Americans are familiar with the subsequent battle at Rorke's Drift from the truncated two hour version of the film ZULU. The uncut film runs 3 1/2 hours and gives the political and historical setting, which is cut to unintelligibility in the television edition.

One casualty of the fighting was Prince Imperial Louis Napoleon IV seen by most historians as the future leader of France. Prime Minister Disraeli summed it up:

A very remarkable people the Zulus. They have defeated our Generals; converted our Bishops; and settled the fate of a great European dynasty.

When Gatsha Buthelezi was in our Africana Library and saw Cetewayo's name, printed by the Zulu King, he said he had never seen it before and his eyes misted over. One of the writer's most memorable evenings was in Buthelezi's home at Mahlabatini when he played the ugbu, a sort of Zulu viola, and he and his mother, Princess Magogo, sang plaintive songs from the days of the Zulu triumphs.

We also showed the signature to the present Zulu King, Goodwill, on his last visit to Los Angeles, and he said he was moved by it.
The Buthelezi Commission represents an effort by a distinguished African leader to achieve a just society in South Africa, not by the use of warring Zulu impis or modern guerrilla tactics, but by peaceful negotiations. Studies by the Arnold Bergstrasser Institute of West Germany and others have shown a wide and deep measure of black support for Buthelezi, both in urban and rural areas. Inkatha is the second largest political or quasi-political organization in South Africa. It is not now bent upon confrontation with the white government. One senses from talking with leaders on both sides that they hold the other camp in great respect and are aware that any confrontation in the future could have grave consequences. If the divers efforts at constitution making are successful, such a confrontation need never eventuate.

Professor G. D. L. Schreiner, Chairman of the forty-member Commission, has described the Commission as "an initiative from a black leader -- a clear statement that he was prepared to negotiate," and one that the people in power could ignore only at "the peril of South Africa."

It is because the Commission is so important that we present information on it here to a wider American audience.

Ned Munger

NOTE: This issue is made possible with the help of editing by Wilma Fairchild, translation by Anneke Gerber, and typing by Linda Benjamin.
THE BUTHELEZI COMMISSION

The present position of KwaZulu and its Legislative Assembly is that it is an intermediate step in the South African Government plan for Black ethnic groups living within the original borders of the Republic. The end point of the South African Government plan is the redrawning of the boundaries of the Republic of South Africa and the acceptance by each of the intermediate "homeland" governments of a total "independence." This is associated with a formal geographical new state, and a change in citizenship for all members of that ethnic group, whether permanently resident within the newly drawn Republican boundaries or in the new state. Some territories have accepted this plan and now exist as independent states even if this independence is recognized only by the South African Government and themselves. Other ethnic groups, in the intermediate stage of homeland government, have not moved toward this final step and KwaZulu has specifically rejected the final stage. Recently the Ciskei appointed the Quail Commission to report fully to it on the consequence to Ciskei and Ciskeians of accepting the final step of independence. That Commission's analysis led to the statement that it considered independence, as presently understood, to be undesirable for Ciskei and suggested a number of conditions that would need to be fulfilled before Ciskei should consider opting for full independence.

The present position is one of deadlock -- on the one hand, a policy of subdivision of the old Republic of South Africa into a number of independent states which could, after separation, come together, for their mutual benefit, in a number of different possible ways, most recently defined as a "constellation" of Southern African states; on the other hand, a rejection by some "shadow states" of the necessary precondition of independence which would allow the formation of such a "constellation." It must be recognized that there are very substantial proportions of black and white South Africans, with considerable backing from the rest of the world, who see the suggested constellation as merely an attempt by "white" South Africa to retain wealth, most land and power in the hands of a minority, and who reject completely the concept of ethnic division in formal political and constitutional terms. Very considerable and influential internal opposition to present policies is a factor of cardinal importance. Furthermore, it is a fact that many black and some white South Africans are prepared, particularly following events in countries on South Africa's borders, to encourage or enter into confrontation in order to prevent the realization of current policies. Those political leaders, both black and white, who seek to find a peaceful solution in South Africa are caught between the intransigence of the imposed plan of the South African government on the one hand and those who advocate total confrontation on the other. They are seen as
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noncooperators by one side and as collaborators by the other.

The Buthelezi Commission, then, has been established in these circumstances. Its task, within its very wide terms of reference, is to investigate fully the present social, economic and political situation of Natal and KwaZulu within the larger political situation and report to the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly on the prospects for and nature of a localized regional "solution." In the light of the analysis and recommendations, the Assembly will formulate its policy for implementing those aspects which are within its competence and for taking the other aspects further in negotiation with or representations to the South African Government.

A regional "solution" has a number of prerequisites. It must be seen to be respectable and legitimate to individuals and groups within the affected areas of the proposals. It must lead directly to a loyalty to that "solution" which would preclude an acceptance of those extreme views which themselves would make the solution impossible. It must be seen not to preclude, but to be included in, a wider loyalty to a general South African framework. It must also be sufficiently fundamental in its approach to achieve that sense of direction and cooperative purpose which will allay suspicions and fears and lead the people of the region to believe in its merit for themselves. Finally it must not only be economically viable but should also have features which will stimulate appropriate economic growth.

The unusual composition and size of the Commission — widely representative of a variety of interests within the region of Natal/KwaZulu, and from outside this region, — is a necessary reflection of the test against which any proposals to be made by the Commission to the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly must be put. Any proposals or recommendations which are made by the Commission will necessarily have the stamp of having enjoyed full consideration by this widely representative cross section of informed views and interests.

There will be very real practical difficulties in the functioning of a Commission of this size and it is clear that all Commissioners will not be fully involved in all the aspects of the Commission's works. It is envisaged that the whole Commission will meet in Plenary Session to structure its terms of reference so that it can define and place in order particular aspects upon which it will call for submissions of evidence. It will, at the same time set up small working groups from amongst its members who will be charged with analyzing the evidence presented and preparing, for the general Commission, working documents which will then form the basis for later Plenary Sessions of the Commission. It is difficult at this stage, therefore, to indicate with any clarity to individual Commissioners the extent of their involvement in meetings. It can only be said at this point that it is intended that a report will be available within a year of the first Plenary
There is ever mounting controversy regarding official policies for the constitutional development of South Africa, and around us there is abundant evidence that serious internal tensions exist in our social, economic and political affairs. The Buthelezi Commission undoubtedly will have a vital role in contributing to policies which will alleviate these tensions and form a basis for the peaceful future evolution and development of our society.
COMPOSITION OF THE BUTHELEZI COMMISSION AS AT 30/10/1980

Professor G.D.L. Schreiner -
Vice Principal of the University of Natal - CHAIRMAN

Professor L. Schlemmer - SECRETARY

Professor H. Adam - South African Specialist, Simon Frazer University, VANCOUVER.

Mr. A.J. Ardington - South African Cane Growers Association

Mr. J. Basson - Prominent South African Politician

Mr. R.C.C. Bennett - Town and Regional Planning Commission of Natal

Mr. H. Bhengu - Attorney

Mr. Y.S. Chinsamy - Leader of Reform Party of South Africa

Mrs. D. Dhlomo - Women's Representative/Head of Kwazulu Nursing Services

Dr. O.D. Dhlomo - Secretary General of Inkatha

Miss N. Dlamini - Nominated by FOSATU

Dr. B.A. Dobie - President of Natal Teachers Society

Mr. C. Ebrahim - Labour Party of South Africa

Mr. C. Eglin - Progressive Federal Party

The Hon. D.G. Fannin - Educationalist and retired Judge

Dr. H. Giliomee - Historical and Political Analyst, University of Stellenbosch

Mr. P.G. Gumede - Inyanda Chamber of Commerce/NAFCOC

Mr. E.G. Hotchkiss - Natal Chamber of Industries
The Most Reverend
Dr. D.E. Hurley
- Religious and Social Leader

Mr. H. Johnston
- Associated Chambers of Commerce

Mr. J.S. Kheswa
- Natal African Teachers Union

Professor K. Knight
- South African Institution of Civil Engineers

Mrs. J. Laubscher
- National Council of Women of South Africa

Professor A. Lijphart
- Political Scientist, University of California, SAN DIEGO

Dr. L.P. McCrystal
- KwaZulu Development Corporation

Mr. A.P.E. Mkhwanazi
- KwaZulu Planning, Coordinating and Advisory Committee

Professor Jill Nattrass
- Economist, University of Natal

Mr. H.F. Oppenheimer
- South African Industrialist, Chairman of the Anglo-American Corporation of S.A.

Mr. R. Parsons
- Associated Chambers of Commerce

Mr. A.J. Rajbansi
- South African Indian Council

Mr. M. Rantho
- Social Worker/Community Participation Manager, Urban Foundation

Professor J. Sadie
- Economist and Demographer, University of Stellenbosch

Mr. C.J. Saunders
- South African Industrialist representing Natal Sugar Industry

Mr. G. Thula
- Central Committee of Inkatha

Dr. J.C. van Zyl
- South African Federated Chamber of Industries

Professor A. Vilakazi
- Social Scientist, University of Zululand

Professor C. de B. Webb
- Historian, University of Cape Town
Senator W.T. Webber - New Republic Party
Professor M. Wiechers - Constitutional Lawyer, University of South Africa
The Rt. Rev. Dr. A.H. Zulu - Religious and Social Leader

STILL AWAITING NOMINEES FROM:
Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut
Association of Law Societies of South Africa
Dr. Anton Rupert
Member of the International Community
African National Congress
Institute of Bankers in South Africa

REFUSALS FROM:
The National Party of South Africa
Natal Agricultural Union
Dr. W. de Klerk, Editor of Die Transvaler
Mr. T. Myburgh, Editor of the Sunday Times
Dr. Anton Rupert in his personal capacity
The KwaZulu Chief Minister with
Prime Minister P. W. Botha
Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, in delivering the Chief Minister's Policy Speech during the debate on the Appropriation Bill in the 1980 KwaZulu Legislative Assembly session, released details about the Commission of Enquiry he had called for. The following are extracts from his speech:

I. AIMS OF THE COMMISSION

With the independence of Zimbabwe on the 18th April 1980, South Africa and South African-controlled Namibia are the only two remaining territories in Africa in which central political decision-makers are unrepresentative of the majorities of the people. At this time, a South African Parliamentary Commission is considering the constitutional future of South Africa at the behest of the white parliament and within the context of white political concepts and policies. The present Prime Minister, the Honourable Mr. P. W. Botha, has outlined a broad commitment to the establishment of a Constellation of States for Southern Africa, a confederal form of inter-territory linkage with a dominantly economic content. No indications have been given of any intention to deviate from the central concepts of Separate Development. At the same time, a Commission is considering changes to the boundaries of the "homeland" territories strictly within the politico-geographic framework of Separate Development.

When the Assembly met last Session, I detailed before it the new attitude of the Prime Minister towards consolidation which differs from that of his predecessor, Mr. B. J. Vorster. This Assembly had a special session at which it considered the question of consolidation on the basis of the 1936 Native Land and Trust Act. This Assembly decided then that while it will not refuse to take any land that is given to the Zulus under the 1936 Native Land and Trust Act, since our people are land-hungry and overcrowded, it will not cooperate or participate by sitting on any committees that are set up to carry out the present government's consolidation plans. There is an eastern committee on consolidation, which deals with consolidation in KwaZulu. Because of the decision on nonparticipation taken by the Assembly at the special session of the KwaZulu Assembly, the Cabinet has found it not possible to endorse attendance of the representatives of KwaZulu to sit on the committee to participate in working out consolidation plans even now that the Prime Minister has changed the basis of consolidation and has broken away from Mr. Vorster's 1936 Native Land and Trust Act quota. The question is now being put by me to this Assembly whether our attitude should continue to be that of nonparticipation, or whether the KwaZulu representatives, say in
the person of the Minister of Education and Culture, should sit on the eastern committee for consolidation either as participants or as observers, or whether they should have nothing to do with such a committee consonant with the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly special session decision in 1972. I hope members of this House will indicate to me whether this is possible or not. We have not as a Cabinet applied our minds in favor of any particular stand and we leave it to members of this House to guide us on this issue. Your decision on this issue is extremely important.

South Africa therefore stands on the threshold of a new era as the sole remaining white-ruled territory in Africa, with signs of impending internal change, yet with all formal initiatives for change occurring within the white National Party-dominated political framework.

That this is inappropriate to the times is more than self-evident. Since the time of Union blacks have had no formal share in the shaping of the constitutional, administrative and economic structures of South African society. The absence of formal initiatives by blacks has left the central political process in South Africa dangerously impotent and helpless to solve its own problems. While these political affairs are dominated by concerns relating to blacks, policy formulation is narrowly restricted to white perceptions of possibilities and alternatives. The problem is much more than an issue of white versus black interests. The major, indeed the overwhelming, pathology of white politics in South Africa is that what they exclude is unknown and hence feared. White politics are dominated by white constructions of what black political participation could mean. South African politics, more than being the politics of privilege or white identity, are the politics of unrecognized possibilities.

Given this truncation of political vision, it is hardly surprising that today South Africa finds itself in a situation of stalled political evolution. There is much talk of change among whites, there are great pressures for change and black expectations are rising, but with every passing day opportunities are lost. Some blacks are responding with intensified protest, others in their frustration and despair call for the release of a brave political leader whose struggle ended with imprisonment nearly two decades ago. They, and the whites against whom they protest, are helpless prisoners of separate political frameworks which cannot interlock.

INKATHA recognizes that the present political impasse cannot be circumvented by protest. It also sees very clearly that the time has come for a formal black initiative in planning the collective political future. It has reached this decision knowing that African political traditions can contribute to resolving some of the key issues of conflict in South African political life. The contrasting of majority rule and preservation of group identity, for example, rests on very restricted notions of representation.
Other possibilities exist, among others, that all people can be represented and exercise their choice communally through their interest groups or within community contexts. Modern western forms of democracy allow for a dangerous alienation and isolation of the ordinary people from political participation. Representation through smaller communal bodies in which issues are debated might allow more people to share effectively in the political process. Through this participation they will not only be more adequately represented but also be more aware of practical constraints and problems. Irrational mass sentiment is an ever-present threat to the Western form of democracy—a threat which whites as a minority fear. These dangerous mass effects are more likely when citizens are participants only at election time; in other words voting fodder with no meaningful exposure to the realities of political participation is conceivable. These are simply examples of the necessity to look beyond the sterility of existing Western conventions. Knowing that these possibilities exist, INKATHA is convinced that imaginative and constructive new initiatives, some based on black traditions, can contribute to South Africa's political and economic evolution. The time has come for a formal black contribution to the political process, not simply to resist or challenge the present order, but to rise above it and provide new concepts and to give whites new perceptions of possibilities which will add to the security and prospects of all South Africa's people.

This challenge is not viewed lightly, however. The difficulties and complexities are well-recognized. In particular, the impossibility of confronting the whole South African problem all at once is clear. The greatest effect can perhaps be achieved by restricting the focus initially to one region of South Africa.

Natal is the most appropriate choice as the region. First, differing white political interests and party preferences are most evenly balanced in Natal. Secondly, Natal is the province in which whites are the smallest minority and in which the dependence on black labor and public cooperation is greatest. Thirdly, Natal is a province in which the juxtaposition of areas presently under white and black administrations is so complex and widespread that no single region can be planned or administered without taking the dual administration into account. Fourthly, Natal is the province in which adult black workers in the 1973 labor protests demonstrated a capacity for spontaneous yet disciplined coherent action which, more than the brave but despairing rebellious Soweto youth, showed that our present stability is very shallow. It is fortuitous that INKATHA should have its headquarters in Natal because today INKATHA is the largest organized grouping of blacks in the history of South Africa, and it is appropriate that this body, which has constantly striven to make the black voice a formal and institutional part of the political process in South Africa, should take this initiative.

The initial task then and the aim of the Commission should
be to consider the collective destiny of all people in Natal, with a view to making proposals which will add a new dimension to the political evolution of South Africa. The Commission, while existing as a black initiative, should give impartial consideration to the prosperity and development of all groups. It is a black initiative taken on behalf of all the people of Natal as an example for the rest of our country.

The aims of the Commission must be fundamentally political in the broadest sense, thereby including constitutional, economic, social and planning issues. Just as its more specifically constitutional aims must be to transcend the categories of formal political debate in South Africa, so should its economic aims be to look beyond the conventional categories of economic conflict and standard notions of development planning.

These aims may be idealistic, but unless this idealism can be made operative in Natal, everyone will face a bleak future. The instruction to the Commission must be to exercise its imagination and to translate the most venturesome political and economic possibilities into practical proposals for coexistence, cooperation and increased prosperity for all.

If this can be achieved then no government in Cape Town and no administration in Pretoria will be able to deny for too long Natal and KwaZulu the right and the facilities to begin implementing the proposals. In order that the proposals themselves compel acceptance, gradually or otherwise, by the South African government, they must be sufficiently representative to be supported and prescribed by all responsible major organized interests in Natal. A spirit of reconciliation is therefore required of the Commission; not the dead compromise of evasion, but a determination to seek practical formulae to allow conflicting interests to be transcended or outgrown.

The aims are ambitious, but if they do not succeed, peaceful change is impossible and the peoples of Natal and South Africa will have to revise their perceptions of their own futures accordingly.

II. THE STRUCTURE OF THE COMMISSION

A black initiative is not to be confused with an ethnic initiative; the latter would be a perpetuation of a divisive tradition. As a black initiative the Commission has to:

- be fully representative;
- place wisdom and expertise above sectional interests;
- explore possibilities beyond the confines of currently
established concepts and approaches in political and economic development;

and, in view of the importance of different sectors of activity and interests, it has to represent major areas of occupational and community concern.

This means that the Commission has to be large in order to accommodate the desirable diversity. One cannot expect a large Commission to be an effective working body, however, and therefore the Commission will contain within it a smaller working group.

**Composition of Full Commission**

The full Commission will consist of the following members.

1. **A Chairman.** The Chairman will be a person selected irrespective of race whose intellect, interests, objectivity and public position will not only lend stature to the body and its activities but will also be such as to effectively and sensitively guide the Commission in its very difficult and complex task.

2. A noted Natal Historian

3. A Political Scientist and Constitutional expert of international repute

4. A Development Economist of repute

5. A black Social Scientist of repute

6/7. Two prominent representatives of the church community in Natal

8/9. Two representatives of Inkatha

10. A representative of the Inkatha Institute

11. A representative of the KwaZulu Development Corporation

12. A representative of Natal-based secondary industry

13. A representative of Natal-based Sugar Industry

14. A representative of Natal-based Sugar-growing

15. A representative of Natal-based General Agriculture

16. A representative of Banking and Finance
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17. A representative of the Federated Chamber of Industries
18. A representative of the Associated Chamber of Commerce
19/20. Two representatives of the Afrikanse Handelsinstituut
21. A representative of NAFCOC
22. A representative of Inyanda Chamber of Commerce
23. A nominee of Anglo American Corporation
24. A nominee of Rembrandt International
25. A representative of the Afrikaans Press
26. A representative of the English Language Press
27. A representative of the black labor movement
28. A representative of the Natal Provincial Town and Regional Planning Commission
29. A representative of the KwaZulu Planning, Coordinating and Advisory Committee
30/31. Two representatives of the National Party
32. A representative of the P.F.P.
33. A representative of the N.R.P.
34. An overseas representative of the ANC
35. A representative of the Labor Party of South Africa
36. A representative of the Reform Party of South Africa
37. A representative of the S.A. Indian Council
38. A prominent African Attorney
39. A prominent black social worker
40. A prominent member of the international community
41. A nominee of the Natal African Teachers Union and The African Inspectors' Association
III. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The aims of the Commission require that its tasks include very specific objectives as well as open-ended and exploratory investigation. Because of the latter, no firm time-period can be laid down in advance. For this reason it is suggested that the Commission deliver an interim report to the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly after a period of one year. In the interim report the Commission, if its tasks and circumstances so dictate, may recommend that the interim report be regarded as the final report and that its task be seen as completed. Failing such a recommendation, however, the Commission will continue its investigations with a view to producing a further and final report, unless, of course, the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly should decide otherwise.

The full Commission, once appointed, shall meet in initial plenary session to consider the terms of reference, and if it so decides, make recommendations to the KwaZulu Cabinet in regard to any further terms which could be added.

The full Commission at its plenary session will constitute a Working Group from among its members to proceed with the necessary investigation, research and gathering of evidence. The working group will report to the full Commission at a second and subsequent plenary sessions. At these meetings the full Commission will reconstitute the working group, changing its membership on the recommendation of the Chairman as priorities alter.

The working group will:

1. Conduct its own investigations

2. Commission research and memoranda from selected parties

3. Hear evidence locally

4. Travel to other centers to hear evidence. (Should the Chairman so decide the working group could travel abroad to hear evidence)

5. Invite written evidence from all interested parties

The Commission will have at its disposal a Secretariat. This Secretariat will comprise a Secretary to the Commission and supporting administrative staff, and shall be provided by the INKATHA INSTITUTE which will be appointed by the KwaZulu Minister of the Interior.

Funds will be voted by the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly for the maintenance of a Secretariat and for costs associated with the gathering of evidence, conducting of research and remuneration of participants where necessary.
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In matters relating to high level communication between the Commission and the South African Government, the services of the Commissioner-General of KwaZulu will be sought.

The terms of reference shall be as follows:

1a. In terms of the requirements of peace, stability, prosperity and equity, to consider fully and appreciate the present position of Natal and KwaZulu within a constitutional and political structure of South Africa, taking into account possible or likely future developments, and with due cognizance of alternative constitutional forms and modes of political organization and development.

1b. To assist and evaluate the rationality, desirability and viability of the present constitutional, social and economic situation of Natal and KwaZulu in the light of historical development, and the current and emerging political reality of South and Southern Africa.

2. To inquire into and report and make recommendations on the constitutional future of the areas of Natal and KwaZulu within the context of South Africa and Southern Africa.

3. To relate the conclusions of 2 above to the issue of the constitutional future of South Africa as a whole.

4. To consider the degree of economic, social and administrative interdependence or otherwise of Natal and KwaZulu and make recommendations in regard to the:

   a) Constitutional and political structures for the areas separately or collectively, or both separately and collectively, which are appropriate to the relationship between them.

   b) To consider immediate and medium-term measures and proposals which could be implemented during the period prior to the stage when the constitutional and political developments recommended under 4 could be implemented.

   c) To make recommendations in regard to whatever administrative changes and economic and social planning and development would be necessary to accompany or precede the constitutional and political developments.

5a. To inquire into and report on the patterns, problems and needs in regard to economic development in Natal and KwaZulu as they relate to the infrastructure, production, employment, technology, indices of overall prosperity and the quality of life of ordinary people in all areas, rural and urban, and to make recommendations bearing upon:
i) Planning and administrative requirements for more rapid and appropriate development within Natal and KwaZulu, singly and collectively

ii) Access to land and rights of tenure

iii) Appropriate forms of labor organizations

iv) The role of small-scale and informal activities

v) The possible variations in forms of ownership, control and organization of different kinds of development or enterprises

vi) Appropriate changes in controlling laws, ordinances and regulations

vii) Methods of stimulating and financing appropriate development, and of involving a wider ranger of contributors to development than is presently the case

5b. In relation to the above, to consider whether or not political developments and the conventional framework of development planning have retarded economic development and levels of welfare, what the social costs might have been, and how to correct whatever the consequences are. In this regard the Commission will also consider the social and political costs of alternative strategies for future economic development and relate these findings to the recommendations under 5a.

6. To inquire and report on the provision of social services, amenities and community facilities available to the people of Natal and KwaZulu and to make recommendations in regard to to the improvement of such services and facilities and in regard to appropriate forms of community development and the role of the various authorities in such development.

7. To evaluate the educational and training facilities and services available in Natal and KwaZulu in the light of educational and training needs, to make recommendations regarding the most appropriate ways in which all services may be rationalized, expanded and enriched as regards content and quality, and regarding the desirability or otherwise of a fuller decentralization of educational planning and organization so as to meet the human development priorities of Natal and KwaZulu.

8. To evaluate the housing and settlement pattern of Natal and KwaZulu and, in the light of the needs and preferences of all groups, make recommendations in regard to a housing and residential policy for the region.

9. To identify any negative consequences of the present social,
political and economic situation in Natal and KwaZulu which might indicate the desirability of changes in the system; such problems might include manifestations of marginality, alienation and apathy, and to ensure that changes eliminate groups which are not catered for by standard of social practices and the operating institutions of society.

10. To inquire into and report and to make recommendations on any other matters which are relevant to the terms of reference outlined above.

11. In all relevant matters referred to above, through research and the gathering of other evidence, to take full account of the preferences, needs and perceptions of the citizens of Natal and KwaZulu, as a basis for arriving at proposals of the broadest possible legitimacy.
AT THE FUNCTION TO LAUNCH THE BUTHLELEIZI COMMISSION INTO THE FUTURE OF NATAL AND KWAZULU

Address by Mangosuthu Buthelezi

WEDNESDAY 29 OCTOBER 1980

ELANGENI HOTEL: DURBAN

Members of the Buthlelezi Commission, friends and colleagues. Tonight I believe I share with you a feeling of great comradeship and mission. You have all volunteered to join Professor Schreiner, your Chairman, in paving a new road to a shared future of peace and stability in our country. This task will be enormously challenging and very daunting. You may rest assured, however, that as you work you will have the full and heartfelt support of the vast majority of black people in Natal and elsewhere. I also know that you will have the support, even if unstated, of very many deeply concerned key decision-makers in all walks of life and of all political persuasions in our country. Furthermore, I have just returned from a visit to the European Parliament and your Secretary, Professor Schlemmer has just returned from the United States and he and I can assure you that this venture is being viewed with very great interest at the highest levels in Europe and America. The expectations are very high, but so is your combined wisdom and expertise. I have no fears for your success.

It is obviously not my task to guide you in your work. Tonight, therefore, I will not tell what I would like to see emerging from the deliberations. Inkatha is represented and through that representation and through the evidence which we, as Inkatha, will give, our viewpoints will no doubt enter into the mix which you will have to sift and sort. I do think that it is appropriate, however, to say very briefly why the KwaZulu Cabinet and Assembly launched this commission. I would also like to give a very broad indication of what might happen after you have reported to my government. Finally I would like to tell you how I see the major criticisms which have been directed at the establishment of this Commission. Let me repeat, I do not intend by speaking in this way to influence your views. That, in any event would be futile with so prominent and independent a group of people. I share these thoughts with you in order to place your work fully in context and to help you weather the winds of controversy surrounding your work.

Why did we establish the Commission? A few days ago, the Prime Minister, the Honourable Mr. P. W. Botha is reported to have said in a speech to ASSOCOM that it has proved to be impossible to
consolidate the homelands in such a way as to make them economically viable. Central government policy is now to deal with economic independence and regional inequity by means of a new thrust for planned decentralization within a system of formal regional interdependence, called a Constellation of States. Here is a policy for new growth points, perhaps even a new axis of development here and there. This is essential and the KwaZulu government will cooperate in any venture to bring growth nearer to the margins of poverty in our country. Yet we also know that the need for joint planning must go far beyond growth paths and points. Natal, KwaZulu and the surrounding areas are a mesh of interdependence and at every point on the map the need for integrated development is urgent. Consider that virtually half of Durban's black population lives in unplanned settlement on a fringe of the city which is formally regarded as marginal, to both Natal and KwaZulu. Our greatest problems, our most urgent needs and our most exciting possibilities often lie in the gaps between formal development plans.

The majority of Natal's black workers are migrants. How can an economic system prosper and develop its productivity when it cannot be responsive to the community needs of its employees? I know how mounting land density is robbing the younger migrant contract workers of residential and social security. Our shared economy cannot afford to have the morale of its labor steadily eroded. KwaZulu's educational system, severely overstressed, is partly responsible ultimately for the aptitudes and productivity of the emerging labor force in Natal and Transvaal. There has to be reciprocity between supply of and demand for skills. And innovative new strategies are required.

Ladies and gentlemen, I could go on and on giving examples of the need to look courageously and boldly at the intertwined and intermeshed realities of our situation. I have not even mentioned the political challenges. I am very grateful that the Prime Minister has said so much about the political substance of the proposed Constellation of States. I have urgently called for a moratorium on political and constitutional planning for black people so that black people can first be brought into the policy planning process. The fact that the Prime Minister has ignored my call does not mean that I must stop ringing these warning bells. We simply must halt the headlong political alienation of black people so that we can start building the structures of inter-group responsiveness in policy planning. The political vacuum in the Constellation proposals for me was a godsend — an opportunity to introduce a black political initiative.

I have said before, the essence of a constructive black initiative is that it transcends race. Because I as a black leader know that my cause is simply that of South Africa, I was happy to disregard race in this Commission. The Commission is a black initiative and, all of you are not only welcome but essential as part of it.
Finally, there have been the painful difficulties we all have experienced with the President's Council and the now aborted Black Council. I have made my responses to these bodies public and I have communicated very directly with the government. In this I have been aligned with virtually all sectors of black opinion. I do not believe in the politics of negativism, however. With the mounting frustration in our land, simply rejecting and disparaging all government actions and doing nothing more is in itself a violent strategy. It creates the climate in which people sink into the politics of despair, reaction, and what is often referred to as subversion.

While the then proposed Black Council was inadequate and a dangerous diversion and symbol of division, to the extent that, in part at least, it was motivated by the real need and some desire for negotiation with black people it warranted a more positive response than cynical rejection.

All these considerations drew together in the realization that the time had arrived for a positive black constitutional, socio-economic planning and economic policy initiative — the Commission of which you are now members. What will happen when the Commission reports? No politician binds himself to a commission's findings in advance, and therefore all I need say formally is that it will be received with great interest and will be analyzed, by way of white papers, in order to inform KwaZulu, on government policy development. I want to go further, however, and say this. If I am right in my assessment that your report or reports will rise to the challenges of our time and situation, we will have a political input of major significance. My colleagues and I will treat it as such, in our interaction with the central political institutions. I can give you and the South African government some assurances. It will not be used as a weapon in confrontation. It will be used in a new phase in our ongoing search for common ground. It will also not be left as a symbolic political gesture, however. Apart from the fact that many of its administrative, educational, economic and planning proposals will be within the formal competence of the KwaZulu government to consider for direct implementation, its broader proposals could form a strategy for debate and interaction in the political arena. It will also be subject to carefully assessed timing. As I have already indicated, if the time is inopportune, the Commission, or a part of it, may have to continue until auspicious circumstances emerge. For the sake of our country, I fervently hope and believe that your work will assist those of us who do not merely pay lip-service to peace, to establish the conditions for that peace-conditions which are so painfully lacking at the present time.

In conclusion, I want to speak directly about some of the controversy which has and will surround the Commission. Firstly, I am highly gratified by it, not because I like controversy but simply because criticism has come equally from right and from left. Perhaps you will agree that this kind of balance of controversy
usually is positive proof of being on the right road.

One reservation expressed about the Commission with which I have no empathy is one which argues that it is to be avoided because it is too "political." This is usually found among people who would serve on the Commission had the central government established it. This attitude is usually that something which is fully of the "establishment" is "respectable" and therefore not "political." The fear of that which is "political" is a fear of any alternative to the status quo. I simply want to say, ladies and gentlemen, that if this Commission were not political it would be a waste of your time and my time. It is not likely to be less political in the sense in which the Lombard findings were seen to be political and created such a political rumpus, despite the good intentions of those who set it up.

The Commission has been criticized from the left for being too local in its concerns. Some critics even see it as a thinly veiled attempt on my part either to legitimize independence for a part of this region or to manufacture some sort of Natal separatism. This is of course done by people who are my political opponents. They deliberately distort our intentions because they have an axe to grind in political terms.

I want to state as emphatically as I can that this was not even remotely our motive in any sense. Our motives, very broadly, were twofold. Firstly to seek ways of dealing constructively with the myriad economic, educational administrative and political problems which intermesh in the fabric of KwaZulu and Natal. Secondly, we urgently require some concrete change in the race structure in our society. Those of us who are committed to peace must be able to point to meaningful development. It is not the vitriol of condemnation of government policies that will resolve our problems. The international debate on apartheid while welcome has achieved minimal results for us as South Africans. I believe that one must contribute on the ground by laying foundations for alternative models for peaceful coexistence of our peoples. Knocking down the government for its abhorrent ideology of apartheid deserves our commendation. But I think we blacks, as the voiceless and the dispossessed of this land, must be able to say even, if the worst happens, that we did point the way, away from disaster and we were unheeded. This is a black initiative. I also believe that we must have a legitimate counter to the swelling chorus of voices, here and abroad, which intone that all nonviolent options have failed. Black leaders must also be able to challenge our brothers who maintain a fashionable cynicism about all gradualist strategies. Their cynicism, as I have said, breeds violence. However, we are all aware of the enormous constraints which centuries of apartheid have created. Let us then try to overcome these constraints in different places at different times, by seeking to find regional options. I am not trying to fragment our country, I am simply trying to fragment the impediments. If one has a political logjam it is foolish to keep on trying to move
all the logs at once. Moreover we who appreciate the complexity of the South African situation do like to say to those who disagree with us, and who thrive politically, on condemning us vehemently at every turn, that we have never stopped them from implementing their instant solutions in South Africa. We are all in the market place of ideas. Let them therefore sell their options to the public. This is democratic. Their success can always be gauged by the extent of the support they get for their instant solutions. To be frank I would also buy instant solutions if I knew some that can really work. Even ordinarily in life I find that short-cuts are attractive to me, but I find quite often that short-cuts are often more costly than what might appear too long a route to follow.

We have also been criticized for attempting to secure representation from the external mission of ANC. The accusation, in particular, is that one should not deal with an organization which is committed to violence and confrontation. My stand on the current strategy of the external Mission of ANC is well known and it is not only superficial but mischievous to suggest that by seeking their participation I am going soft on violence. The strategy of the ANC’s external Mission has not always been what it currently is. In part, the ANC’s external Mission and others surrounding the movement have adopted their current stance because the peaceful options which they could perceive were closed off to them. Is it not then vital to try to engage them in a venture which may prove that peaceful strategies still exist? There are many black exiles who are watching this Commission with great interest. Furthermore, the sincerity of many generations of African leadership must be recognized and I owe it to the collective history of black people to acknowledge this by remaining firm on the invitation I have extended.

The size of the Commission has been described as unwieldy and unworkable. I found again that white backskap and white arrogance, could not help rearing its ugly head which is always knowing what is good for the "Native," better than he does himself. I was given advice by many people including some from the so-called Verligtes on how I should have composed this commission. I had not asked for their advice. Some did this in letters where they were declining to serve on the Commission, which is their right. I acknowledge their right to refuse to serve on the Commission. They were not satisfied with this but started showering this unsolicited advice on this poor "skelpel." While I sympathize very deeply with the almost unfair task which I have presented your Chairman, a more important consideration exists. Democracy when it works does so because an open franchise makes a government legitimate and trusted, but it also works because it provides channels for the articulation of diverse, cross-cutting interests. Stability in democracy, it seems to me, is not so much achieved through the franchise but through the balance of lobbies, interests, concerns which both inform government and curb potential excesses. I have attempted to establish this principle in the Commission. I would like to know that its eventual findings are the result of a process
of give and take, contrast and reconciliation, among all the major representative interests in our region or relevant to our region. A smaller so-called "expert" commission would have been much more efficient, but its findings would have had to be tested at the end. Your Commission at least have built into it a constant reflection of political reality and of economic realities. Perhaps it may even serve as a model, in itself, for a principle of political development. It is just possible that our concern, one way or another, about the franchise needs to be complemented by a concern with ways of formally integrating and articulating into our future political process the essentially stabilizing balance of interests and lobbies in the political, social and economic marketplace. For these reasons I thank you, Professor Schreiner and all the Commissioners, in advance, for the patience and delicacy of the necessarily complex task ahead. I realize how busy all of you are. I bow my head in great appreciation and humility to you for agreeing to serve in spite of your demanding schedules. We should not miss the important point that what comes out, will be placed against to wider canvasses of South, and Southern Africa. I would like to say finally how much I regret that the National Party has not seen its way clear to serve on the Commission. Let me also say immediately that I can understand fully the main problem which the National Party has in this regard. The policy of the party up to now has been to attempt to limit and circumscribe the formal competence of black leadership to very restricted areas and spheres of activity. This Commission, in its terms of reference, moves outside of these areas and spheres. It is vital, however, that I say something in defense of this departure. Firstly, there is no reason why a region or a country anywhere in the world cannot formally inquire into, study and make recommendations in regard to its relations with other regions or countries and vice-versa. There is a vital difference between inquiry and actual intervention, and as I have said before, it is a naive criticism to suggest that KwaZulu is actually attempting to participate in the affairs of surrounding regions. It also reflects a complex built into most of our Countrymen who wield power, that the whiteman can interfere as much as he likes with lives of blacks, but never the other way round. We live in South Africa, and we live in Southern Africa, whatever the ruling Party sleight of hand politics tries to dictate to us. Secondly, there is a definite trend in central government policy towards the increasing recognition of interdependence of peoples and regions. This Commissions's terms of reference may place it somewhat ahead of this trend but it is fairly and swaurely on the track which more general policy is moving along. We regard it as our bounden duty to move ahead to meet the future. To do anything else would be a dereliction of political duty.

Thirdly, virtually all responsible South Africans must by now be coming to realize that South Africa needs black leaders with the trust, the following and the legitimacy to join whites in the struggle for development, stability and the design of a political accommodation in South Africa. How can I meet this challenge
within the outmoded confines of a so-called black homeland. My real constituency of organized support reaches into the homes, factories, offices of people who are permanently working and living in Durban, Johannesburg, Bloemfontein and even Cape Town. The problems of my people may well be greater on the Witwatersrand than they are in KwaZulu. If I am even to carry out only those tasks that the present policy would assign to me, I must explore beyond the limits of KwaZulu as it is currently defined.

Nevertheless, the Commission now has the problem that, at the present juncture of policy evolution, our ruling party finds it impossible to participate. Please see this as a challenge to make doubly sure that the National Party's viewpoints are very fully and fairly considered. Apart from being our Compatriots, they wield power in our land. For our part in the KwaZulu government and in Inkatha, we are utterly determined that the fruits of this Commission will be offered to and debated with the National Party, over and over again if necessary. Any more political, social and economic alienation of black from white in South Africa will open a seam of disintegration which will widen into an abyss of doom for all of us. Therefore you as a Commission, and we as black leaders, must reach out and strengthen the bonds of contact and negotiation, despite the South African government's present difficulties.

These, Professor Schreiner, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen are the ways in which I see your Commission and its tasks. I know that you will make up your own minds on all these issues. I also know, however, that we share the same concerns and interests, just as we share the same country. I wish you well in your task.
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Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to begin by thanking each one of you for accepting the invitation from Chief Gatsha Buthelezi to serve on this Commission. I know that, in every case, it involves already busy people in an additional load of work and I am certain that your acceptance of this extra work carries with it the recognition that, potentially, the work of this Commission and its ultimate findings and recommendations may be of very great significance in South African development. This, of course, will only be true if the ultimate product of our work is acceptable not only to the body which created the Commission, the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, but also carries a stamp of legitimacy because it is found acceptable as well to a far wider audience. This must include the central government of the Republic of South Africa, the international community and many if not all of different groups of people who make up the South African community. This acceptability is unlikely, of course, to be absolute to any one of the groups for it must arise from compromise, but it may be found to be acceptable to some, not because of its immediate merits but because a real consideration of the alternatives shows that if it is not accepted a worse situation must result. Were I not optimistic that this Commission will be able to make a real contribution I would not be here and I am sure that you, too, must also share my optimism, at least in part. I am considerably honored to be allowed to chair a Commission which is so varied, so able and so distinguished in its membership and in each case your individual involvement reinforces my optimism that we will be able to make a real contribution to the development toward a wider concept of South African loyalty than has been achieved so far.

Before turning more specifically to matters relating directly to the Commission itself I would like to stress one feature about it. We are a Commission set up by the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. We are a part of a new initiative — a black initiative. In effect this Commission’s creation is a statement from a very powerful Black leader that, despite the past, despite the previous exclusion from involvement in all processes of centralized decisionmaking and policy determination, he is still interested in attempting to find a new direction of cooperation, rather than confrontation, along which he will lead his people. It is equally a statement that the present dispensation wherein black involvement in government processes is concerned only with black
people must lead inevitably to confrontation and therefore the strengthening of those who seem already to have decided that violence is the only path. It is further a statement that consultation, as it is envisaged and practiced at present, is insufficient to satisfy black ambitions and is a path leading again to strengthening the hands of those who would seize power. We, as Commissioners appointed by the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, are a part of that initiative and must accept what Chief Buthelezi in his letter of appointment to me as Chairman, described as "this is our black wisdom" which is immediately reflected in the nonracial constitution of this Commission. He charged me in that same letter to "guard that wisdom carefully." This I will try to do and it will require your thoughtfulness and imaginative support to do so.

Let me turn now more directly to the Commission itself, first its composition and then the way in which it will function. It is not quite true that the Commission is large enough to vote itself into power at a general election but is certainly very much larger and more representative than any other Commission that I have heard of. Even at this stage the final membership of the Commission is not completed as we have still to hear replies to some invitations which have been sent out. The very size of it presents its own peculiar difficulties as is illustrated by the fact that it has not been possible for all Commissioners to be present at this first plenary session. This will be a recurring problem but we will attempt to arrange the dates of subsequent plenary sessions sufficiently far in advance to minimize this difficulty. But there is another difference between this Commission and a more "normal" one. Some of the Commissioners have been invited to serve on the Commission as individuals, some serve here as nominated representatives of specific organizations. This "representative" nature of some of the Commissioners is of two kinds. Some clearly are representative of organizations which are either political parties or of organizations which have an essentially political nature. For these representatives, whose organizations are publically committed to particular political policies and constitutional designs there can be little doubt that there may come a time in the discussions of the Commission where they will face a conflict of interests and may find themselves in a position of inability to support particular aspects of some recommendations the Commission may make. Clearly such representatives must remain free to disagree if it is ultimately and absolutely necessary. Then, if they deem it necessary, they must needs submit disagreeing minority reports. On the other hand, there is another group of Commissioners who represent organizations which in the very nature of their association are of a positively a-political nature. They, too, clearly must be recognized as having a need for accommodation within the Commission -- in this case the more limited right of abstention from involvement in any part of the final report which is seen by them to be of too directly political a nature. I suggest that in this case the right in relation to the final report is limited to abstention, because disagreement in a minority report with a "too-
political recommendation" might seem to be itself a too-political involvement. It must be made clear, however, that during the proceedings and discussions of the Commission those "representative" Commissioners have a clear obligation to present to the Commission their views of the effects that particular political developments might be expected to have on their organizations. If there were any withholding of views as to the possible effects of political or constitutional adjustments on the organizations represented on the Commission I believe that the legitimacy of any final recommendations would be more questionable. It seems to me then, that, up to the problem of support of the final report, where accommodations may necessarily have to be made for those representative Commissioners, there would be no significant differences between the contribution made by the "representative" type of Commissioner and those whose presence here is more individualistic. I anticipate that from time to time as the work of the Commission proceeds, Commissioners and particularly those of a "representative" nature will write "position papers" which will reflect their individual or organizational views on particular issues which arise during the work of the Commission. The contribution of such "position papers" from Commissioners will be a major method of the procedural inter-communication of the Commission for, as will become clear later when I talk of the time scale of the Commission's work we cannot anticipate that we will have too extended a period of meeting in successive plenary sessions.

Every member of the Commission has at least one significant advantage over the Chairman. Each of you brings to the work of the Commission a relevant expertise and knowledge to contribute the Commission's proceedings. I have no such claim. I represent for each one of you therefore an opportunity -- an almost entirely blank canvas on which, if it is sufficiently skillfully done, you may paint your own picture of what is important for the proper development of the geographical area of KwaZulu/Natal or Natal/KwaZulu. But it is perhaps because of my own deficiencies that I recognize that there is a first phase which I consider to be essential in the development of the work of this Commission. We are basically concerned with the realities that presently exist, now in 1980/81 and those that will remain in the future, rather than with the past and, in particular, those parts of the past which have been related not to realities but to conceptions of reality. We, as Commissioners, cannot hope to all acquire the various levels of expertise that are available to the Commission, but there is a requirement for each of us that, as we prepare to think through the possibilities offered to us by our terms of reference, we have all of us a minimum background of the irreducible facts about the area and the people we are talking about. I have attempted to start this phase of our work by supplying to each Commissioner some indication of those irreducible facts that I am talking about. These are in the form of maps of the whole area with which this Commission is concerned. These maps, for what they are worth (and some of these may already need
amendment) are merely an example of what seems to me to be one of the fundamental necessities for the adequate presentation of the work of the Commission. Also included is a paper, not immediately relevant today, which contains a map of KwaZulu areas in Durban and illustrates well that what may on one scale appear comparatively tidy, presents when looked at on a larger scale a totally different picture. If I may use an example from the terms of reference of the Commission I cannot see that we can "evaluate the educational and training facilities and services available in Natal and KwaZulu in the light of needs and make recommendations in regard to the rationalization of such services and their planning and organization including decentralization" unless we have a clear knowledge of the region's demography both on a large and a regional scale linked certainly, too, with an understanding of problems related to the possibilities of transportation in each of the regions served by schools or other training facilities. I am not suggesting that each of us must reach a level of detailed regional knowledge of the whole area of Natal/KwaZulu nor that proposals emanating from this Commission must necessarily be evaluated in the last details but I am suggesting that it is one of the most important functions of the first working group to be set up by the Commission that it arrange for the continuing supply of factual information to members of the Commission so that its collective thinking about the feasibility of its proposals will be related to the known unavoidable realities. I am deeply concerned that the extremely wide ranging terms of reference of the Commission should not lead to the formulation of a report which will be couched in such general terms that its recommendations are little more than pious expressions of desires to reach unattainable goals. I would hope, therefore, that it would be a primary object of this first plenary session of the Commission that we would address ourselves today in full plenary session and tomorrow in more specialized groups to defining, as accurately as is now possible, those spheres of factual information which the central Working Group should be preparing for the furtherance of both the general and more particular purpose of sub-groups who will be charged with furthering the work of the Commission.

The document containing terms of references of the Commission lays down that at this first Plenary Session a Working Group be constituted which will "proceed intensively with the necessary investigation, research and gathering of evidence" so as to report to the full Commission at a second and subsequent plenary sessions. It seems to me essential that we go further than this at this first plenary session. That we must form a Central Working Group is essential, and that this group must report to the full Commission is clear. If, however, we remain bound by the proposal in the terms of reference proposed that this Central Working Group be varied only by the full Commission at subsequent plenary sessions, we may be less efficient than we could be. I would suggest that it is necessary that this plenary session authorize the Central Working Group to change its membership as is seen fit by the Chairman and the Working Group (for report to successive
Let me return however to the subject of the development of an understanding of the irreducible facts of the area KwaZulu/Natal. Ignoring for the time being the presence of people in the area we can comparatively easily form a picture of the 1980 physical realities of the area. Its geography, its soils, rainfall, rivers, topography, raw materials, ports, railways, energy supplies, road network, can be readily built into a picture by thinking of each being represented on one of a series of transparencies which when superimposed will present a picture as a whole. By superimposing on this group of transparencies a further group containing amongst other things the distribution of people, their average educational level, their present economic circumstances, the rates of change of population, rate of change of the distribution of population, the rate of change that can be expected in education level it would be clearly possible to formulate some concept of the potential of the whole area for development. This is indeed nothing other than what those concerned with developmental planning for the area have done and are doing. But we must however recognize that if we were, each one of us, now, to be looking through such a series of transparencies we would, inevitably, each form a somewhat different picture of the potential or desirable development of the area and its peoples. Each of us, and I would not suggest that we might be prejudiced, is at least preconditioned to see the same set of facts in a different light. It will be the necessary function of this Commission to bring together as closely as possible these different developmental visions. But before we leave the transparencies there remains one further factual transparency to be superimposed on all the others. This you already have — it is the present division into the politically separate authorities of KwaZulu and Natal. Although it is possible that the immediately available facts of the boundaries of these two areas may be changed yet again, and that this may occur even during the work of the Commission, it is essential that we examine carefully whether such a sub-division of the overall area, with its consequent sub-division of economies and of governing and planning authorities, is the organization best suited to the realization of the developmental ambitions of all the people in the area KwaZulu/Natal. It will therefore be a significant part of the work of the Commission to understand the interactions that are possible between the existing governing and planning authorities and to examine their effectiveness against that of alternative organizational structures.

This then brings in a further set of 1980/81 facts which are a necessary but less easily defined part of the overall picture we need to build up. I have referred to "the developmental ambitions" of all the peoples of the area KwaZulu/Natal. These are, of course, as real and as cogent facts in considering the future path that should be followed as are the railways, roads and power supplies. They are, however, less easily established. They are expressed, in part, in the support given to political leaders
and in the definition that such political leaders give to them in statements of policy. In many cases we find these being stated in general terms but with certain reservations being made which are said to be "nonnegotiable," and, in South Africa, some of the "nonnegotiables" of different groups are in apparent and immediate conflict. If we were, here and now, to assume the utter finality of stated "nonnegotiables" we would, I think, have to recognize that this Commission's work would be unlikely to be crowned with success. It is, however, not necessary to look even as far as Zimbabwe to realize that even apparently fundamental policies are not unalterable. It is not very long ago that the Indian population of South Africa changed from being regarded as temporary dwellers in the country to their present position. Nonnegotiability is only tested when seen in relation to the alternatives that will follow if it remains totally "nonnegotiable." We must, in fact, proceed to design the optimum future path on the assumption that "nonnegotiables" may be varied. But "the developmental ambitions," the attitudes of people and groups of people are an important controlling factors in what may be regarded as possible as are some of the more tangible facts. It will be a necessary part of the work of this Commission to investigate such attitudes amongst different groups of people and in different parts of the KwaZulu/Natal area. To this end a part of the budget that has been provided for the Commission has been earmarked for the employment of an independent firm of investigators who will report to us the results of investigations that we have instigated. It will be therefore a part of our immediate task to define the fields in which we need such research so that the data may be obtained and the analysis of that data be incorporated into the overall picture of the area which we are to build up. In addition to the independent researches which will be a part of our work a great deal further information about attitudes and ambitions will be derived from evidence called for from existing organizations both those represented on the Commission and others.

It is then my view, that the initial work of the Commission must consist of the establishment of the 1980/81 realities in the physical and human worlds of the area KwaZulu/Natal and that it next should subject these to analysis and determine the optimum direction of development for the whole area. Only after this has been done, and I would hope that we could have arrived at this point with still a large measure of agreement amongst the members of the Commission, should we turn to the possibilities of recommendations about the governmental or constitutional structure that will best fit the progress of the people in the area. The structure of the organization needed for the governance of the area should be based on and arise as the consequence of the analysis of the optimum direction of development. So, too, should the need for and the method of participation in that governance be related to the realities which have been determined as existing and important factors in the chosen developmental direction. We would be asking the political scientists and constitutionalists to tailor a
governmental structure to meet most closely the chosen path for optimum development. By following this path, any recommendations which the Commission makes would be entitled to be considered fully legitimate by the people in the area KwaZulu/Natal provided the Commission had reasonably fulfilled its task of balancing the many varied interests.

But there are entirely different considerations which affect the "legitimacy" of the work of the Commission. The first affects the Composition of the Commission and its internal legitimacy. The second concerns the relationship of the area KwaZulu/Natal and the remainder of the Republic of South Africa. The third concerns the international community. They are all linked to one another but can usefully be separated for simplicity. I have spoken earlier of the size of the Commission and of its composition. It is widely representative but not widely enough so. This is not the fault of the invitation list but, as members of the Commission will know, the National Party has not been able to see its way to serve on this Commission. I find this regrettable, but understand some of the problems which led to that decision. The Commission itself must seek from that Party submissions on various issues, so that, in its deliberations, it is accurately aware of the point of view of that Party in relation to any possible proposals the Commission may make. But it is also true that the Commission, as at present constituted, may be seen to be one-sided in lacking members who may opening express the political interpretations of that Party. On the other hand, it must also be recognized that there is another body of opinion, entirely relevant and significant to the work of this Commission which cannot be represented on the Commission. Although the ANC (a banned organization) has been invited to participate we have as yet received no reply to the invitation. If we were to receive an acceptance, the physical presence on this Commission of a representative would not be possible and the participation of the ANC-in exile would require a highly unusual accommodation. It needs to be said, also, that there is a body of opinion in South Africa whose views might best be given to this Commission by people who are presently in jail. There is little doubt that the internal "legitimacy" of the Commission is called in question by the absences I have referred to, but the Commission must be prepared to go to great lengths to have placed before it evidence of as widely representative views as possible. Certainly it should anticipate that some of its members might have to visit neighboring countries so that all relevant views may be before the Commission. It certainly cannot accept that the views of persons or organizations, banned on political grounds or those who have been convicted of political offenses, are irrelevant to the choice for the future.

The second aspect concerning "legitimacy" concerns the relationship between KwaZulu/Natal and the remainder of the Republic of South Africa. Both KwaZulu and Natal are at present constituent parts of the Republic, but with significantly different status. KwaZulu, the independent "homeland" is envisaged as an
interim stage in the formation of an "independent" state. Natal retains its traditional status as a province, one of the four provinces resulting from the formation of the Union of South Africa. The Commission needs to consider as an aspect of the "legitimacy" of its findings, the alteration of the relationship between the two areas KwaZulu and Natal, and the Central Government of the Republic. If the concept of the Commission's work was that it was of a separationist nature it would be allowable for the Central Government to regard the work and any recommendations made which lead in the direction of separation as illegitimate. If, on the other hand, the work of the Commission is conceived as being concerned with examining the situation of the interrelationship of KwaZulu and Natal within the overall framework of the Republic of South Africa there can be no quarrel about "legitimacy" although there may well remain disagreement about any recommendations that are reached. I would like this Plenary Session to consider and accept that its work lies within the framework of exploring changes in organization within the area KwaZulu/Natal as a constituent, if possibly altered, part of the Republic of South Africa. If this is seen as an essential feature of the work of the Commission it means that we must add to the understanding of "what-might-be-acceptable" to the people in KwaZulu/Natal the further discussion of "what-might-be-acceptable" to the people of South Africa.

The third aspect of "legitimacy" which deserves the Commission's general consideration concerns what might be termed "international legitimacy." The Commission could, if it wished, take the view that it is concerned only with a legitimacy which is purely internal and rely on the recognition of that internal legitimacy which might eventually find a wider acceptance. Alternatively, it could, at this stage, see as a necessary part of its investigations the determination of the views of such influential countries as say the "Big Five," so that it might be able to include in its understanding of what might be considered "legitimate" some concept of the international requirements of acceptability of change in South Africa. The Commission must consider seriously the consequences of ignoring the requirement that its findings should be seen to be legitimate in a wider theatre than South Africa and, depending upon its decision, plan its strategy accordingly.

There is another aspect of the present situation to which I think it necessary to draw the Commission's attention. In some senses the South African situation appears to be extremely fluid. Changes of some but largely unknown potential significance have taken place since the formation of this Commission was announced. There has been, of course, the formation of the President's Council; there appears to be a possible change in the previously rigid prerequisite of independence prior to participation in a group of cooperating states: the Prime Minister has spoken, in the economic sphere, of the possibility of "regional solutions" rather than what seemed previously an essential single approach concerning the whole Republic; announcements have been made, very early, of
new Bills which are to be placed before Parliament which may seriously change the present dispensation. No doubt during the period of the Commission’s work there will be further changes and predictions of change which will complicate its work. The uncertainties that exist about what is accurately envisaged in the concept of a constellation of states or about what developments can be expected from the work of the President’s Council should not be allowed to delay or distract the work of the Commission. Indeed the very fluidity of the situation places upon the Commission a compulsion to complete its work as rapidly as possible so that its reports may be known and become part of the developments being planned and instigated elsewhere.

This brings me directly then to the method of working of the Commission and the time scale which it should aim to define for itself. It has been suggested that "the Commission deliver an Interim report to the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly after a period of one year," and it is suggested that the Commission could recommend that the interim report be regarded as the final report and its task be seen as completed. I believe it essential that from the outset the Commission works toward the second situation and aims to complete its work and its report by not later than one year from now. This time scale forms part of the Agenda of this Plenary Session but at this stage I must attempt to go further into the detailed operation of the Commission. I have suggested that we need a fact finding and initial research phase which I suggest should be limited to three months during which time there will be no further plenary session. During this time the Commission will be carrying out its work through a Central Working Group which will be formed during this Plenary Session. In addition to this Central Working Group, this Plenary Session will set up smaller specialist groups with specific tasks of investigation, the number and constitution of which will be determined during this session. Each will be given specific responsibilities taken from the terms of reference which will by then have been agreed upon. Not all the members of the Commission will be involved in these groups and one of the responsibilities of the Central Working Group will be to set up an adequate means of communication between itself and each of the Commissioners so that each Commissioner will be aware of the ongoing work of the groups, the evidence that they have received, and from time to time the analysis that each group has made of its specific task.

It will also be part of the responsibility to make arrangements for a centralized information and data storage division from which both individual Commissioners and groups could obtain, if they so wished, the primary evidence as well as the more summarized or derived evidence referred to above.

It is envisaged that at the end of January or the beginning of February 1981 the work of the Commission would have progressed sufficiently for a second Plenary Session to be held to receive interim progress reports from the Central Working Group and each of
the Specialist Working Groups. The purpose of this Plenary Session would be to review progress to date, to test the levels of internal agreement on the Commission with the progress reports and to formulate any new directions of inquiry which were thought necessary. Following on that Plenary Session, the work of the Commission would continue in its fragmented form until a third Plenary Session in late July at which further reports and analyses would be submitted. It is hoped that at this session the form of the reports and analyses received could be viewed as drafts for the preparation of the final report. It would therefore be a vital Plenary Session at which the full framework of agreement of the Commissioners with the findings and recommendations of the Commission would be sought. For this reason alone it would be probable that it would be a longer Plenary Session than either of the first two. All this may seem at this stage to be crystal gazing and or pre-empting our own agenda item for later today but it will serve at least to focus that discussion.

I would like to turn now very briefly to the matter of the public and its involvement, via various media, during the work of the Commission. I have no doubt that it is right and proper that the public be informed, as far as is possible, of the work of the Commission, of who is doing what, of what evidence is being called for at particular times and of the interim progress of the Commission. It may well be that such an open attitude would from time to time cause difficulties in the work of the Commission but I do not believe that they would be insuperable. I believe, on the other hand, that public knowledge and involvement in the information and debate of the Commission would be of great benefit. I would like to propose to the Commission that our general attitude should be that each Commissioner should be free to express his or her views about our work and that the Central Working Group should be charged from time to time with the duty of issuing factual reports of the work of the Commission. There is, however, one real limitation I would place on this open attitude. I believe it necessary that we should have some level of privacy in which we are able to disagree and disagree cogently and forcefully without it becoming the immediate subject of Press comment. We cannot deny ourselves the freedom to arrive at compromise and, therefore, I believe that the Plenary Sessions, and the sessions of the Working Groups should not be open. I believe, for instance, that at this very first session it should be open to the Commission to disagree fundamentally with its Chairman and even overrule him on the subject of his attitude toward public involvement in our progressing work.

Finally let me return to what I said very near to the beginning of this long address. We are a part of an important Black initiative. In our segregated country it is almost inevitable that we think in terms of our own immediate group and that we find it difficult to be aware and sensitive to the changing thinking and political pressures in groups other than our own. Apparent material progress and economic recovery recently seems to
blunten our sensitivity to the impatience and frustration of others and it is easy to lose a sense of urgency about the position in South African society. We cannot afford to do so. We cannot afford to think that we can slowly or even apparently quickly modify our present dispensation into a more just society if we have not analyzed the basic causes of it being now "not just" and therefore recommending the elimination of those causes. We are in an urgent situation — Africa as a whole tells us this — cosmetics are a handicap — and we will need imaginative and courageous thinking, divorced in many ways from past conventions and prejudices, if we are to be able to make a significant contribution to the solution of our problems. In making this statement of our position I am expressing a sensitivity to the position of all those who are seeking to find a peaceful way out of our present dilemma. The position of the leaders of those who have least to lose and who still seek a cooperative solution is more particularly perilous. If we, as a Commission existing only by right of a Black initiative were to lose sight of this in our considerations and our whole intent of work, we would most certainly have failed in our appreciation of the present South African position.
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My brothers, the Revd. Hendrickse, Mr. Mabuza, Mr. Chinsamy, all my Colleagues in the South African Black Alliance, my brothers and sisters. How great it is to be in your midst here in Port Elizabeth, once again. We still cherish wonderful memories of our visit to Port Elizabeth, last year. I thank the Almighty for this Alliance which has made us real neighbors that we are, in our beautiful land by making it possible for us to get together in this fashion every few months. I thank this Alliance for contributing so much towards bridging the chasms which have been maintained for generations between us as fellow countrymen and Comrades in the struggle for liberation. There is no doubt that it is only the interest of the oppressors which were served when in the past, we have fallen so easily for their ruse, to keep us apart. South Africa is an unique place in the entire world, because nowhere in the World have people structured policies of any Country on the basis of an abominable ideology such as Apartheid, whose goal is to keep people apart, rather than together. There is not a single place in the World where there is perfection. There is not a single place in the World where those who govern are paragons of perfection. There is hardly a single place in the World where there are no have-nots on the one hand, and Haves, on the other. But our imperfections in South Africa are so wicked because we aspire to maintain them on the basis of race, something which none of us have any choice about. South Africa is such a strange place not only to the entire Community of Africa, but to the entire international Community, for here one’s place in society is determined by one’s colour and one’s race, something no one amongst us can do anything about. It is fitting when I speak here in Port Elizabeth, to recall the memorable words of my Professor the late Dr. Z. K. Mathews, who taught me at Fort-Hare. He saw discrimination on the basis of one’s race as the most wicked basis for discriminating against a whole people. He said that one could perhaps understand the position where discrimination on the basis of whether people were educated, for example, and those discriminated against were uneducated, because those who were uneducated could at least be inspired to do something about getting themselves educated. He said that he could even understand discrimination on the basis of whether people were clean on the one hand, and those who were discriminated against were dirty, because the dirty ones could at least do something to solve their problem with a piece of soap. He said that discriminating against people on the basis of race was so unfair, because there is nothing one can do about one’s race, as we are born into our own racial
groupings! There is nothing one can do to change that. There is
the nub of this whole international debate, which is resented so
much by many of our White compatriots. The argument is often
advanced that racial prejudice is not something that is peculiar to
South Africa. This is of course true, but the difference is that
there are few Countries in the World where racial prejudice is
enshrined into law and made to appear to be something sacrosant.
How many Countries in the world have legislation forbidding
marriage or sex across the colour line? And yet we know that there
are many communities who for reasons of culture, history or sheer
prejudice do not marry across their own cultural or racial group.
But here in South Africa where the very community within which our
legislators are born, has in fact produced through relations across
the colour line, a whole people, the Coloured Community, are
holding on to the Immorality Act, to forbid some human behavior,
that is proved by the very existence of our Coloured Community to
be impossible to forbid. These are the things that make our
Country to appear on the international scene as the skunk of the
entire world, even regardless of the fact that there is no Country
which is perfect. It is this kind of hypocritical conduct which is
structured in so much white arrogance, which makes people think
that our South African Society is the strangest society in the
whole world. What is more, people appear to be so hard on South
Africa, because we do not need a magic wand to improve our image in
the World, this can be done literally almost with a stroke of the
pen, if those in power choose to do so.

Nothing has highlighted the political crookedness of our
South African legislature in recent times, more than the
establishment of the President’s Council has done. I have been
amazed by the manner in which some people have looked askance at
me, when I have reiterated to them, this Black Alliance’s
opposition to the President’s Council as presently constituted. In
the first place we were expected to say "Dankie Baas," even for as
demeaning a structure as the black advisory Council. When we
rejected it so completely, there was resentment from many whites,
that we are not grateful, that they had decided at this day and
age, to foist such a farcical structure on 71 percent of the South
African population. When it was withdrawn as a result of our
opposition, we were again expected to be "constructive" as the
argument went, "to allow" or even "to encourage" our brothers
within the Coloured and Indian Communities, to join whites in the
President’s Council as against the rest of us as their people. To
me, these are symptoms of a twisted society. It is common cause
that the black Council was established in order to make up for
African exclusion in the President’s Council, in the first place.
In other words it was realized at that time that it was wrong to
exclude Africans. So a black toy-telephone in the form of a black
Council supposed to make up for African exclusion in the
President’s Council. And yet when we forced the Prime Minister
through our strong opposition, to withdraw black Council, many
whites do not understand why we are not grateful that they are
providing us with the beautiful machinery in order to further split
us up in this way, by giving the false impression as if our Coloured and Indian brothers and sisters have by inclusion in the President’s Council become top dogs together with white South Africa. The effect of this ploy is to designate the rest of the black population as political underdogs of this world. Our brothers and sisters in the Labor Party, and in the Reform Party realized the folly of this white divisiveness, and have paid a high price for their convictions, by remaining out of the President’s Council. We want to applaud this great act of patriotism on the part of our brothers and sisters. We are convinced that this political masterstroke on behalf of all the politically deprive population of South Africa, will never be forgotten by future historians of our times. We salute our brothers and sisters in the Labor Party, and in the Reform Party for trying under extreme pressure to save South Africa from disaster through their decision not to participate in the President’s Council. Nothing would have widened the oppressors’ created chasms between our peoples, if such political wisdom did not prevail within the Labor Party and the Reform Party.

That South Africa is sick as a society is evidenced by the political schizophrenia, which makes white South Africa proud to die on the borders of South Africa with blacks, but at the same time to resist with all their might as they do, any moves to share power with blacks. The two attitudes are irreconcilable. We blacks can share death with whites. To whites, this is noble, but it is not noble for blacks to share power with whites. I think it is not quite fair to blame this only on the government. There were editorials by some of the Newspapers that are commonly regarded as liberal, chiding some of us for not lapping up the Government’s farce of a black advisory Council and participation in the President’s Council by our Coloured, and Indian brothers. It is in this context that we feel that enough tributes have as yet not been paid to the Progressive Federal party for their political courage. We commend the Progressive Federal Party for taking their courage in both hands, by refusing to be part and parcel of such a blatant white baaskap scheme such as the President’s Council is, to which there has been arrogated the right to determine the future of the entire South African population, without any participation by representatives of 71 percent of the population of South Africa. We know that it needed not only courage, but also true South African patriotism for the Progressive Federal Party to take this bold stand. In historical terms the Progressive Federal Party’s stand on this issue, will be seen, as the one and only thing which saved the entire black population at this time, from writing off any possible white role, in working together for peaceful change in South Africa.

We can just read between the lines in many utterances even by supposedly liberal whites, that the decision of the Progressive Reform Party in standing out of the President’s Council is clearly resented, even by their own Constituents. This is in itself a disturbing sign, because those of our people who for good reasons
do not trust the entire white population, will quote this attitude
by these so-called "supporters," of the Progressive Reform Party,
as evidence that whites even who claim to identify with blacks will
ultimately cling to other whites, and will not hesitate to ditch
blacks, when the chips are really down. This has been one of the
most disturbing elements of this entire debate on participation or
nonparticipation in the President's Council. The election results
of the Simonstown and East London by-elections confirm this view.
As you are aware, I refused to attend a conference called by the
Prime Minister of South Africa to discuss these very issues on the
8th of August. This I did not on a calculated confrontationist
basis. I did this as an act of reconciliation to save South
Africa, just as our brothers in the Labor Party, the Reform Party
and in the Progressive Federal Party have done through
nonparticipation. I knew that if I attended there would inevitably
have been confrontation between me, and the Prime Minister.
Nothing would have been more ominous for South Africa than that.
Not that there is any silverlining on the dark cloud as a result of
this move on my part. The point I am making today, is that the
situation is bad enough as it is, and my attendance of that
farcical conference on the 8th of August, would have taken us
further along the road to confrontation, which white South Africa,
because of reasons of being armed to the teeth seem to be dying to
promote. We must accept that we who are working for possible
peaceful change in South Africa, are between the Devil and the deep
blue sea, today. The majority of white South Africans are already
spoiling for a confrontation with blacks. There are blacks on the
other hand who as a result of this white attitude are already
spoiling for violent confrontation with whites. That we are in an
eleventh hour situation is not merely proverbial, in these
circumstances we are clearly on the brink of disaster.

There are people who in fact denigrate us because even in
this eleventh hour situation we here, are still using all the power
at our command to work for a peaceful solution in South Africa. In
the face of humiliations which blacks have endured for so long from
whites, and in view of white intransigence, which the President's
Council evidences, people within this school of thought think that
a point has been reached when events should take their own course.
By this they mean that violence in South Africa appears inevitable,
in the light of such white intransigence as I am referring to here.
They conclude therefore, that it makes a lot of political sense not
to impede the speed with which the ship of State seems determined
to move towards disaster. They then add, that the sooner the
better for all concerned. In other words for both whites and
blacks.

This clearly places us in a situation where we are being
fired at from all sides. I can understand white Hawks who are
spoiling for war because they know that they can rely on their
military hardware. They know that the violence they will unleash
against millions of unarmed blacks will be viable from their point
of view.
I have understood the call by our brothers in exile, whose call to arms has lasted for the last 20 years, because for them there is in fact no other option that is open owing to their commitment to violence, as a result of continued white reluctance to share power with blacks. I have said to them both here and abroad that in the market place of ideas they are free to recruit cadres for their armed struggle. In the present struggle I concede it as their right to advocate for black support for the line of action they have chosen to pursue. In as much as I concede this as their right, to pursue the course they have chosen, I have argued that I have as much right in the market place of ideas where we all operate, to advocate for support for my point of view, that no stone should be left unturned in avoiding violence, even if this goes on right up to that point of violence, if black people in South Africa ever see it as the only option left for them to take at anytime in future.

When I was in London in October-November of 1979 with a sixteen member Inkatha delegation, to meet and discuss strategy with Oliver Tambo, the President of the External wing of the banned ANC and members of his executive, I made these points I am making before you. The meeting was requested by Oliver Tambo himself. Although there has been criticisms of me expressed by both Mr. Tambo and Mr. Alfred Nzo, his Secretary-General, I am still grateful to Tambo for inviting me. I am glad that the unwarranted attacks on me, which they have launched lately, come after my international demonstration, before the whole world, of the brotherhood, and comradeship, I have expressed, and of our commitment to the one common struggle even via different strategies. The strategy they pursue in exile is suitable for the political terrain they have chosen. The strategies we here pursue within South Africa, suit the political terrain we are on in pursuing the black liberation struggle within the borders of our troubled land.

I have no intention of regarding any black organization which is committed to the same goals, as we are committed to, as my enemy, merely because we employ different strategies. I discuss these matters even at a gathering like this, because it is absolutely necessary for you to hear about these matters from my own lips.

Moreover whenever I have tried to explain my point of view publicly, quite often some sections of mass media always report any defense of myself from attacks from our brothers in exile, and the explanation of my own political position, as attacks on the external wing of ANC. Even for this reason, I owe this meeting this kind of explanation, as attacks on me are going on through broadcasts which are beamed by our brothers into South Africa, and through some of their publications, which also filter through South Africa, from time to time.

I have not condemned my brothers for choosing violence, and
I challenge anyone to prove that I have ever done so. In turn, do not expect them to judge me so harshly for actions I do on a political terrain they left nearly twenty years ago. Apart from all these points the so-called white radicals must stop playing us off against our own brothers, whatever differences we may have amongst ourselves. We in Inkatha regard our movement as the best custodian of the 1912 ideals of the African National Congress as propounded by the Founding fathers. Over the years Mr. Tambo has recognized that position. This I am not surmising, as he has always been in contact with me through the emissaries we have exchanged over the years, and at private discussions we have had in Europe and in Africa. I can name countries and dates on which all these contacts occurred. The statement which was issued by the 8 expelled members of the external wing of ANC is also evidence of the contact which I am talking about here. Tambo was attacked by them for this very contact which he had with me all these years. We are members of a family with our brothers in-exile, and if that is so, no one should regard them to be so much of sacred cows, that I cannot even lift a finger in my own defense, when they spread untruths and distortions about me, that are absolutely unwarranted.

There is also another category of blacks, who think that they do us a lot of good, when they portray blacks in South Africa as almost resigned to the status quo. They go on to argue that only those of our brothers-in-exile are in the liberation struggle. We have a record of which we can be proud in this struggle. Plans by the Regime to have a three-tier Parliamentary system were sabotaged by members of this Alliance. I have already described in this very speech some of the government’s plans that have had to be withdrawn because of our concerted opposition to them. I want to say today to those people who regard the armed struggle as the only way, that none of us in the leadership roles here, have ever prevented or dissuaded anyone from joining the armed struggle. It is not even so complicated to skip South African borders. We get a little impatient with all the amount of abuse that is poured on our heads, by people who pose as advocates of the armed struggle but who lack the guts to skip the borders to join the armed struggle about which they exude so much rhetoric.

We should never underestimate the great work which this Alliance is performing, in getting us together at short intervals as the oppressed of this land. We should not pretend that living in different residential areas, learning in different schools, worshipping in different Churches, and the varying of our inferior treatment by the oppressors, has had no cumulative effect in freezing the chasms that have been deliberately created between us, as the oppressed of this land, on the basis of the old principle of Divide And Rule. There is a lot of rhetoric which certain front organizations spin about black solidarity, when they have had no demonstration of this, in the manner in which we in this Alliance have demonstrated it, in such large numbers, and all the time as a continuous strategy we are seriously engaged in.
Those of us who were educated at Fort Hare University 30 years ago such as the Revd. Hendrickse, myself and others who are here, know how enriching our experience of living and studying together had on all of us, who had this privilege. That is why our relationship has such depth, we are not acting for any galleries. Black brotherhood was not a theory. For us black brotherhood was a way of living during our formative years, as students. There are people who have no contact across their own cultural groups, who use certain front organizations ostensibly to deal with mundane things like rent etc, who are creating a volcano, by attacking us and poisoning the minds of innocent children particularly in the Durban area. This I believe is going on in many parts of the Country as well. We have never pretended here that we are above criticism. But what is going on is not criticism. It is a whole calculated campaign aimed at villifying us, for this unity we have forged is seen as a threat to certain power-mongering cliques, both here and abroad. It leaves me quite flummoxed to think that in this day and age we still have people who are so willing to be used as pawns in promoting black disunity. Quite clearly this can lead to more serious things than just verbal differences. You must have seen in "The Sunday Times," revelations of how certain individuals, who may appear radical, can be used as Agents-Provocateurs, by the Security Police. This indicates how complex the black political scene is. Those who pose as holier-than-others, in political terms, are very often the very people who are used to sow seeds of disunity amongst us and who wreck black organizations, while posing as radicals, who are so committed to our black cause. They often pretend that they have now opted out of their own white society because of this commitment. I am not planting seeds of Cynicism in our midst in speaking as I do. But we would be fools if we fail to understand what forces are at work within the black political scene. The black liberation struggle is our struggle. We are not in it on sufferance. We are in it as a right. We are in it because we represent millions of oppressed black people in South Africa. We have a right to express amazement when millions of Rands were donated in the name of these millions of oppressed people, but ended doing all other things, except to promote black development or the liberation struggle. I want to express thanks for assistance that is given to those of our people who are persecuted by the Regime. But I am at the same time very concerned about the wide sense in which what goes as "political cases" can cover such a multiplicity of things for which so many hundreds of thousands of Rand are contributed according to last Sunday’s report. I am naturally quite supportive of financial assistance which our exiles receive from all sources. But I think it is tragic that political priorities for black South Africans are decided according to the report, by political pals for political pals.

All these things indicate to us how complex our black liberation struggle is. It also sounds a warning to us to be self-reliant in this struggle because when we are given such a glimpse of the chaotic management of liberation money, we have no
abuse. What reason can ensure that liberation money that is
donated for the black liberation struggle, is used mainly for the
liberation struggle in general, and not for pals.

There is the other dimension of this whole thing. There
tends to be a euphoric view of our struggle as waged from outside.
We are tempted even to have a romantic view of what may happen from
that angle. One lesson we can learn from all the mess we read
about last Sunday, is that we should never drag our feet in the
struggle, in the hope that something is going to occur sooner or
later from outside of our borders. There has been a tendency to
see the main thrust of the struggle as coming from beyond the
borders. What is done outside the borders in promoting black
liberating is of course just as important for us as any other
aspect of our struggle. But there are people who because of the
Regime's ruthlessness try to inculcate a feeling in us that we
should not try anything from within South Africa, as, more pressure
can be expected to hot up from outside. This is often the myth,
which people who do not want to sacrifice their way of life, cling
to, often as a pretext for doing nothing, except throw abuse on
those of us who are trying to do something practical, about the
black liberation struggle from within our borders.

I have just returned from a very interesting trip abroad.
I was invited to the European Parliament by the Socialist Group
through its Chairman, Mr. Ernest Glinne. The letter of invitation
written by the Secretary-General of the Group Mr. Paolo M. Falcone
reached me in August. I was invited to attend part of the European
Parliament's part session in Strasbourg from the 13th to 17th
October. The letter stated that I would have the opportunity to
observe the House at work, and also take part in a special group
discussion on the political situation in Southern Africa.

Members of the European Parliament take their seats as
members of International groups rather than as members of National
delегations representing countries of their origins. There are
altogether seven political groups. The Socialist group which
invited me to Strasbourg is the largest with 113 members. Other
parties are represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Christian Democratic Group</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Democratic Group (the Conservatives)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist Group and Allies Group</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal and Democratic Group</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of the European Progressive Democrats</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group for the Technical Coordination and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense of Independent members</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine members of the European Parliament do not belong to
any political group.

The number of members elected from each of the member
states is:

58
BELGIUM  24
DENMARK  16
FRANCE  81
GERMANY  81
IRELAND  15
ITALY  81
LUXEMBOURG  6
NETHERLANDS  25
UNITED KINGDOM  81
TOTAL  410

The first elected Parliament met for the first time at the PALAIS de l'Europe in Strasbourg in July 1979.

I was accompanied on the trip by Mr. G. J. Thula, the Chairman of INKATHA Central Committee's SUB-COMMITTEE FOR ELECTIONS, PUBLICITY AND STRATEGY. I was also accompanied by my Personal Secretary, Mr. E. S. Ngubane and another Aide, Mr. Mkhize.

When we got to Strasbourg, arrangements were made for me to meet not only the Socialist Group who were my hosts, but also the Liberal Democratic Group and their leader Mr. Martin Bangeman, the Conservative (or the European Democratic Group) led by Mr. Spicer and the Communist Group, which was led by Madame Fabrizia Baduel Glorioso and also the Christian Democratic Group which was led in our discussions by Mr. James Janssen van Raay.

I had only one speech which was addressed to the Socialist Group on: "SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES." In all the discussions we had, members of the European Parliament expressed deep concern about the black-white conflict in South Africa, and all wanted to know whether there is still any chance for peaceful political change in South Africa. Issues were raised by each and everyone of the groups we met, were disinvestment, the implementation of the EEC Codes and possibilities of applying sanctions on South Africa. We were told that at the meeting of ACP Countries i.e. the 58 developing African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries which are linked with the Community through the LOME Convention in August in Luxembourg a decision was taken by representatives of these Countries to withdraw the EEC Code because it is regarded by them as ineffective. This is merely a Consultative Assembly which meets from time to time to review the working of the Convention. The preparatory work for meetings of the Assembly is carried out by a joint committee comprising an equal number of ACP representatives and members of the European Parliament. This principle of equal numbers holds good in the Assembly too. It comprises two delegates from each of the 58 ACP Countries, and 116 members of the European Parliament. At the meetings of the Assembly the chair is taken by an ACP member and an MEP in turn.

This democratic consultation has helped to bring major innovations and improvements to the LOME Convention, including what
is called the "STABEX" system for stabilizing export earnings, the accession of new member states and an increase and greater flexibility in both development and emergency aid. I was also introduced to the President of the European Parliament, Madame Sumone Veil.

I was impressed by the interest in the situation in South Africa, shown by members of the European Parliament of all the parties I talked to, and its possible resolution. When one takes into account the fact that this Parliament has only recently been set-up, my invitation by the largest radical party (the Socialist Group) is the very measure of their interest in the South African situation. They are under great pressure from activist groups in Europe to take a hard line on South Africa and to treat South Africa as the polecats of the World regardless of the consequences of this line to missions of oppressed blacks in South Africa. I have great respect for the way my hosts the Socialist Group and their colleagues in the other parties, were so open-minded about discussing these issues with me, as a black leader from inside instead of relying on what activist groups in Europe which support blacks on a selective basis have to say to them on this explosive situation which for us, the blacks of South Africa, is not academic, as we are involved in it from day to day.

There is a tendency in many quarters abroad, to disregard the fact that millions of blacks live in South Africa. That we blacks will continue to live here as much as people of various Countries live in their different Countries.

Because only once in a blue moon do people from inside South Africa particularly black leaders, appear abroad, there is a dearth of information on the kind of struggles blacks within South Africa are engaged in. It is this realization which has prompted us in Inkatha to seriously consider establishing a few information offices abroad. Certain mass media has given the impression that this arises out of recent developments between certain leaders of the external wing of ANC and myself. I want to make the point today that this is very far from truth. This has been on the cards for much longer than that. I find that people abroad are extremely interested in the South African Black Alliance for example. But the information they get on the Alliance is very scanty, where it exists at all. We are not establishing offices to counter any particular organization. We have no black targets in this struggle, our target is the Apartheid Regime in South Africa.

We wish to brief the international Community on what is going on in South Africa. The international Community either gets stale scanty information about the South African situation either from people who have been out of South Africa for many years, or alternatively they get biased information mainly from South African embassy sources. It is in the interests of the black liberation struggle that fresh and unbiased information be made available to the international Community. I believe that it is extremely
struggle that fresh and unbiased information be made available to
the international Community. I believe that it is extremely
important, for our struggle to be seen by people outside of South
Africa in its correct perspective. I cannot see that anyone
overseas can be expected to play a meaningful responsive role vis-
a-vis the black liberation struggle, unless people there, are fully
informed of our true position. In this respect, as I have already
indicated my recent visit to the European Parliament, was extremely
important and useful.

We in this Alliance, have no illusions about the heavy and
risky demands of this struggle. We are not political simpletons
who imagine that shouting expletives alone, will cause the walls of
Jericho to fall. We in this Alliance, see before us a task, and we
respond to the demands of that task by dedicating ourselves each
time we assemble in this manner, to do all in our power to meet
those demands. We must remind ourselves that we have strategies
within our policy which we have so far not even touched. We
believe that it is absolutely essential for us not to be stampeded
into precipitate action for which the people have not been
prepared. This to us, is the thing that makes protest politics
alone to be a strategy of limited possibilities, unless it is
combined with the hard work, of organizing people on the ground, so
that when massive action is called for, they are ready to respond.
I want to repeat here today that blacks cannot hope to resolve
their problems through acts of violence by blacks on blacks.
Blacks have been terrorized by whites for generations. It is
unthinkable that blacks should imitate their oppressors by
intimidating other blacks. Any successful war is fought by
soldiers who are convinced of the righteousness of their cause and
who as a result have dedicated themselves to pay any price to bring
such a war to a successful conclusion. It is just not possible
that we can succeed in pursuing our struggle successfully on the
basis of substituting the important task of convincing people of
the righteousness of our cause through democratic persuasion, with
the use of violence on them. I believe that this sows seeds of
future violent society. Once we accept as a way of life the use of
violence on each other, even in a liberated South Africa that use
of violence will be a pattern which our society will inherit for
all time. Once we accept use of violence on other blacks, then we
must accept that they have the same right also to retaliate with
violence. From the reports we have recently read, we now have
confirmation of certain information that we already had, that
certain funds are being channeled to certain people in South Africa
to promote this kind of violence of black on black. There is no
doubt in my mind that people who go out of their way to cultivate
this pattern of violence in our Society can only be people who have
no intention of living in South Africa as we do. It is easier to
establish brute force as a way of life, for other people, if one is
not going to be at the receiving end of such brutality. There is
an emerging pattern in South Africa, when such threats of violence
by blacks on blacks, and the use of violence by blacks on blacks,
is being encouraged perhaps even unwittingly by certain well-
regarded as sub-human creatures, who do not quite make it, in the opinion of our rulers, as fully-fledged human beings. This kind of conduct where black on black confrontation becomes a way of life justifies the denial of human rights to blacks. It therefore serves the interests only of those who wish to justify this denial of human rights to us, on the basis that we are not more than just "savages." How can they possibly be expected to share power with people who still thrive on using violence on each other? That is the inevitable question they pose even to people overseas. This attitude is amply justified by this sort of political violence, which is being funded by those who know that they will not be at the receiving end of it, or be caught in the ensuing cross-fire of such violence.

The net result of all this confused politicking, if I may call it that, can only be a complete set back in our struggle for liberation. This might even be so by a generation or two. I have spoken before about the myth that certain individuals both here and abroad are promoting, that our black children are different from children of other race groups. That the generation-gap is such in black society, that our children do not want to participate in the struggle with us. One must sound warning bells even here. We have not seen children of anyone of the white cultural groups separating themselves from the adults in the hope of achieving something for their particular population groups, on their own. Here again I smell the same divisive rat which merely guarantees that we blacks end up in internecine strife between us, and in this way give further time to the oppression of the black man, while we and our children are at each other's throats. I appeal to the entire black population of South Africa to think very seriously about these matters. The time scale for liberation will in the final analysis be determined by the extent to which we counter all this divisive mischief by our enemies, and power-mongers amongst us. We should therefore continue to do the things we are doing. There is no substitute for the hard work of organizing people. People now think that when we talk about the use of our worker power, and consumer power, that this is no more than just rhetoric. But this is far from being the case. We in this Alliance know that these are powerful strategies we should not attempt to employ before we have consolidated the solidarity which this Alliance is engaged in establishing amongst all our people. Each time half-baked schemes to employ these strategies based not on democratic persuasion, but on dragooning other people, they have misfired. We know by what happened at Mzimhlophe in 1976, the extent to which the misfiring resultant from these strong arm methods, can assume ugly proportions. Each time such misfiring occurs, our people get completely disillusioned, and the struggle is set back each time by so many years. This is becoming a general pattern. It is something that serves the interests of our enemies.

Those who may feel impatient with us that we do not take the plunge, must understand that our struggle is sabotaged by all the in-fighting that is promoted within the black Community. They
the plunge, must understand that our struggle is sabotaged by all the in-fighting that is promoted within the black Community. They must know, that each time half-baked methods are used to employ even such good strategies prematurely, we experience another setback in the struggle. People can only generate the kind of morale we need to successfully employ our strategies, if people are united. The more disunited the people are, the longer it will take before we can even attempt to successfully employ our economic muscle in the liberation struggle in which we are engaged. We will achieve political freedom in South Africa. That is one thing we are all certain about. But we must work hard continuously to achieve it. Political freedom is not "just around the corner," as certain theoreticians are claiming. It is there for the taking alright, but it is hard work, and not just rhetoric which will assure us of victory in achieving it.

There is no need for us to be apologetic, particularly when we know where we stand. We know where we are now, and we know where we are going. We accept that the going will be hard, because we face the oppressors who are powerful, and who use all kinds of things to cause confusion within our own ranks on the one hand. On the other hand, we have black power-mongers here and abroad who are not concerned about black solidarity, as such, but who on the basis on their political one-upmanship game, do things in the interest of their obsessive political megalomania. These facts leave us in no doubt that our multi-pronged approach is the only one which can help us to achieve victory at the end. Down with the divisive Presidents’ Council!

AMANDLA!  NGAWETHU!
ILIZWE!  NGELETHU!
MATLA!  ARONA!
Dear Uncle George,

Our hearts a warmed

loving New year greetings

to all.

Thank you gratefully

for your letter to us;

"The others" a gift from

regards their best.

Thanks to you - for the
Newspaper cuttings.  
I wish I could in any word convey to you any sort of idea of the immense support your constant loving thought a few
Letters have been to Lyford & was ok. We cannot be grateful enough to you for them & I often think they were the finest anything we have received in breaking down Post Gog -
I enclose you Cattway's autograph!!
My name written by
herself!
From your ears
affects more
than you.
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