

MC 1911-43-4-8

Fax (021) 222626  
Tel (021) 222424

1002 NBS Waldorf  
80 St George's Mall  
P O Box 3684  
CAPE TOWN 8000

**FAX COVER SHEET**

**DATE** : 14 OCTOBER 1992

**TO** : ANC H.Q.  
DEPT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FAX NO : 011-3339090

**ATTENTION** : BILLY COBBETT

**SUBJECT** : DOCUMENT ON REGIONS

**FROM** : ALBIE SACHS

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE):** 3

---

*Merrett - faced word on - for comments  
but are proceeding*

## DISCUSSION DOCUMENT : REGIONAL POLICY

### COMMENTS BY ALBIE SACHS

Dear Comrades

The document reached me late, so at Zola's request I am sending my personal comments directly to you.

1. The document reads well and I think is basically sufficiently well focussed and well articulated to go out for discussion purposes.
2. The form in which I got it seemed a little jumbled with pages out of place and possibly pages missing.
3. Its main strength lies in its presentation of the arguments for a regional policy based on development. It also makes a major contribution in relation to the whole question of so-called fiscal federalism.
4. The paper is relatively weak on the political dimension. This is where the debate is being concentrated inside and outside the country. I think that this area needs to be strengthened. We need to say that it is a healthy constitutional and democratic principle not to concentrate too much power in too few hands in any country. The paper does not deal with regional representation at the level of national government (possible regional as well as national lists for the lower house and direct regional representation in the upper house). The whole question of soft boundaries and hard boundaries is not just a spatial one but a jurisdictional/functional/law-making one, that is, the vertical boundaries should also be soft.
5. The theme on the role of civil society is barely touched upon. We have creative things to say in this area. (See the note I sent the other day.)
6. The question of boundary-fixing is not well-developed in the version I have. I understood our position to be that there would be agreement on the basic number and siting of regions but that a delimitation commission would determine the exact boundaries, for example, in relation to East Griqualand.
7. I think the status of this document should be made clear from the beginning. These are not positions that we propose to negotiate now with the Government. We are simply trying to determine ANC policy so that when the Constituent Assembly meets we will have developed ideas and formulations to put on the table.
8. I would love at a later stage to be able to work with yourselves on the final style of the document. Perhaps I could sit down with you after comments have been received from the regions, to cooperate with the production of the final document to be presented at the conference, taking into account comments made by the regions.

9. One point that I meant to make at the small workshop last week - the adoption of the idea of ten regions did not spring from simply accepting the nine Development Bank regions. What struck us was the overlap between ANC regions, which were worked out by the ANC in ignorance of the DB regions, and these nine regions. For tactical purposes some of us thought that it would strengthen our case for the regions we wanted, if we said that they corresponded basically to the Development Bank regions. I mention this not to pre-empt the debate over ten or sixteen regions, which I think is a most fruitful one, but simply to put the record straight. It would have been difficult to argue that the ANC regions should serve as the basis for the country's regions - that would have looked like an ANC takeover. I think the formulation in the text perpetuates the misrepresentation of the position in relation to how the ten regions were arrived at.

Warm greetings.

ALBIE

*Albie*

*14/10/92*

REPEAT P.S. TO BILLY - Have you followed through on Steve Merrett??!