

QUESTIONS FOR DEURBRAAK

1. WAS THE ISSUE OF POWER-SHARING REALLY THE CAUSE OF THE SPLIT IN THE NP OR WERE THERE OTHER FACTORS AT PLAY AS WELL?

I do not believe that the issue of power-sharing as such was really the fundamental cause of the split in the National Party. Even now, we are not quite sure exactly what is meant by the concept of "healthy power-sharing". What we saw happen here was more the case of a number of factors building up into a tension situation which eventually was precipitated into a split as a result of a remark made by the Prime Minister. For a long time now we have seen the gradual breakdown or disintegration of so-called social and economic apartheid, and this has led to a great deal of unhappiness within the National Party. On the part of some, the feeling started developing that the initiative for segregation was slipping away from the National Party. That is why, when there was a move on the constitutional level towards some form of co-operation and joint decision-making, the tensions within the National Party increased.

2. HOW DOES THE PFP'S CONCEPT OF POWER-SHARING DIFFER FROM P.W. BOTHA'S SO-CALLED "HEALTHY" POWER-SHARING?

The National Party's concept of healthy power-sharing is confined largely to the limited degree of joint decision-making that is contained in the 1977 proposals. And this form of joint decision-making is further limited to Coloureds, Asians and Whites only. The PFP, on the other hand, obviously believes in a concept of power-sharing that relates to all the different population groups in South Africa within the same constitution in which all people, irrespective of race, will participate in the political system without one group dominating the other.

3. IS THE NP NOW A PURIFIED AND ENLIGHTENED PARTY, FREE FROM THE BRAKING EFFECT OF DR. TREURNICHT AND HIS VERKRAMPTES? WHY WON'T YOU ENCOURAGE VERLIGTE VOTERS TO LEAVE THE OPPOSITION AND GO AND SUPPORT P.W. BOTHA?

The National Party, to a certain extent, is more purified but not necessarily more enlightened than it was. The split has made reform more probable but by no means inevitable. Within the ranks of the National Party there are still a number of people who feel exactly the same as those who have broken away. But let us assume that all of them have moved out - then it is still not quite clear what the rest really feel about reform and in which direction such reform should take place. If that is simply confined to the 1977 proposals, then there is absolutely no reason to enthuse that the National Party, having purified itself of its right wing, is any more an instrument of reform than before the purification took place. And therefore all the reasons that I have put forward for not supporting the National Party, remain equally valid.

4. DO YOU EXPECT FURTHER BREAKAWAYS FROM THE NP AND, IF SO, WHAT FACTORS WILL CAUSE THESE BREAKAWAYS?

I believe that we will see some more breakaways from within the National Party. The underlying reasons for the re-alignment taking place are exactly the same as those which led to a re-alignment taking place in white opposition politics. I believe the same questions are now presenting themselves to supporters of the National Party. These questions refer to the same fundamental problem, namely a division between those who believe that we are going to resolve our problems through a process of negotiation as against those who believe and accept that confrontation is inevitable.

5. WITH THE BROEDERTWIS DOMINATING THE POLITICAL SCENE, IS THE PFP NOT IN DANGER OF BEING IGNORED AND BECOMING IRRELEVANT?

On the contrary, I think we have an opportunity here to keep the PFP right in the forefront of the debate. We must remember that the issue on which, ostensibly, the Treurnicht group broke away, is a concept which is central to our political philosophy, namely the concept of power-sharing and this is an opportunity for the PFP to continually put forward what it sees to be the real issues of power-sharing as against the issues which the Treurnicht group believes to be the issues of power-sharing and, on the other hand, the issues which the National Party talks about. So I think the PFP can in fact come out of this much stronger if they seize the opportunity.

6. WHAT SHOULD BE THE PFP'S ROLE IN THE SPLIT?

Here, I think, we should perform a two-fold function - on the one hand, to continually protest against and reject any form of racism or swart gevaar which undoubtedly will be the strategy used by the Treurnicht group but, on the other hand, to keep on encouraging and persuading the Government to go for systematic reform and not to see itself hog-tied by its own right wing, even though that right wing is now outside the National Party.

7. HOW RELEVANT IS THE SPLIT IN THE CONTEXT OF BLACK AND WHITE POLITICS?

Anything that has an impact or effect on the concentration and control of political power in South Africa, is of significance within the context of black/white politics. There is no doubt in my mind that this split could have a profound impact on future developments. If the Prime Minister, for example, seizes the initiative, now that he is in a position of being able to jettison the right wing, for introducing systematic reform, it can have wide-ranging effects on white/black relationships as well as

improving black life-chances. After all, what is reform in the final analysis all about? Reform is about a government using its position of power to introduce systematic developments away from confrontation and conflict. There is no way in which such reforms can come about without a significant change in the attitude of those who govern.

8. WILL THE SPLIT AND THE BROEDERTWIS CONTRIBUTE TO THE POLITICS OF SIEGE OR NEGOTIATION?

At present we are poised on a knife-edge for either possibility.

I am slightly pessimistic about negotiation.

It all depends, of course, ^{on} what the Government is going to do as a result of the split. Is it going to spend all its time placating the right wing in order to re-establish Afrikaner nationalist unity or is it going to use this opportunity to confront the right wing and move systematically for reform? This is, of course, what we all hope.

9. IF DR. TREURNICHT'S CONSERVATIVE PARTY SHOULD, IN THE NEAR FUTURE, FORM A DIRECT THREAT TO THE NP'S POSITION OF POWER, WILL YOU BE WILLING TO FORM SOME SORT OF ALLIANCE OR WORKING ARRANGEMENT WITH THE NP TO KEEP TREURNICHT OUT OF POWER? IF SO, ON WHAT TERMS?

I think this question is premature. A country does not talk itself into a coalition. The coalition comes about as a result of force of circumstances. I have declared publicly, many times, that I am willing to support any group or movement, including the Government, if it promotes the politics of negotiation and if it brings about reform on the basis of full citizenship rights for all South Africans, irrespective of race or ethnicity, effective political participation for all persons, irrespective of race or ethnicity without one group

dominating the other, no statutory discrimination and voluntary group association on the part of the individual. If this becomes the line of development supported by the Government, then I will support the actions that they perform in bringing it about.

--- oOo ---

29 March 1982