

## PRESS STATEMENT

by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi  
Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha

ULUNDI 3RD OCTOBER 1989

The New African in an article published on the 2nd October 1989 under the heading "Holomisa slams Buthelezi's double standards" may or may not be accurate in the statements that it attributes to General Holomisa but that is for him to say. The report, however, entirely distorts the interaction between myself and himself.

The facts are that I received a letter dated 19th September from Paramount Chief Ndamase, the President of the Transkei, inviting me to attend a meeting of "Heads of State of Governments: independent and self-governing States" which he proposed should take place not later than the 30th September.

I replied to Paramount Chief Ndamase very correctly and regardless of my total abhorrence of the South African constitution and the Tricameral Parliament, and my total abhorrence of past South African Governments' tearing off pieces of South Africa and giving them to whomever they chose, I showed the Paramount Chief the courtesy of Africa by sending my reply to him by hand in the persons of the National Chairman of Inkatha and the Secretary-General of Inkatha.

They returned to report that they were very well received by Paramount Chief Ndamase and Major General Holomisa and were treated courteously. They reported that because of the letter I sent a reply would be given after further careful consideration.

Point one is therefore that I made no statement. I still await the reply from the President of the Transkei. Quite clearly The New African has either not seen my letter to the Paramount Chief or alternatively it attempts to distort what I wrote. I must therefore give a brief summary of the points I made.

1. That Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima in a meeting held in Umtata in 1973 attended by all the then leaders of the then self-governing regions vowed to all of us present that he would not accept so-called independence. Within months he turned his back on us and betrayed the spirit of trust that characterised that meeting.

2 When after the new constitution had been introduced in 1983 an initiative to establish a South African Federal Union to bring Blacks together in opposition to the new constitution, Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima sent a delegation led by Mr. T.T. Letleka to meet with me. This delegation motivated the need for a meeting between Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima and myself. This meeting took place in Tongaat in 1983.

8is After this meeting there were further ongoing discussions between a number of black leaders but the whole venture was terminated when Chief George Matanzima sent a message to me through Dr. Oscar Dhlomo the Secretary-General of Inkatha, and Dr. Frank Mdlalose, National Chairman of Inkatha to the effect that the Transkei would withdraw from any further involvement in SAFU because they were bowing to pressure from the South African Government which was reminding them that in their so-called independence agreement, the Transkei had undertaken not to interfere in the internal affairs of South Africa.

4. In my letter to Paramount Chief Ndamase I said that in the circumstances I could not attend a meeting with him, Major General Holomisa and other leaders unless there was a clear indication that the Transkei was going to renounce the agreement of so-called independence with the South African Government.

Dle I did make the point that I only wanted to be involved in developments where the agendas were open for scrutiny. I quote from my letter: "I made the point repeatedly that I will not become involved in any politics of negotiation behind the people's backs. I will go to negotiate with a mandate from the people and I will return to the people to report to them and seek their backing for that which I negotiated. I will never turn the political negotiating table into a forum for prescription."

I then asked the question: "How does one fit this need to come from the people and return to the people into the kind of meeting you are now proposing?" I added: "I do not want to slip off to the Transkei in some fast aeroplane which can travel by night and come back without the people knowing that I have left and returned."

Nothing whatsoever in my letter justifies the comment made by The New African: "It would seem that KwaZulu's Chief Minister Gatsha Buthelezi is demanding that talks with organisations should be conducted through him or under his surveillance." The New African attributes this sentiment to Major General Holomisa. Not having had a reply to my letter, only he can say whether The New African does so correctly.

A distortion which I can call a distortion because I know the facts of the matter is The New African's assertion that I "refused to attend the meeting partly because of an earlier meeting between Holomisa and African National President Oliver Tambo." There is

'\

not one line of my letter to Paramount Chief Ndamase which justifies this statement. The only context in which I raised Mr. Oliver Tambo's name was done in these words: "May be Major General Holomisa who had a more recent discussion with Mr. Oliver Tambo than I can tell us if the External Mission of the ANC has taken a different stance on this issue" - the issue being my stand against so-called independence, and acceptance or non-acceptance of those involved in independence or Regional Legislative Assemblies like KwaZulu.

As far as I am concerned, the more dialogue the better and the more Blacks from inside South Africa speak to our brothers and sisters in exile, the better. It is only hidden agendas in which things are decided behind the people's backs that I object to.

There are points in The New African article which leave one puzzled because they seem unintelligible. Speaking about Major General Holomisa the article said: "He said looking at the various so-called political dispensations, including the independent States, in retrospect, one finds that most of them felt that fighting South Africa's repressive laws from within was the best strategy." And then the article adds: "We do not spend a decade mourning about their mistakes."

It is difficult to decide whether this is the language of a soldier of fortune who is learning politics as he goes in his coup d'etat state, or whether it is garbled reporting from The New African. The same garbled thinking is contained in the statement attributed to Major General Holomisa: "Whatever names are given to us either independent states or self-governing, it must be remembered that at the end of the day we all get home with pay packets from the same Pretoria administration and to dabble and nibble in semantics will therefore not benefit the black community of Southern Africa."

As far as I am concerned this is an unrepenting Transkei at its

worst. It was a hideous thing that Chief Kaiser Matanzima did to Black South Africa when he accepted the ridiculous so-called independence Pretoria offered him. Major General Holomisa

continues in doing that hideous thing in leading the Transkei in its so-called independence.

As far as Black South Africa is concerned, the Transkei will have to return to South Africa. There is one South Africa. There shall be one sovereign Parliament and there shall be one people with but one destiny. The wounds in the South African body politic which the excision of the Transkei made are still bleeding politically. Major General Holomisa is part of Black South Africa's pain and the vast majority of Transkeians would agree with me. His only hope to make the transition from soldier to political leader lies in the possibility of him arranging a coup d'etat in the Ciskei, uniting the Ciskei and the Transkei and then downing his political tools until the people have elected him to some office or other.

Â¥2600 0 e o R â\200\224â\200\224