ARTICLE FOR THE CITIZEN

- Dr. F. Van Zyl Slabbert, M.P. 15 September 1983

English-speaking voters are being encouraged to vote "yes" on November 2nd by being told that a no-vote would be interpreted as a victory for the right-wing and support for Dr. Andries Treurnicht. In terms of the available evidence that we have from opinion polls and surveys, this is a totally illogical argument. For example, in Rapport of Sunday, 11 September we have screaming headlines saying "It is yes - English speaking voters are also with the Government". Further on we read that it says 67% of the voters would vote "yes" and 32% would vote "no"; and that the major reason for there being a successful yes-vote is the supposed support of the English-speaking voters for such a yes-vote.

If, therefore, by November 2nd the situation changes to the extent that the no-vote is successful, then it is equally obvious that that no-vote was successful because many of those English speakers who had committed themselves to a yes-vote would have changed their minds - or else it would mean that the average National Party supporter would have left the National Party in droves sufficient to strengthen the Conservative Party. There is no evidence to back this latter trend.

About 6 weeks ago in another edition of Rapport, a survey was published in which the state of the parties reflected that the
Conservative Party had dropped to 12.8% of white electoral support and not increased. The PFP stood at approximately 19% plus and the HNP at 2.5%. If all these are added up, the total doesn't come near to 50%. So, if there is going to be a successful no-vote and if this is going to be interpreted as a victory for the C.P. and Andries Treurnicht, then there would have been a massive turn-about. But, there is no sign of this at the present time.

I wish to make it very, very clear to all the voters, and in particular to the English-speaking voters, that if they vote "yes" on November 2nd, they are not stopping Andries Treurnicht; they are voting for a new constitution for the Republic of South Africa - and it is a National Party constitution. Let there be no doubt about that.

A second reason that is given why particularly English-speaking voters must vote "yes" on November 2nd, is that a no-vote would stop reform in its tracks. Again, this is a totally illogical argument. Nobody has argued persuasively why the constitution in particular is going to be an effective instrument to bring about reform. In fact, even those newspapers who have come out with a qualified "yes" for the constitution, spend a great deal of time explaining why the constitution is fatally flawed, an abortion and why perhaps the fact that it cannot even work might be the most promising thing about it.

Therefore, if a no-vote is going to stop reform in its tracks, the alternative should surely be explained, namely that a yes-vote
will be a major impetus towards reform. And, in order to prove this, one has to look at the constitution itself as being the factor responsible for bringing about such reform. This is where we reach a fundamental paradox in the whole argument. Surely reform is going to have to do with the removal of racial discrimination, and anybody who comes into this new constitution will be interested in bringing about the removal of racially discriminatory measures. However, part and parcel of the new constitution are discriminatory laws such as the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act. The irony of the whole situation is that even those Coloured and Indian leaders who have expressed very strong conditions for their possible participation in the new constitution have made it quite clear that they will be coming in with the expressed intention of changing the constitution in these vital areas.

In order words, what they are saying is that they will first have to reform the constitution before they will be able to reform South Africa. Or, to put it differently, you can only have reform in South Africa if you reform the constitution. What is the point of all this then?

Again, I wish to make it clear to those who are going to vote "yes" on November 2nd: they would be voting "yes" to a constitution that is riddled with discrimination, and not "yes" to reform in South Africa.