

I thank the Editor of Drum for allowing me as Secretary-General of Inkatha to correct the distortions, half truths and downright untruths about Inkatha and its leader which were featured in the December issue of Drum. I think that if the readers of Drum are expected to offer constructive comments on Inkatha, they should first know what Inkatha is and what the basis of its political philosophy is all about. I must also hasten to add, for the benefit of your readers, that neither Chief Buthelezi as President of Inkatha, nor myself as Secretary-General were ever interviewed by the writer of the article so that we could present our side of the story. In writing his article the writer deemed it necessary to rely on an internal discussion document published by the Inkatha Institute which did not purport to spell out official Inkatha policy and political strategy. In fact the truth of the matter is that, the document in question was not adopted by the Central Committee and does not therefore form part of Inkatha policy and strategy.

My comments will be divided into two parts. In the first part I will deal with the distortions in the article itself, most of which are aimed at casting a slur on Chief Buthelezi's personal integrity, and in the second part I will deal with Inkatha's philosophy, its objectives and political strategy.

#### The Distortions:

It is not true to say that the banning of the Black Consciousness Movement was a turning point for Inkatha. That is to ignore the fact that on the 19th September 1977 Chief Buthelezi as President of Inkatha was summoned to Pretoria by the then Minister of Justice Mr Jimmy Kruger where he tried to give him orders not to enlist any other black persons into Inkatha other than Zulus and threatened to take action against the President of Inkatha if he continued to do so. Chief Buthelezi told Mr Kruger that he would continue to enlist every black person into Inkatha as long as the National Party continued to enlist every white person. Even at that time in 1977 before the other black movements were banned, in terms of membership, Inkatha was already by far the largest black political organisation in the history of South Africa. Further, in 1978, the

now famous scientific findings of the Arnold Bergstrasse Institute of Freiburg University, in West Germany, did reveal (after detailed research from 1974 to 1978) that Inkatha was a dominant political force in black South African politics and also that Chief Buthelezi's following in South Africa transcended ethnic boundaries. All this happened well before the other black movements were banned and before the late Mr Steve Biko was murdered! It is surprising that the writer of the article on Inkatha ignores these facts and chooses instead to insult us by alleging that we stepped into a void. Does the writer want us to believe that the hundreds of thousands of black people who supported Inkatha during this period did so on behalf of the security police?

There is no "divisive role" that Inkatha played during the Soweto riots of 1976, and files from all South African newspapers will show this clearly. The contract workers from Mzimhlophe Hostel who marched on residents, were not Inkatha members. It was proved in an article by the then Rand Daily Mail African Affairs reporter that they were not even just Zulus, as newspapers alleged at the time, but that in fact the majority of the residents of Mzimhlophe Hostel were Tswana-speaking. When Chief Buthelezi went up to Soweto in the face of warnings and threats not to go from Mr Jimmy Kruger, he did so as a black leader and was received on that basis by both the Mzimhlophe residents and the contract workers. Why does the writer of this article publish such extremely scurrilous and false allegations against Chief Buthelezi and Inkatha and base his allegations on information that has been proved to be an untruth?

It is not us in Inkatha who "see ourselves" as a national liberation movement but black people who in their hundreds of thousands have joined Inkatha because they see it as such - a national liberation movement for black people.

About 3 years ago, at the 1979 conference, Inkatha amended its constitution and removed all references to the Zulu ethnic group with regard to the position of President of the

movement. This fact is known even to overseas media. Therefore, for the writer of this article to allege that the President of Inkatha "must also be Chief Minister of KwaZulu" is either a deliberate attempt to give authenticity to a falsehood or is proof of his ignorance of the subject he is writing about.

I do not understand why the writer should describe Chief Buthelezi as a "zealous Zulu Nationalist". Throughout his political career Chief Buthelezi has never seen or spoken of a separate Zulu destiny as a solution for South Africa's political problems. He has never deviated from this conviction and that is why he has consistently rejected independence offered by the Pretoria regime. His rejection of a separate Zulu destiny is proved by the support that black people in South Africa give him.

To talk of the Chieftainship of Chief Luthuli in the context of Chief Buthelezi's hereditary chieftainship shows abysmal ignorance of the backgrounds of the two leaders. It is, I think, unfair not to do research before writing an article of this kind. Chief Buthelezi's chieftainship is a hereditary birthright because that chieftainship has existed ever since the Zulu people were created as a nation by their founder King Shaka. On the other hand Chief Luthuli was a teacher at Adams College when in 1935 the people of Groutville Mission invited him to take over the chieftainship of Amakholwa of Groutville. A chieftainship which is elected and which is therefore not hereditary is not a birthright according to African tradition. Chief Luthuli could decline to take it up if he did not want to take it up. This therefore cannot be compared to Chief Buthelezi's chieftainship. If Chief Buthelezi has risen to power on "the mantle of chieftainship" why do so many chiefs in South Africa not attain the political power he wields on the basis of their chieftainships? If being a chief is a stumbling bloc to leadership and must therefore be condemned, then that condemnation would apply equally to Chief Luthuli or even more. I believe that the people of South Africa are politically sane enough to look at a person's leadership qualities and capabilities and not at whether the



title before his name is Chief, Doctor, Reverend, Bishop or Sir. Incidentally it is a historical fact that the South African Government tried all kinds of tricks to ensure that Chief Buthelezi did not succeed to the chieftainship of the Buthelezi clan in the 50's because they knew its importance in the hierarchy and politico-military history of the Zulu nation.

It is grossly offensive to us as his followers to label Chief Buthelezi with the smear of "collaborator". Collaborating with whom, in what? This smear in fact borders on libel. Why is it that the South African Government has been battling throughout his political career to have him removed as leader in KwaZulu through BOSS, through the now defunct Department of Information, through the then Department of Bantu Administration, through the Security Police and even by trying to manipulate the venerated Zulu King? Why was Chief Buthelezi denied a passport for 9 years from 1963 to 1972 even before being "passportless" in South Africa was a passport to international fame? I challenge the writer of this article to show me one leader inside South Africa today who has done more than Chief Buthelezi in opposing the present South African Government in the political marketplace. He has blocked the government's grand design of denationalising millions of black people by enticing them to accept so-called homeland independence, he has challenged the government single-handedly in the courts of the land when they tried to rob his people of their land, he has legalised the colours of the black people of South Africa (black, green and gold) by declaring that the national flag of KwaZulu shall bear these colours, he has legalised the national anthem<sup>5</sup> of Africa - Nkosi Sikelel' iAfrika - Morena Boloka by declaring that it shall be the national anthem of KwaZulu, he has mobilised the biggest political force against apartheid in the form of Inkatha and he has produced volumes and volumes of speeches where he constantly champions the cause of blacks in South Africa, without singling out the Zulus, whom he traditionally leads, for special favours. Really, short of ordering his followers

to shoot their way with AK 47 rifles through Pretoria and Cape Town, (something no black leader in history has successfully done inside South Africa) what is Chief Buthelezi expected to do to qualify, in the opinion of our detractors, as a genuine leader?

I do not understand what the writer of this article means by Chief Buthelezi's "obedience to the ANC leadership". As far as I am aware Chief Buthelezi acknowledges the leadership of those who were leaders of the ANC, while he himself was a youth member, and when the ANC functioned legally in South Africa. He still has warm feelings and a sense of loyalty to them. But that does not mean that he is prepared to be an underling or political bag carrier of the now banned external mission of the ANC. It is only a political fool who would accept that a handful of African patriots who have been in exile for more than two decades will decide the political destiny of millions of black people who are, struggling inside South Africa, in the frontline of the struggle, under difficult odds, to overthrow apartheid. We were taught that it is the dog that wags the tail and not the tail that wags the dog. The view of Inkatha is that it is the external mission of ANC in fact that need Chief Buthelezi and not Chief Buthelezi who needs them. Through his movement Inkatha, Chief Buthelezi has already attained an unassailable political position inside South Africa and he is in the process of making far reaching political inroads in the international scene right under the noses of the external mission of ANC in spite of their unjustifiable hostile international propaganda against him. I vow to you today, Mr Editor, as Secretary-General of Inkatha and as a black South African, that, unless the external mission of ANC make a plan to forge an alliance with Chief Buthelezi and Inkatha, we will beat them many times over in a free and fair election in a democratic South Africa and they themselves know this.

Dr Albertinah Luthuli whom the writer of this article ostensibly quotes as an ANC member, was, until recently married to Dr Pascal Ngakane who is one of the 12 who broke away from the external mission of the ANC. Has Albertinah Luthuli since

been re-admitted to the external mission of ANC? She herself has never been hostile towards Chief Buthelezi. She knows that Chief Buthelezi delivered the funeral oration when her father Chief Albert J. Luthuli was buried. Chief Buthelezi did this at the request of ANC and her family. She knows that Chief Buthelezi assisted her mother to organise the unveiling of Chief Luthuli's tombstone at the request of the Luthuli Memorial Foundation in London of which she herself is a trustee. She knows that Chief Buthelezi accompanied her Mother Mrs Nokukhanya Luthuli to Maseru to receive Chief Luthuli's posthumous award from the O.A.U. at her mother's request. She knows that Chief Buthelezi spoke at the function in Maseru organised by the O.A.U. attended by the monarch of Lesotho, the Prime Minister of Lesotho, the Cabinet of Lesotho and African diplomats, on the same platform with a representative of the external mission of the ANC. All these things are recorded and are in the files of all newspapers in South Africa. At that time, Chief Buthelezi was already Chief Executive Councillor of KwaZulu. Nothing has changed since then. Chief Buthelezi has neither changed his political views nor his political stance. He therefore should not be held responsible for Dr Luthuli's hallucinations which are clearly a part of a problem she has had for a long time. Chief Buthelezi's role at "the national level" of the Zulu people was not created by the so-called "system". Any journalist who does his homework would know this historical fact.

It is also blatantly untrue to allege that there was ever a time when Chief Buthelezi ever contemplated taking so-called "independence". Chief Buthelezi was paid the compliment by the late President Tolbert of Liberia for "being constant and consistent", when he awarded him the Star of Africa decoration, for the very reason that he never chops and changes his political strategy. When Chief Buthelezi spoke of an outlet to the sea, he was merely taunting the then Prime Minister Mr Vorster. Chief Buthelezi said that if the South African Government was seriously committed to an imaginary



independent state of KwaZulu, why would they take away Richards Bay which would have given such state a port in order to breathe? To quote things out of context in order to smear Chief Buthelezi is not only evil but it also does the African cause grave injustice.

The Sobukwe funeral incident to which the writer of this article refers was organised by known political groupings and individuals, and it was not something that can be regarded as a rejection of Chief Buthelezi by the youth. The recent revelations before the Eloff Commission have shown who paid for the bus-loads of those who were involved in the incident to murder Chief Buthelezi in Graaf Reinet. History will be the judge in this case.

The KwaMashu school boycott is also twisted deliberately by the writer of this article. Only 36 out of more than 2 000 schools in KwaZulu were involved in the boycott. While Inkatha is still around, no pupil shall be allowed to burn down schools which are built by the sweat of starving black parents. As is known, black parents in KwaZulu pay for the building of schools for their children. The Pretoria Government does not contribute a cent. What leader worthy of the name could allow children to burn down their parents' sweat as KwaMashu children were attempting to do?

We had a big laugh about the CIA's so-called "secret" document which alleged that Inkatha was losing support amongst the youth. To date Inkatha has a membership of 750 000 and our Youth Brigade is the largest in the history of South Africa. It is growing all the time in all the provinces of South Africa. After all, who is still prepared to believe the CIA after their predictions that Bishop Abel Muzorewa would win the elections in Zimbabwe? In any case it is not the CIA but the black people of South Africa who will tell us who our leaders are.

It has always amazed us that people who are vitriolic in attacks on Chief Buthelezi are people whose ethnic roots are in Transkei, Ciskei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and KwaNdebele. As a result of their failure to do something about preventing these regions from taking Pretoria's independence, they then try to play down Chief Buthelezi's blocking of independence for the largest grouping of blacks in South Africa. Isn't this extra-ordinary?

Inkatha and its strategy and political objectives:

Purity politics, based on stark ideals around which people cannot afford to organise themselves, has not succeeded in South Africa. Mother Africa hears the countless hordes of starving and dying blacks and seeks to raise her children to levels of safe and healthy living. Mother Africa through the blood in our veins is nurturing Inkatha as a black political response to a very complex situation. Inkatha is history in the making. It has emerged in seven years to be a miracle of black political endeavour unequalled across the length and breadth of Africa. It will be the salvation of South Africa, and it is the hope of Southern Africa.

The treatment of Inkatha by the writer of this article can lead to spurious debate about inconsequential issues. We hope that the editor will not allow readers who will blindly hurl abuses at Inkatha and Chief Buthelezi as "sell outs", "collaborators" and so on. What we expect is for your readers to tell us plainly where they think our political strategy is wrong and also to suggest an alternative winning strategy which should have been used by black people during 300 years and more of our bondage.

I personally believe that the writer of this article renders the struggle for liberation a dangerous disservice when he declares that the final hurdle Chief Buthelezi has is the breaking of his ties with Pretoria. The truth is that there are no ties; there is no dependence; there



is no collaboration.. There is only the challenge of black South Africa in a black mass movement which will change the shape of South, Southern Africa and Africa at large. If I did not sincerely believe this, I would not have sacrificed my cosy and lucrative job as a university don to join Chief Buthelezi's struggle for black liberation in South Africa, under the auspices of his Inkatha Liberation Movement. My other colleagues in the Central Committee of Inkatha would not have sacrificed their lucrative practices as medical doctors to join Chief Buthelezi. If we are all wrong we are prepared to perish together on the day of liberation. But in the words of our colleague Gibson Thula, we will be there in full force on the day of liberation and we sincerely ask Drum to remind us of this statement on the day of liberation.

Those black South Africans who feel frustrated and angered and have got no concerted plan of political action and no strategy for victory, must stop tearing at Inkatha, The struggle for liberation is a struggle for the ordinary people who comprise the black masses. The black masses have spoken to South Africa and the world in the phenomenal voice of Inkatha, and those who tear at Inkatha can only be venting their frustrated anger on the wrong object.

Inkatha does not, however, expect people who disagree with its programme of principles to join. People join it voluntarily and have done so in their hundreds of thousands over the past 7 years since its founding by Chief Buthelezi. To date it boasts a membership of over 750 000.

Contrary to what the writer of this article claims, Inkatha does not aspire to lead "all the people". No liberation movement all over the world has ever succeeded to lead "all the people". Even Jesus Christ, the greatest leader of all time, failed to lead "all the people". What Inkatha aspires to is to lead as many people as will enable it to cause the edifice of apartheid and white privilege to crumble in South

Africa and make way for the establishment of a non-racial society based on the principle of universal human suffrage. If that is a wrong and futile aspiration, the readers of Drum must tell us.

The accusation that Inkatha is an ethnic or Zulu liberation movement because it was founded by a Zulu and has a base in the KwaZulu region of South Africa is similar to accusations that were hurled at Swapo a few years ago that it was Owambo and ethnic. It is also the same as the accusation that Zanu, the ruling party in Zimbabwe today, is Shona, and Zapu, is Ndebele. There can be no end to this type of ethnic sniping.

Finally, those readers of Drum who will debate Inkatha's strategy should do so on the basis of the following aims and objectives of Inkatha as found in its constitution. We expect to be told where the following aims and objectives are a betrayal of the black political cause:

- "a. To foster a spirit of unity among black people throughout South Africa and between them and black brothers in Southern Africa and to keep alive and foster the tradition of the people,
- b. to help promote and encourage the development of black people spiritually, economically, educationally and politically,
- c. to establish contact and liaise with cultural groups in Southern Africa with a view to the establishment of a common society,
- d. to stamp out all forms of corruption, exploitation of man by man and intimidation,
- e. to ensure acceptance of the principles of equal opportunity and treatment for all peoples in all walks of life,
- f. to co-operate with any movement or organisation for the improvement of the conditions of the people and to secure the most efficient production and equitable distribution of the wealth of the Nation in the best interest of the people.

- g. to abolish all forms of discrimination and segregation based on tribe, clan, sex, colour or creed,
- h. to protect and support worthy indigenous customs and cultures,
- i. to protect, promote and encourage trade, commerce, industry, agriculture and conservation of natural resources by all means in the interests of the people and encourage all citizens to participate in all sectors of the economy,
- j. to give effect to the principles approved from time to time by the appropriate organs of the movement,
- k. to ensure the observance of fundamental freedoms and human rights,
- l. to inculcate and foster a vigorous consciousness of patriotism and a strong sense of national unity based on a common and individual loyalty and devotion to our land,
- m. to co-operate locally and internationally with all progressive African and other nationalist movements and political parties which work for the complete eradication of all forms of colonialism, racialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and discrimination and to strive for the attainment of African unity, and
- n. to carry on any other activities which in the opinion of the movement are conducive to the attainment of the aims and objectives of the movement and to do such things as are incidental to the attainment of the above objectives."

*O D Dhlomo*  
.....

DR OSCAR D. DHLOMO

SECRETARY-GENERAL OF INKATHA



File  
DRUM MAGAZINE

23