





# Cameron Design

59 HARRINGTON STREET  
CAPE TOWN  
8001

Hi Albie,

We would like to incorporate any changes or suggestions you might have before we do the final corrections and layout.

So please excuse the typos - they will all be eliminated on the final copy!

Thanks - Antene.

WITH COMPLIMENTS

PHONE 4623910/11  
FAX 4623912  
PO BOX 17191  
REGENT ROAD 8061

spective but truly as a national issue. Just as apartheid penetrates through to every aspect of South African life, so must the struggle against apartheid be all-pervasive; it is first and foremost a battle for political rights, but it is also about the quality of life in a new South Africa. It is not just playing with metaphors to say that we are fighting to free the land, the sky, the waters as well as the people.

The overall problem is to try and find the connections between the immediate world in which every individual lives and the broad planet on which we all exist. For people for whom the immediate environment is catastrophic and harmful, it's actually easier to make the connections about the hidden dangers to the environment than for people who live in comfort and luxury. People who have been lied to all their lives are more accepting of the deceptions that were involved, as they have a strong mistrust of government, employers and manufacturers. The difference would be to evoke a sense of meaningful interest, not just a vague kind of sentimental interest in the environment.

For example, the question of water is overwhelming for some people; they're either flooded out or can't get clean water and have to walk for miles to fetch water. The problem of water and the environment isn't simply a question of hidden pollutants, it's a question of access to clean water. People understand about about dirty water and the importance of boiling water and cleanliness and so on. Clearly if one wants a water consciousness to develop in the whole population you can't do that without relating it to the question of access to water which has immediate implications. I wish that people concerned with the environment in the broad sense would take more interest in the environment in the immediate sense. The question of management of scarce resources is something that poor people know much more about than the rich. It's the rich who despoil and utilise resources and throw away in a massive way, whilst the poor pick up the abandoned scraps and conserve everything.

A.C.: Do you think that solutions for this country is to evolve as a First World entity or to develop itself at a grass roots level?

A.S.: There are aspects of what's called First World society that can be helpful for human development and for the conservation. If you look at the question of energy: if with the population that we have, with their needs and interests, and we rely simply on burning wood, then this is going to be devastating to the environment. Coal is also devastating to the environment, it pollutes, it's dangerous, smelly and expensive. So from that point of view electrification, I think, is a policy that ought to be adopted and as the main source of energy. The question is not whether you have electrification or not, but how to create a way that doesn't cause damage to non-renewable resources and to the general environment? One builds into electrification with both hydro-electricity and coal-fired power stations the question of clean air has to be part and parcel of the cost of the energy and has to be built in as soon as possible. I'm not sure that it's useful to make this First World/Third World kind of distinction and if Third World means that the people who've benefited from First World technology till now continue to benefit in future, and the people who have been excluded and ignored and forced to live in what is called Third World circumstances continue to do so, then it's going to be disruptive and harmful.

A.C.: Does the ANC see the development of an educational policy with the recommendation that conservation is structured into existing school curricula? If it does, would it constitute a subject in itself or would it attain a certain ubiquity within all school subjects?

A.S.: I sense among educationalists a considerable environmental awareness. So, in principle one won't be overcoming obstacles to get it integrated into the curriculum. There are certain subjects that already exist where it would fit in. Funny, we used to have a thing called Nature Study and then Nature Study got replaced by Biology. Biology sounded more scientific. Maybe we should go back to Nature Study. The content is basically the same, but it can be understood in a broader sense.

It's not simply learning about stamens and pollens and how the birds and bees do it. It would be integrated into the whole concept of the planet, the world which we live, the air we breathe and ourselves as part of that. I would urge that environmental consciousness be introduced into all subjects. In history the devastation of continents and countries should be covered. It would certainly come into geography and into the study of human beings which, I seem to remember, was actually rather neglected at school. We learned very little about ourselves, our bodies, certainly nothing about our minds and emotions and nothing about our place in the world, which is what education should be about. It would be a pity if it was simply studied as a course for which you got marks and passed an exam. What one wants is an environmental awareness that enters into the daily life of the school and the pupils' attitude towards waste conservation and specific materials. We used to learn a lot about cleanliness and that cleanliness was next to godliness and to 'keep your school tidy'. An enormous amount of energy went into that, with rather scant results as far as I can remember. That same kind of morality in daily life and the habits of daily life could be brought out into something a bit more meaningful, like conservation.

A.C.: A quote from the World Conservation Strategy states: "A new ethic embracing plants and animals as well as people, is required for human societies to live in harmony with the natural world on which they depend for survival and well-being. The long-term task of environmental education is to foster or reinforce attitudes and behaviour compatible with this new ethic".

Recently there's been a lot of focus on our country's game reserves where the white rich drive around in lush vegetation observing wildlife while on the other side of the fence the rural people starve through lack of resources. Is it your party's blueprint to change the status quo, and if so, how?

A.S.: The question of the future of the game parks is getting special attention, as they are an important natural resource, not simply because of tourism but because they're part of our country. We would like all our people to have a sense of access and to glory in the diversity of the fauna and the flora and so on. The problem is to open up the areas to tourism, so that it's not simply for rich tourists and for whites but so that all our people have access. The other aspect that's flagrant is that many people who traditionally have relied on hunting for a certain source of food supply are cut off. People find also that land which they've used for agriculture is being used now simply for game. The game have priority and there's generally a lack of employment opportunities for many people living in the vicinity of the game parks. Steps have been taken already in some areas to have an integrated approach towards the environment, addressing the need for employment and conservation. There has to be extensive participation of people on the ground. There mustn't be programmes for them, they must be part and parcel of the decision-making. They must benefit from the programmes economically in terms of life-style and personal dignity. We will encourage that process, so that there isn't an inevitable conflict between livelihood and a sense of belonging, of the people living on the outskirts of the game parks on the one hand and the conservation of parks and tourism on the other.

*Whatever happens, the fauna and flora reserves are assets beyond price and must be conserved.*

A.C.: On a recent visit to the Okavango swamps it was obvious, even with the drought-stricken conditions, that people living outside the fence were creating quite a bit of havoc to the environment because of the tradition of keeping cattle and goats which actually don't belong there, while on the other side of the fence the game were in comparatively healthy bushveld considering the eight year drought, because they feed differentially. Even from an economic point of view: for one head of cattle I think they get about R600, whereas one springbok could fetch R2000. Would it not be better maybe to reintroduce indigenous species to the people living on the land rather than to let them farm cattle and goats?

A.S.: I can't speak for Botswana. I know what's complicated the position in this country is that people haven't had basic rights. They haven't had the vote, they're not involved in local government. The

people who were put there from the black communities were mostly corrupt and uninterested and by and large have a terrible record of mismanagement, inefficiency and corruption. So what one really wants is local government that functions in a democratic way with a lot of participation. People are not stupid, they will see the advantages of the extra food supply that they can get, the extra income they can earn and I'm sure they will respond, but they must be part and parcel of the process. It must not be some programme which is worked out in some remote office, for then they are told they are stupid because they are not doing what's in their own best interests. You had all sorts of betterment schemes in the past that were imposed in that way which had the effect of really limiting the number of cattle that people could have. But they saw white farmers with huge herds of cattle and so people resisted. What one's dealing with now is a new system of government, a new concept of human rights, employment rights and economic rights of people in relation to the land. It's all part of a comprehensive package. Clearly the example you have given sounds like a very good example: where the respect for indigenous fauna and flora goes together with conservation and with economic advantages. It mightn't always be possible to do that. We can't regard cattle in South Africa or maize as alien animals and alien vegetation. Can you imagine forbidding South Africans to grow maize because it came from South America? It's inconceivable.

A.C.: What is your stance on population control?

Is it perceived as a mechanism amongst whites to control black supremacy in terms of numbers, or do blacks understand it as a question of economics and sustainable growth?

A.S.: I think the starting point on any discussion on population control has to be human rights. If population control is seen as some enforceable method of getting people to have fewer children, then it's disastrous. It violates human rights and it doesn't work. If limiting the number of children is seen by people, particularly women, as a great advantage, then it works. The fundamental question is the rights of women to control fertility as a matter of choice. Access to contraception and safe childbirth is part and parcel of that, as is the right to choose to not have unwanted children. I would personally say it's very important. There isn't a final ANC policy yet on the question of abortion, but in any event I don't think abortion should ever be a key method of population control; Where women all over the world have access to education and employment as a matter of choice, that's been the greatest factor in reducing the number of births. As somebody put it: "DEVELOPMENT IS THE BEST PILL", and I think we would all go along with that. In the case of South Africa the population question comes through in a most unfortunate way: the pressure is on black families to be smaller, not on white families. It's the whites who consume resources in this country and particularly non-renewable resources. I think that in absolute terms, the whites, being only 15% of the population, consume more non-renewable resources than blacks do. So population control shouldn't be an issue. What can be said is that smaller families give the children, whatever the background, a better chance in life. But the key to any form of limiting the size of the families is the informed volition of women.

*and they are in a position to act on their decisions*

*promiscuously*

A.C.: The wealth of South African citizens is greatly affected by existing laws regarding land tenure. Does the ANC have any intention of changing the status quo in this regard?

A.S.: We're doing a lot of work on this. The old Roman Dutch law system actually included the phrase "the owner has the right ( ius utendi et abutendi) - to use and abuse the land". There could be no greater right than that: you could dig holes in it, you could burn it down, you could destroy it. That was the classical Roman Dutch law that we inherited, and to a large extent it still survives. It's only subject to certain planning permissions, controls which apply at specific times. You can't do it in a way which damages your neighbour. We need to look at the concept of multiple use of land. Many people can have guaranteed rights and interest in the land. You can't expand the amount of land you've got, as it is a finite resource. The present ownership is so grossly unequal and unjust it has to be changed. One way of changing it is not by simply transferring absolute ownership from one group

*We need an active population policy that encourages smaller families as a matter of choice not compulsion.*

to the other, but by extending the range of interests and rights that different people can have on the same piece of land. Communal forms of tenure need to be studied. They do exist in certain parts of the country already, where land is legally held in trust by the chiefs on behalf of the whole community and there are many advantages to that type of system. There are disadvantages as well. The big disadvantage is getting any security for building a domestic commercial development and there's always the possibility of corruption. But the advantage is that the land is seen as a whole and the actual boundaries and fences, to some extent, are less important. The concept of the land being in trust for the whole community is a very positive one and works favourably environmentally. But because of the great overcrowding, there has been the reality that the plots tend to be too small, they're under-resourced and over-utilised. So it's not the tenure system alone that's going to conserve those areas. But I think that attention can be paid to the idea of communal or group ownership of tracts of land not only in existing Bantustans, but maybe in other areas as well. Where it fits in with the culture of the people and where people want it. It's not an argument for collective farms however.

A.C.: What about redistribution of existing ownership? Are you not going to force people to sell part of their land?

A.S.: We have quite elaborately developed ideas on redistribution. It will be done through a court, a land claims tribunal. Some people would have a claim as of right: those people who have been expelled from land in recent times would get the land back. They wouldn't be paid compensation. There might be compensation for existing title holders. Then you are going to need guaranteed rights for people who have lived on land for a century or more, whose great-great-great-grandparents were often given titles by Paul Kruger and other leaders of the time and who are now regarded as squatters with no rights at all. They also have rights and can't be expelled. They have rights to utilise plots and have security in relation to their homesteads and to reconcile that with the rights of the existing title holders. There has to be a legal framework. Then there's unused land. There are lots of questions that have to be gone into, and the question all along will be to build in the green factor wherever possible. People are telling us, in fact, that family farming can be more productive than the existing large scale farming and it tends to be less devastating to the soil. But what one really wants is productive use of the land, bearing in mind conservation of the soil.

A.C.: In the light of the fact that the profit motive cannot ensure sympathetic environmental consideration, what does the ANC intend to do to prevent exploitation and pollution of our natural resources?

A.S.: We are told that the world can't live without the profit motive and that it's the driving force of everything, and if we even raise an eyebrow at that we are accused of being radicals and who knows what. The fact is that it looks as though profits are going to be with us always, so what that means is that you try to create incentives for conservation and disincentives for anything which is harmful to the environment. If one could rely simply on that it would be wonderful. But experience in other countries, particularly countries with powerful market economies, suggests that is not enough. In other words, if there could be pure voluntary adherence to environmental codes, and the industrialists and the people involved in the extractive industries, and so on, would accept voluntary reduction of profits for the sake of conserving the environment, then one mightn't need strict environmental laws. But experience everywhere has proved exactly the opposite. It's not enough to have a few managers or directors of boards who have got a 'green' awareness. It's always a question of getting the right balance; but in the end the profits will come and go, There is only one earth and it has to survive.

A.C.: The present government has had no environmental policy as such and the few laws they do have are unco-ordinated and poorly implemented, whilst the ANC does have an excellent environ-

*like the poor, if not always, then for a long, long time.*

*##*

*#*

mental policy. How do you intend to ensure that it's properly enforced?

A.S.: There are three essential elements. The first one is very strong NGO's, and public involvement and concern. It's important partly to keep up the pressure, and to have people literally on the ground at grass roots, ~~who knows what's going on~~. The second is a strong right to information. That has to be built into government at every level. People must know what's going on and the right to information must apply not only to government. It must be strong enough to compel industrialists and other people, whose activities naturally impinge upon the environment, to come clean. Thirdly it's going to be necessary to train people to be whistle-blowers all over the place, attached to government, keeping their eyes and ears open all the time, in touch with the NGO's and just watching out for what's happening, but with the necessary technical expertise to understand and to be well-informed. I would say these are the key factors. We are discussing the whole question now of what structures in government would be best to ensure that proper attention is paid at all levels, ~~to the environment~~. In other words, should we have a separate department or should environmental people be put into every department? There has to be meaningful involvement, but how do you organise it? Is it better to have a separate watchdog with a global responsibility, or do you have little pockets, ~~as it were~~, in every ministry and in every department, or do you have some combination of both?

*This would be the fourth factor.*  
*Demagogic*

We need to look to the future, without making empty promises. If ever there was an area which requires integrity, that's been messed up by a lot of words and fancy phrases and democratic statements, ~~now~~ it's the area of the environment, and we have to be careful ourselves. While we are enthusiastic about it, we must not succumb to that temptation. *to promise everything while we are out of power, and do nothing ~~while~~ when we are in office.*

A.C.: How much of you annual budget do you intend to allocate to environmental issues? In the previous issue of Earthyear it came across that the present government, while they spend 23% of their budget on defence, spend 03% of their budget on conservation.

A.S.: I think there has to be a total review of the defence budget. Anyhow its not only that it's involved colossal wastage of money for very negative purposes (to deny people their rights in the townships, to terrorize people and to invade neighbouring countries), there have been vast expenditures on weapons of destruction which we don't need. But a particular area which we will have to look into will be the area of nuclear energy and the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. ANC policy has been against that for a long time and I trust that this will be maintained. What does South Africa need nuclear weapons for? There are also other aspects such as testing happening right now at Rooi Els.

There you get this combination of vast expense and destruction to a very beautiful area and lies and deceit. Promises are made about huge sums, that South Africa is going to be in the first league of the nations of the world, as we are going to export so much. You know, I just don't believe a word of it. The army uses state-owned land because they don't have to pay for it. If we can bring an end to this kind of thing it doesn't necessarily mean we are spending more money on the environment, but we are doing fewer things that are damaging to the environment in the name of defence.

*reduce*

I am not sure how one calculates the money spent on the environment: I suppose it would come in two ways: you spend a certain sum of money specifically on calculated programmes to protect the environment, but one also wants programmes of a more negative nature, that ~~don't~~ have the effect of impinging negatively on the environment. We've got to have experts. I'm discovering now that I personally, as Albie, can have a certain sensibility and general views, but I always have to run to experts to find out: is this damaging or not? You need a lot of technical know-how about the marine environment, about the sea-shore, about air, about water, and what things really mean.

A.C.: In his book "Private Power: Multi-national Corporations and their role in the survival of our planet", Axel Mercken asserts that global enterprise stands in stunning contrast to government power. The fastest economic growth is in countries where governments stay out of technology's way — progress lags wherever it is subject to bureaucracy.

National governments are inadequate when it comes to dealing with the planet's necessities. This country has had an abysmal history of nationalisation of the central services, resulting in expensive, inefficient systems which we have all had to suffer, of excessive bureaucracy blocking initiative and communication flow, of mysterious boards keeping prices of essential goods such as meat and dairy products at astronomically inflated prices. How does the ANC intend to avoid these pitfalls, especially when they tend to favour even more nationalisation and bureaucracy?

A.S.: I think governments must do the things governments are good at and let the market do the things that the market is good at. Governments are not good at making attractive, cheap shoes; let the market do that and the people choose. But markets are not good at providing basic education, health, road systems the general infrastructure for the country. In this country it's particularly important that government takes on that responsibility, which it's provided for decades. A Government has a very big role to play in protecting the environment and establishing a legal framework to prevent the despoliation of the environment. In terms of bureaucracy, I think that nobody has suffered more than the black people of South Africa from the behaviour of bureaucrats. It's bureaucrats who've told people where they can live, forced them to carry passes, controlled every aspect and every detail of their lives. So people want freedom, they want choice, they want the right to pursue personal initiatives, to pursue happiness in their way, and from that point of view we want much less government than there's been in the past. Also there's a multiplicity of boards which were set up basically to promote interests of the white farmers, and they've established monolies of one form or another and these have the effect of keeping out black farmers and small traders in general. There's quite a strong move on the way already to do away with them or diminish them, and I sense from people working in the sphere of economics that they are not going to fight to the death to preserve the Banana Board and so on.

*The question is not whether or not to have government, but how to have good government.*

As far as nationalisation is concerned: at our recent conference on general policy a few months ago, in 1992, we said that economic policy is really driven by the need to have economic growth in a way that will help satisfy the needs of the broad mass of the population. We're not committed to any particular modality or form, and we're certainly not looking to any programme of nationalisation to solve the major problems here.

A.C.: Would you like to run the country?

A.S.: No, I'd just like to get a decent cup of coffee on South African Airways!

..

~~I am not sure how one calculates the money spent on the environment: I suppose it is the money that is lost through the loss of the environment. Progress lags wherever it is subject to bureaucracy. National governments are inadequate when it comes to dealing with the planet's necessities.~~

*ends*