

# The case for Inkatha

It is not surprising that there is a great deal of confusion in some quarters about the national cultural liberation movement, Inkatha, led by Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi.

Recently, for instance, *The Star* in one issue (January 31) published a Page 8 denial by Inkatha of any involvement in so-called "vigilante" groups in Leandra. On Page 12, however, journalist Jo-Anne Collinge wrote with some authority about "so-called 'Inkatha' gangs" in Leandra and "pitched battles between gun-toting 'Inkatha' members and ... supporters".

Ms Collinge did not make it clear that the reason she put the name "Inkatha" in quotes was because there was no proof that the real Inkatha movement was involved. In short, what she should have said, but didn't, was that there were allegations that a gun-toting gang calling itself "Inkatha" was running amok in the Leandra area. Inkatha officials had, however, denied that any Inkatha members were implicated in any way.

Ms Collinge had not, in fact, contacted Inkatha to hear its side of the story — hence this lengthy explanation of Inkatha's views and its rebuttal of allegations which, to put it mildly, somewhat smear the good name of the movement.

To be fair, Ms Collinge was not the only one who made the same "mistake". Another newspaper went further and said that not only had an "Inkatha" gang murdered Chief Ampie Mayisa in Leandra but that the "vigilante" group was paid R10 000 to do so.

So ready were some to believe this libel that even the Anglican Bishop Suffragan of Johannesburg, Bishop Simeon Nkoane, was quoted in the Press as telling US Assistant Secretary of State Dr Chester Crocker that "... Mayisa's attackers were members of Inkatha, the powerful and politically conservative organisation led by Chief Buthelezi".

So now Inkatha stands accused not only of having "vigilantes" but, even worse, of being involved in paid "death squads".

The facts of the matter are that Inkatha does not have a branch in Leandra or anywhere near it. Furthermore, the poor unfortunate man who

By Dr  
Oscar  
Dhlomo  
(right),  
secretary  
general of  
Inkatha



was hacked to death in Leandra for being an "Inkatha" member was not a member of Inkatha.

In short, Inkatha denies any involvement in the tragic murders and mayhem in Leandra. Inkatha does not have "vigilante" groups, nor does it support these so-called "extra-legal agencies".

So why, readers may well ask, was Inkatha's name dragged into the issue in the first place? And why are some people only too willing to perpetuate this slander? To explain this one must move away for a moment from the sordid subject of "vigilantes" into the bloodier arena of politics in South Africa today.

Inkatha has a total membership of 1 155 094. No other political organisation in the country, black or white, can prove so many paid-up supporters. And here lies the rub. Inkatha's strength is feared in many quarters. Respected, of course, in others.

The main protagonists in a well-organised campaign to erode Inkatha's power base are the ANC mission in exile and the United Democratic Front. This is a simple statement of fact.

The UDF and its leaders and patrons, including prominent churchmen who openly call for support for the ANC, leave no stone unturned in their attempts to denounce Chief Buthelezi and Inkatha.

## Strategies differ

Numerous documents and verbatim statements in possession of Inkatha indicate that as far as Inkatha and Chief Buthelezi are concerned, these men of the cloth definitely do not "love thy brother". Working in tandem, supporters of the ANC and the UDF have mounted a highly sophisticated campaign of denigration and vilification against Inkatha. The reason is really quite simple. Strategies differ.

Where the use of violence is concerned the UDF has, since its inception, set about to make the country ungovernable and the ANC has been waging a so-called "armed struggle" for decades. Inkatha is committed to non-violence and the politics of negotiation.

The UDF does not espouse the free enterprise capitalist system, nor does the ANC. Inkatha does. The UDF supports sanctions against South Africa

### The Sunday Star JAN 19

"To my astonishment, he told me my would-be assailants had been at the police office and had just left and that the police were aware that 'Inkatha' (the name given to the vigilantes, although their standing with the national Inkatha movement has not been established) wanted to burn down my house and kill me.

### The Star JAN 20

He stated that he and the chief had had a week's warning that the vigilantes, commonly known as "Inkatha", (but NOT the official Inkatha movement) were out to kill them.

Previous references to the Leandra vigilantes which appeared in articles written by Jo-Anne Collinge. The above items make it clear that *The Star* does not link them to the national Inkatha movement.



and so does the ANC. Inkatha is resolutely against the disinvestment campaign.

So, clearly, we have two organisations whose political agendas differ quite radically from Inkatha's. I won't complicate this scenario by bringing in other organisations, such as Azapo, which don't agree with Inkatha or the UDF.

The ANC and the UDF have, quite correctly, perceived Inkatha to be a threat to their ultimate aim of becoming South Africa's de facto "post-liberation government" — as the political pundits put it. (Political commentators seem to be all agreed that the leaders of the UDF would readily allow themselves to be absorbed into the ANC if that organisation were unbanned.)

On no occasion has the ANC ever committed itself to a multi-party democracy. It sees itself as a government in a future one-party state. And on no occasion has the UDF ever challenged this interpretation of democracy.

Inkatha, meanwhile, has set itself on the road to peaceful black negotiations with whites, coloureds and Indians and the ultimate expression of this would be free and fair elections in a multi-party unitary State.

Inkatha and its leaders in kwaZulu (no matter that they have blocked so-called independence for the region) have become a focus of political enmity by the ANC and the UDF. On their side, the level of animosity is very deep indeed.

### **Smear campaign**

There is not doubt that the ANC and the UDF appeal to a considerable number of people who have "high visibility" (as they say in media jargon) in their various fields.

And when it gets down to the dirty tricks department, there's nothing like a good smear campaign to sow dissension and confusion among the ranks of the "enemy" and elsewhere. One just has grudgingly to admit that the ANC and the UDF are doing a magnificent job on their respective propaganda fronts.

Inkatha is literally under siege as it tries to fend off reports claiming, for example, that Inkatha members "swoop on houses with heavily armed policemen", that Inkatha "impis" terrorise whole townships and so on and so on. The movement gets blamed even for tribal faction fights. And the latest is gun-toting vigilantes called "Inkatha" running amok in a township.

One would like to be able to ignore these attempts to discredit Inkatha but the campaign of vilification has become very serious indeed.

The cruel world of South African black politics is such that fair play has flown out the window and, as a result, actions and reactions and abuses are perpetrated by all.

The facts of the matter are that all is not well in the black struggle for liberation and often things are not what they are purported to be.

Politics in this country have entered a crucial phase of transition. It would, therefore, be naive for concerned citizens who read newspapers to take everything at face value.

The struggles for power are under way in all quarters. Some have already taken off their gloves and are baring their bloodied knuckles.

24/02/86





**BARRY STREEK**

reviews the  
black press

# Pass laws 'will bounce back'

CAPE TIMES  
24 FEBR. 1986

IN AN enlarged editorial, matching the style of the government's recent R250 000 advertising campaign to promote its policy statements, Percy Qoboza, the editor of the *City Press*, strongly attacked the State President, Mr P W Botha's, claims that apartheid was dead. The editorial, in the form of a letter to President Botha, said: "I do not, with all due respect, accept that apartheid is dead. I think it's alive and wreaking havoc with our lives — and the lives of your people, too.

"For until the people of Soweto can sleep peacefully at night, there is no chance in hell that the people of Mayfair or Lower Houghton will enjoy their sleep.

"To blame communists, revolutionaries or whatever one wants to call them for all is merely turning a blind eye to the real reality. And the reality is none other than apartheid. The sooner all of us believe it the better."

He said that what President Botha called reality "we interpret" as a myth.

"You speak of the end of the pass laws, sir. Has it ever occurred to you that after Sharpeville in 1960, your government actually introduced a law in Parliament called the Abolition of the Pass Laws Act? Yet the law did not abolish the pass laws but merely put the screws around our necks and plugged the holes in the influx control regulations.

"When I saw your advertisement, my cynicism told me to read the small print. Lo and behold, sir, it was there. The influx control regulations will be replaced in favour of something you call a 'system of urbanization'.

"My unfortunate experience at the hands of your government for more than three decades is that influx control will bounce back under the sophisticated name of 'orderly urbanization'. But the gross impact will be the same," Mr Qoboza wrote.

□ □ □ □ □

**ILANGA**, the Durban weekly, concluded that President Botha was his own worst enemy.

"Many blacks, we are sure, must have been ready to buy Mr Botha's reformist package, with its assurances of power-sharing and meaningful black participation at the highest political level, when lo and behold, the State President came out in his true colours, barely a week after his watershed speech.

"He gave one of his most senior cabinet ministers, Mr Pik Botha, a humiliating dressing down — all because the latter had spoken of the possibility that this country might one day be ruled by a black State President.

"So now we know: Mr P W Botha is not talking about the basics of change as we blacks and the rest of the community hankering after a new order would characterize them.

"Through his sharp repudiation of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Botha has done his reformist cause a great deal of harm. He has confirmed black fears and black suspicions about his motives. We cannot see that any thoughtful and self-respecting black leader would in the circumstances want to align himself with Mr Botha's proposed reforms.

"They are clearly a sham, a farce, an attempt to fool us all into believing the Emperor is fully and decently clothed when, in effect, he is stark naked," Ilanga said.

THE new Johannesburg-based fortnightly, *The New Nation*, said the vision of the future shared by the majority of South Africans was that "this country is able to cater for the needs of all its inhabitants — and that only a true democratic programme can assure us peace.

"That vision is peace.

"Then there is the vision of P W Botha and the Nationalist Party, which is blurred and incoherent. It is a vision that is murky and is likely to drag the country into further chaos and instability.

"Currently, this vision goes under the name of reform.

"Yet, one would ask, where is this reform that some are talking about — why is it not being felt or experienced by the majority of our people?

"Communities are still being forced off their land. More than 11 000 people have been held under the state of emergency while a further 2 500 are facing charges related to the unrest. Many more are dying every day in the current violence.

"It has become abundantly clear that for as long as reform is something that is handed down to people — rather than being a programme that involves them in determining their future — then it is doomed to failure," *New Nation* said.

□ □ □ □ □

**GRASSROOTS**, the Cape Town newspaper, in making its return to publication after production was disrupted by the detention of its key personnel, said President Botha had proved he did not know how to solve the problems of South Africa.

In his speech opening Parliament, President Botha had used words like "freedom" and "justice".

"But we the people have learnt not to listen to P W Botha's words. We have learnt that his government's actions speak much louder than all their nice words.

"When we are thrown out of our houses we know this is how this government deals with their problems. When we feel the rubber bullets and sjamboks biting into our flesh, we know this is how this government deals with their problems.

"When we feel the teargas burning our eyes and killing our little ones, we know this is how this government reacts to the crisis in our land.

"When we see our loved ones being shot dead by police and army bullets, we know that this government has no solution.

"When we think of the men who have been detained and are still detained, we cannot believe a single word P W Botha spoke," *Grassroots* said.

□ □ □ □ □

**SOWETAN** said Dr Van Zyl Slabbert and I Alex Boraine had through their resignation from Parliament said to the world that the South African parliamentary system was charade, a fraud. They are saying that no one who has honourable intentions will allow himself to be part of such a charade.

"We are afraid they have a valid point."

It had been reported that Dr Slabbert and Boraine had hoped more MPs would resign from Parliament and fight by-elections on a basis that they would not enter Parliament again until certain discriminatory legislation had been repealed.

"We are not entirely excited by all that principle seems to us to have merit. It is part of an organization that has no regard to yourself and instead seems to me worse for you and your people, the is to keep some distance between you and such an organization," *Sowetan* said.



## Tape damage to dialogue

**I**N his anxiety to discredit Dr Slabbert by releasing tapes of a private and confidential conversation, President Botha has set back the cause of negotiation politics. He has affronted Chief Buthelezi of KwaZulu who has let it be known that he deplores the President's action very strongly indeed. Chief Buthelezi, understandably, takes strong exception to the publication of a private conversation in which Dr Slabbert and President Botha, as he says, "pontificate" about him as some kind of black upstart. In the conversation both Chief Buthelezi and the ANC are seen by Dr Slabbert and President Botha alike as intent on being "the only bull in the kraal". Chief Buthelezi's justifiable complaints underline the unwisdom of taping private discussions designed to advance dialogue and negotiation but not designed for general consumption — without one or more of the participants being aware of the recording.

When people speak in private they use verbal shortcuts, slang expressions and other rhetorical devices which are unsuitable on a public platform. They are also mildly indiscreet or uncharitable, perhaps, if they imagine that their words are confined to four walls. What visitor to President Botha's office will henceforth feel that he can speak freely? What guarantee will visitors have that their confidence will be respected? Without mutual confidence, how can there ever be negotiation in good faith?

The whole episode of the tapes will no doubt have embarrassed Dr Slabbert. President Botha may feel he has scored a palpable hit. Yet Dr Slabbert is revealed as a good and remarkably patient listener, conciliatory and flexible in private conversation, seldom interrupting, and trying desperately to find a starting point for dialogue between South Africa's black leaders and an implacable President Botha. Dr Slabbert, in attempting the role of a mediator, will appear to the fiercer spirits among his followers as rather weak-kneed, bending over backwards and adopting an ingratiating tone ill-suited to exchanges between political enemies. Yet a reading of the tape by the standards of conciliation politics must give Dr Slabbert pretty good marks for trying — and President Botha very few at all.

Judging by his taped remarks, which he so cheerfully releases for public scrutiny, President Botha is simply not interested in the political dimension of black aspirations, and believes Chief Buthelezi has got his priorities wrong. Sounding somewhat patronizing, he would rather Chief Buthelezi concern himself with the economic development of the Tugela region. A President seriously concerned to promote negotiation — and sensitive to its imperatives — would not have put his relationship with a key black leader at risk like this. As it turns out, it is President P W Botha who is seen to be less than statesmanlike in the shabby affair of the tapes.

## Dr Mulder's magic pen

**S**OUTH African Transport Services should realise that blacks are also South Africans. In its 1985 report, the SATS board listed black employees according to their "national states", their "independent states", other African states not formerly part of this country and SWA/Namibia. Identifying countries of origin such as Lesotho and Malawi is perfectly normal. Even naming Bophuthatswana, Transkei, Ciskei and Venda is acceptable for, though once part of South Africa, they are now independent. But Gazankulu, KaNgwane, KwaZulu, Lebowa and Qwaqwa are all still part of South Africa, just as the Transvaal and Free State are part of South

Africa. White employees of SATS are not classified as "Transvaalers", "Free Staters" and so on. Why should blacks be? It shows how the government's obsession with ethnicity is allowed to impinge itself on every government department, not only on those which are directly involved in separating one kind of South African from another. It was the aim of Dr Connie Mulder when Nationalist cabinet minister to reduce the number of black South Africans to nil. He is now a member of the Conservative Party, but SATS at least have tried to fulfil his ambition. And on paper they have succeeded, by waving Dr Mulder's magic pen.



## Statistical Spotlight

Whatever the political point being made by divestiture, it doesn't seem to have damaged the shares of companies doing business in South Africa.

# Divested stocks aren't cheap

By Leslie Pittel

**W**HAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN to all those South Africa-related stocks that are being dumped by "socially conscious" investors? Will they become bargains? It doesn't look that way.

During 1985 there were 230 public U.S. companies tracked by Wilshire Associates with some investment stake in South Africa. Last year these stocks returned an average 31%. The 5,170 South Africa-free companies returned 34%. Was the 3% difference a result of dumping by people who don't like the South African government? It is hard to draw a conclusion from a single year's trading, since the two groups of stocks are so different.

The South Africa-linked firms, representing a third of the market capitalization, are disproportionately weighted in office equipment, oil and drugs. They're light on media and retailing stocks, which have done well of late. Over the past five years the performance of South Africa-linked stocks and South Africa-free stocks has been nearly identical at an average annual 14% (see chart).

Last year the number of institutions with a policy of South African divestment more than quadrupled, to an estimated 88. All told they hold an estimated \$96 billion of the \$2 trillion stock market. But what they dump, others buy. "The impact of any individual divestiture is lost in the noise of the market," says Anthony Lotruglio, president of Quan-Vest, a Manhasset, N.Y.-based consulting company.

In a perfectly efficient market, prices of South Africa-related stocks wouldn't be depressed unless divesting institutions and individuals ac-

counted for something approaching two-thirds of the market, or \$1.5 trillion. Only then would the nondiversors be unable to absorb the \$700 billion of offending stocks.

Could the divestment movement ever get that big? It doesn't seem likely. Those uninterested in divesting include not only the apolitical but also investors who think the withdrawal of enlightened employers like IBM from South Africa is scarcely the way to help blacks.

Only one of the ten largest university endowments, Columbia's, has dumped all South Africa-related stocks, says Christopher Coons, a research analyst with the Investor Responsibility Research Center. Although more public funds, such as New Jersey's \$10.3 billion retirement fund, are calling for total divestment these days than in the past, the majority of funds still call for only partial divestment. Under this rule, 152 of the 230 tainted companies are acceptable because they have signed the Sullivan guidelines for workplace equality developed in 1977 by the Reverend Leon Sullivan.

Coons' conclusion: "Only if all the major pension funds and universities were to divest completely and all at the same time would it affect the market." ■

### Sell-off candidates?

These South Africa-involved stocks with heavy institutional ownership could suffer if divestiture becomes common. That hasn't happened yet.

Company	Current price	% change since 6/31/85
Allis-Chalmers	3 3/4	-28.6%
Bundy	17 3/4	46.9
Chicago Pneum Tool	23	-14.4
Echlin	16 1/4	26.9
...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...
...	...	...

### Divesting into an efficient market

Over the past five years, stocks of companies without business activity in South Africa haven't done better than companies with business there.

