

from previous page

He continued that White political apartheid was now under very real siege by economic realities. The non-violent transition from the present apartheid society to one based on the principles of open democracy, would be greatly enhanced by a sustained high rate of economic growth.

"Disinvestment and the economic isolation of South Africa will bring about increased immediate hardships and starvation and will increase disease in the short term, without medium term and long term gains to balance deprivation and suffering."

He told President Reagan that while he believed the responsibility to liberate South Africa was a Black one, he also believed that the West should not under-estimate the desperate need to provide humanitarian aid to suffering communities within the country.

"When ordinary suffering humanity is sustained by aid programmes, more morale in the struggle for liberation rises," he said.

"The raising of Black South African morale is something the West can do

and should do and will I hope accept as a very important input to the struggle."

He added that the value of educational and other aid programmes

"I see today in the US an upsurge of genuine concern about apartheid. But I also see ... the kind of posturing which has been of such little significance in the past."

backed by the United States would have a greatly diminished value if they were based on partisan American assessments of the "Who's Who" in Black South African politics and not on needs and opportunities.

"The need to be blind to Black party political affiliations cannot be over-emphasised. I plead for aid for Black

South African organisations across a broad front of Black South African activity and I ask you Mr President and your administration to do everything that can be done to remove aid to Black South Africa from the American party political arena..."

Newspaper reports considered Chief Buthelezi's meeting with Mr George Schultz "one of the most important discussions of his current visit to the United States" and they described the US Secretary of State as "... the dominant figure in the shaping of US foreign policy."

Chief Buthelezi told President Reagan and Mr Schultz that he believed the US was right in formulating a South African policy but, as yet, the vast majority of Black South Africans were not yet aware of anything meaningful in their own lives which had happened because of constructive engagement.

He urged the US to "give more flesh" to the policy of constructive engagement by increasing US assistance to Blacks.

Who will the US promote in SA?

In an address to the Council of Regents of the University of California, Chief MG Buthelezi asked Americans to think "very carefully" about what kind of political forces they desired to promote in South Africa.

He said he felt the question of the growth of democracy in Black opposition to apartheid had not been adequately debated in the US.

The Reagan Administration's constructive engagement policy had placed the question of apartheid and the question of disinvestment on the American foreign policy agenda.

Apartheid had become a rallying word which was not only used to challenge the American nation at large to do something about racial discrimination in South Africa. It was also, unfortunately, being used in inter-party rivalry.

Moral indignation against apartheid was sweeping the United States but not every expression of that indignation was in fact assisting the Black struggle for liberation in South Africa.

Americans were receiving "different signals" from Black South Africa.

"From the ANC Mission-in-Exile they are told that South Africa should be totally isolated politically, culturally and economically so an armed struggle can succeed in overthrowing the government," Chief Buthelezi said.

"Lobbyists from this section of Black South African opinion demand that the US divest itself from any economic ties with South Africa," he continued.

Other Black organisations, such as the United Democratic Front (UDF) and the Azanian Peoples Organisation (AZAPO), were avowedly bent on making South Africa ungovernable as a means of bringing about radical change.

They also lobbied for the isolation of South Africa and called on Americans to divest.

"However, contrary to the signals received from these

quarters, the signals from Inkatha are that Americans should increase their investment in South Africa.

"Inkatha makes this call because contrary to the ANC Mission-in-Exile and other organisations ... Inkatha aims to bring about radical change through non-violent means and through the politics of negotiation.

"Inkatha sees foreign investment as weighing on the side of the scales in favour of the politics of negotiation.

"Inkatha sees that Western influences which come about with imported capital, management and technology have an uplifting effect and promote Black advancement.

"It believes this uplifting and this promotion is desirable in a situation in which the dependence of Whites on Blacks is beginning to create the climate for the politics of negotiation..."

Americans should realise, Chief Buthelezi emphasised, that the "different signals" they were receiving were because there were radical differences in tactics between the groups.

The ANC Mission-in-Exile, the UDF and AZAPO were anti-capitalist and did not see the need to preserve the economic foundations already laid down by free enterprise in South Africa.

"Thus, whereas Inkatha sees the need for negotiation and continued economic growth which favours negotiation, the other three organisations see the need for economic disruption which favours the politics of confrontation."

On the basis of this, Chief Buthelezi said he believed Americans should "think very carefully" about what kind of political forces they desired to promote in South Africa.

"I find it somewhat anomalous that America, as the greatest democracy on earth with perhaps the most effective free enterprise system on earth, should now very seriously be debating the weakening of free enterprise and democracy in South Africa..."