

political systems, forged in the traumatic nature of the 19th century global human experience. This building arises from the soil of KwaZulu to stand as a symbol of the great achievements of the Zulu people in the past, the achievements of which we are proud and achievements which will yet emerge as one of the most valuable ingredients in national reconciliation. This building stands as a Zulu national achievement of political solidarity. It is for this reason that this building

warms Zulu hearts and the fires of Zulu South African patriotism are kindled.

Whether we like it or not, Zuluness amongst six million people is a profound reality in this country. One cannot talk Zuluness out of the hearts and souls of 6 million people. What is commonly termed the Black Consciousness Movement in the company of White intellectuals and the fully mobilised support from the External Mission of the ANC or a

paltry little force in comparison with the other forces of history which did their damndest to annihilate Zulu identity and to make it subservient to party political needs.

There is absolutely nothing incompatible between Zulu pride and South African patriotism. There is nothing inherently wrong in Zuluness which disqualifies those who are Zulu from playing national roles.

## LABOUR PARTY GIVES PIE-IN-THE-SKY PROMISES, CHIEF BUTHELEZI RESPONDS

ULUNDI — Mr Neil Kinnock, the leader of the Labour Party of Britain, is reported to have made a promise that when the Labour Party returns to power, it will reverse the policy of the Conservatives "which has been to protect, encourage and co-operate with South Africa". During a 50 minute meeting of the House of Commons with Mr Oliver Tambo, the leader of the ANC External Mission, Mr Kinnock also said that the Labour Party's approach would be to "isolate apartheid South Africa and to promote effective action to hasten liberation."

After the meeting, the Anti-Apartheid Movement distributed a statement, wherein Mr Kinnock stated that he was very delighted to have met Mr Tambo and express "the solidarity of the Labour Party with the South African Liberation Movement" in person. He said "We are agreed that while apartheid remained, nobody in Southern Africa can be truly free".



Prince Dr M.G. Buthelezi, President of Inkatha.

Prince Dr M.G. Buthelezi, the President of INKATHA and Chief Minister of KwaZulu responded to Mr Kinnock and said . . .

"We in this House need to remind Great Britain and Mr Kinnock that it was not the Boers who destroyed the Zulu Kingdom. It was Britain acting on the advice of her representatives "to destroy Zulu power once and for all" who

waged a full-scale war against us in 1879. It was Britain who first betrayed us by succumbing to the Natal Colonial Government's pressures to take away KwaZulu's protectorate status. It was Britain who annexed KwaZulu and included us as part of Colonial Natal. Had this not been done we would today probably be in the same position as Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana.

What Afrikaners are now attempting to do by trying to incorporate a big chunk of our territory, Ingwavuma, into Swaziland with no regard to our feelings about the matter is something which as former subjects of Britain they learnt from Britain. We were betrayed yet again when Britain gave South Africa autonomy through the Statute of Westminster unconcerned about whether or not we had a vote in the Union of South Africa. This was a monumental betrayal of us by Great Britain. We were not conquered by the Afrikaners here. Britain handed us over to the Afrikaners on a silver platter.

Our own King Cetshwayo travelled to Britain and informed the British Government about the state of affairs here, and the various delegations which the African National Congress sent to Britain also informed the British Government of our views at the

time of the Act of Union. Britain simply ignored our pleas and abandoned us to the fate we have suffered ever since.

I respect the Labour Party's stand against apartheid, said Chief Buthelezi, but Mr Kinnock must understand that we see this promise to Mr Tambo in the context of Britain's past performance over many generations in this part of Southern Africa. The South African apartheid regime has been at the helm for the last 36 years. During that time various Labour Governments were in power from time to time. Mr Kinnock must understand that we are sceptical of British promises and what they are worth to the oppressed people in South Africa. We are sick and tired of pie-in-the-sky promises by British politicians. We are not impressed when they promise us something while they sit on opposition benches, but which they cannot deliver once they become the ruling Party.

We are not impressed by the performances of consecutive British Governments, including the Labour Government's performances, when 200 000 White settlers in Zimbabwe held our people to ransom for so many years. Mr Kinnock needs to be reminded of this. He needs to be asked what Great Britain did to implement sanctions against Zimbabwe? He needs to be reminded of what the Bingham report tells us. He needs to be asked what reason we have to believe that a Kinnock government will impose sanctions on South Africa? We are aware of how poor Britain has become after the loss of her possessions in faraway lands as a result of the decolonisation process.

At present, British investments in South Africa are estimated to be in the order of five to six Thousand million Rand and Britain's export trade to South Africa is worth about Two Thousand million Rand per annum to her. Does Mr Kinnock in all sincerity believe that he will have the support of British voters if he takes action that makes Britain poorer than she already is? Could Britain bring

South Africa to its knees by the use of sanctions if the Wilson Government could not discipline Ian Smith after he made his unilateral declaration of independence? The British Government then did not have the guts to send the army into Zimbabwe to deal with Ian Smith. I believe a great many lives were lost because Britain had cold feet at the time. Rhodesia was in fact a British colony at the time and had legitimate sovereign rights to deal with Ian Smith and to call a halt to what he was doing. Ironically, it was the Conservative Thatcher Government which finally had the guts to sort out Zimbabwe's political problems.

Zimbabwe withstood the use of sanctions against her (on which even Britain cheated) for so long because she was propped up by South Africa because of her economic muscle. I would like to suggest, said Chief Buthelezi, that Mr Kinnock visits South Africa to see the situation here for himself before he makes ex cathedra statements on what a Labour Government should or should not do if and when he takes over the British reigns. We blacks of South Africa are no longer impressed by mere words, words and words. We know from experience, particularly after Zimbabwe, that the British people are human beings like us. They are no angels and are heirs to all human failings. No amount of unrealistic pontifications will satisfy us any longer.

Britain has her own economic problems. Would the British voters allow Mr Kinnock to compound them for our sakes when he takes over? Does Mr Kinnock love us so much that he expects us to believe him when he says that he will be able to make British voters sacrifice their interests for our interests? Where does this newly-found love come from in view of the history I have just recalled. Has Britain at last discovered her morality?

We here appreciate that expressions of abhorrence of apartheid must be made here and abroad at all times. But we have learned the hard way during the more than 30

years of apartheid rule that verbal condemnation alone does not do much to alter our situation. We have always appreciated what the British Government has been doing through the British Council. We wish that it would do more for our students. We wish that it did more for our development in general, whether it be in the area of agriculture, health or education. We do not underestimate what has been done, and continues to be done, but we do need less radical rhetoric and more action on the ground.

I am pleased to notice, said Chief Buthelezi, that Mr Kinnock has at last grasped the truth of what I have been stating over many years. This is that the true liberation of Southern Africa will only take place when South Africa is liberated. Mr Kinnock must ask himself to what extent his proposed actions to isolate South Africa will also harm the people of Mocambique, Botswana, Swaziland and Lesotho. He must do so in the context of the Nkomati Accord and in the context of his own statement that while apartheid remained nobody in Southern Africa can be truly free. Is it not a fact that the precarious position of a country such as Lesotho necessitates the budgetary grants which Great Britain even now gives them? Is Mr Kinnock not satisfied that the monster of apartheid has sharp and dangerous teeth which is bared only a few months ago when the borders of Lesotho were closed by South Africa? Can Britain afford to take Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland on to her lap if South Africa again slams her doors in the faces of our brothers and sisters in these countries?

What Mr Kinnock offered our brothers in the External Mission of ANC is more than yet another pie-in-the-sky promise. The international community, including Great Britain, has offered us these pies in the sky for generations. Mr Kinnock's undertaking to our brother, Mr Tambo, is no more than something which is meant to cushion the effect of the Nkomati Accord on the operations of the External Mission of the ANC from Mocambique and other neigh-

bouring States. It is no more and no less than that. If Mr Kinnock were to promise the External Mission of the ANC the kind of military hardware which the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries give to them, then and then only will we take him seriously.

We are not impressed when we hear that Mr Kinnock is reported to have stated that the Labour Party would give financial and material assistance to the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia. We are not impressed when he says: "And by extending and tightening the arms embargoes and actively supporting the imposition of United Nations comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions, we will work to end the military collaboration which is so essential to the apartheid regime". Are we

expected to believe that Mr Kinnock is not aware of just how self-sufficient South Africa is as far as armaments are concerned? Are we expected to believe that Mr Kinnock is unaware that South Africa is today the largest manufacturer of arms in the whole of the Southern hemisphere?

South Africa is not made vulnerable by pie-in-the-sky promises which never materialise. It is clear that we have to mount a more serious opposition than we have in the past within the country itself. While we are not opposed to any help that the Labour Party or anyone else gives to the External Mission of the ANC, we ask for more sincerity than has been evident in the statements such as those made by Mr Kinnock. Let Mr Kinnock give our brothers who are committed to the armed struggle what they need to carry out that

armed struggle and that is arms. But if they accept that the struggle must be waged more seriously and vehemently within South Africa itself, let them not confine assistance to the external forces of change. Let them help the forces of change such as Inkatha and other Black political organisations that operate within South Africa itself. They must assist internal forces if they are serious in their determination to help the Black people of South Africa to achieve their freedom. Too many people in the West posture for their own constituencies at home when it comes to the South African question. We have had enough of this posturing and I think it is my duty to point out that mere posturing is not good enough for us.