

10.1

16/8/11

Six prickly questions for Transkei

City
Press
29/4/84

R10

goes to the author of this letter
— and you too can win our cash
prize by writing the
"Letter of the Week".

JACK THETHA of Umtata writes:

The Transkei Government says it does not understand why its Bloemfontein offices were bombed on April 6.

Before they can understand this they will have to answer the following questions:

- Why did the Transkei ignore repeated appeals by true leaders that she should not accept self-government in 1963?
- Why did Transkei sign away the birthright of millions of South Africans on October 26, 1976?
- Why does the Transkei Government send her political detainees to South Africa for interrogation?
- If Transkei soldiers were not involved in the Maseru raid on December 9, 1982 why didn't the Transkei refute allegations by Chief Leabua Jonathan that her soldiers were involved?
- Following a K D Matanzima-Pik Botha meeting, Dr Piet Koornhof announced that 16 000 so-called Crossroads squatters were to be moved to the Transkei. Why does the Transkei accept such evil acts?
- Where is Paramount Chief Sabata Danlindyabo? Was he wrong in standing up for the rights and interests of the masses?

The Transkei Government should know that all those who collaborate with the oppressor are also oppressors.

UNION SHOWDOWN

CITY PRESS 29/04/84

OVER STRIKE PARTY

FIFTY enraged members of the Commercial, Catering and Allied Workers' Union had a showdown with union general secretary Emma Mashinini this week to get back more than R1 000 from their strike fund.

At an explosive meeting which broke into anger, threats and tears, Mrs Mashinini was asked to hand part of a R5 000 SA Council of Churches grant to the fund.

The union members — who form part of the group of 213 Sandton OK Bazaars Hyperama workers sacked early this year after a strike — want to use the money to pay legal fees in their bid for reinstatement.

Forty-eight union members finally received R1 759,76c. Two other members could not be paid R70 which the union could not account for, said union members.

This week's showdown was the result of an ultimatum given to Mrs Mashinini last week

— although the workers said their dispute with the union general secretary dates back to the day they went on strike.

Worker spokesman Lucky Melato, a former shop steward at the Hyperama, said they had been shocked to learn that Mrs Mashinini had gone overseas on leave only two days after the strike.

"She should have taken care of the situation when the strike broke out. We couldn't understand her trip when we had been paying subscriptions to a union we believed would fight for us."

Mr Melato also re-

By
Z B
MOLEFE

vealed that they had only received R400 from their union.

This, he pointed out, worked out to each dismissed worker receiving R1,50. For this reason, a dismissed workers' fund raising committee had been set up to seek help from colleagues at OK Bazaars branches and from township businesses.

About R3 180 from the SACC was given to the union's branch executive committee at a meeting in February, and 138 dismissed workers were paid out.

But Mr Melato said they had only found out about the SACC donation by chance, when they saw a letter from the council at the union offices.

Mrs Mashinini refused to comment. "I'm not prepared to comment," she said. "But let me warn you. You must handle this with care, because you know who you are dealing with..."



A weeping former OK Bazaars worker at this week's meeting mirrors the hardship she and her colleagues have endured since losing their jobs early this year.

Pic: PETER GETUKE

16/7/83

you are dealing with

TH

IN A bare four months some South Africans who are not white will go to the polls to elect representatives who are not white to the South African Parliament.

It should be the most critical election in South Africa's history for its outcome will do more than give an entirely new look to this country's Government.

It will also determine whether or not the new parliamentary baby is born with a bang or a whimper, whether its chances of long-term survival are bright, or whether it will be a constitutional weakling without the power to effect further, essential change.

And yet, with only four months to go, an election campaign which should be loud, vigorous and robust appears to be drowning in its own silence.

There are, of course, some good superficial explanations as to why this should be so at this point, most of them centring on time frames, organisational issues and party priorities.

Parties with limited resources are hardly in a position to run a Saatchi and Saatchi extravaganza over four months.

The parties, if they can muster significant campaigns at all, will drive for the line in the last few months.

The constituency delimitations process is still under way and in the way of all politics it can be messy.

The Labour Party, for example, has to finesse a constituency away from the Western Cape (not so favourable) to the Eastern Cape (more favourable).

Thus while the commission sorts out the constituencies, the parties are forced to hang fire over the nomination of candidates.

Once a face has been put to a seat — the parties argue — the fight really begins.

The State propaganda agencies have not yet got into full swing.

A radio and TV "information" drive, the parties argue, will bring much greater public interest in the elections.

And, finally, most of the present attention is directed at the time-consuming process of voter registration.

Latest pointers are that although the results are not dramatic they are not entirely disillusioning.

Thus far 680 000 coloured voters have registered, taking the total number over the 50 percent mark of potential voters.

But that, of course, is not the whole story.

More fundamental forces are at

By **BRIAN
POTTINGER**



PSST! SUNDAY TIMES Wanna 29 APR. 1984 buy an election?

work moulding the form these most exceptional elections will take.

Most important of these are the conflicting strategies of collaboration and boycott.

Like so many past elections for Government-created black platforms the real choice confronting the electorate is not *what* the parties say but rather *where* they choose to say it.

Despite the bitter polemic between the established parties and the United Democratic Front, there has emerged one remarkable unifying factor — they seek to outbid each other in condemnation of the new dispensation.

In the way of all South African black opposition politics, the real count in August will thus not be to establish which party wins but rather which strategy — collaboration or boycott — triumphs.

There are few people taking bets on the outcome.

The UDF has been quietly continuing with its "conscientisation" programmes and its charter is now nudging 48 000 signatures; again not dramatic but also not disillusioning.

Establishment politicians are prepared only to punt a 40 to 50 percent poll.

Given that only an estimated 55 percent maximum of the potential voters will be registered by May 31, the absolute number of people participating in the elections is likely to be low.

A complicating factor is the manner of delimitation.

To get the show reasonably rapidly on the road the Government has asked the delimitations committee to define constituencies on the basis of the population register — in other words all potential voters in an area.

But the elections for those same constituencies will be held on the basis of registered voters.

The results could be astonishing. In areas where there is a strong boycott lobby — the Peninsula is an example — registration is likely to be low.

And it is these same urban areas where the population con-



centration is likely to be highest. And that is not even counting the real possibility of at least some intimidation from boycotters, although the extent of it will, as always, be a subject of fierce debate.

Whether the final voter tally will be the derisory ten percent of the last SAIC elections (the UDF promises it will and the participants and Government trust it won't) can only be revealed by time.

And on that outcome rides any hope of more widely legitimising the "new deal".

But the fundamental division on strategies between the boycotters and the participants leads to a second point: the dramatic impact on the way in which the elections will be carried out.

Take public meetings — a vital weapon in effective electioneering.

Labour Party members have grim memories of the reception they received in the Western Cape when they sought to justify their decision to participate — let alone run for office.

And Peter Marais' rough time at a recent People's Congress Party meeting drove the point home.

The established parties undauntedly claim they will continue to hold public meetings during the election.

Indications are, however, that apart from "safe" areas and some close meetings, the election campaign will have to be conducted via face-to-face canvassing, pamphleteering and the media.

But limited party organisation means scaled-down canvassing and lack of money means limited pamphleteering.

More serious is the fact that the media have no indication of the real constituency of putative "leaders" — a timeless problem in covering black politics where Government-created political structures are widely rejected by the communities and of precious little value for determining support for leaders.

Statements of a plethora of political groupings — all with extravagant claims of support —

are likely to be handled cautiously by the media.

All this, in short, could add up to a low-key campaign.

The third aspect is directly linked to the problems the participating parties are going to have in defining themselves during the campaign.

They have in common an outright rejection of the new constitution, where economic policies are described at all they appear vaguely socialist, and they all admit to the need for political inclusion of blacks in some form or another.

Given the broad consensus on principle, it becomes pretty difficult to score hustling points off opponents on policy.

The elaborate egg-dancing by participants thus far on "issues" gives the clue to the dilemma — not made easier by the proliferation of splinter parties whose names, let alone principles, are hardly known.

The one option left is that of personal attack. And that in itself could be a big switch-off for the electorate, leading to even greater apathy.

The fourth aspect of the campaign is likely to be the most interesting — the war of vacuum-packed ethnic politics.

There is great irony in the process now under way.

Ostensibly these elections will precede the first joint white, coloured and Indian Government of this country.

But the white political parties refuse to publicly involve themselves in the elections for the sister chambers of Parliament — theoretically equally important, central and crucial parts of Parliament and Government.

The Government treads lightly in public pronouncements on "issues" which could effect the elections.

The PFP is meanwhile nervy of accusations that it might "use" the coloured and Indian communities to win what it lost in the white referendum.

And the Conservative Party — apart from moments when it makes party points off Labour statements — tends to dismiss the whole affair as an affront to whites.

Even Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu, and one of the great movers and shakers in the opposition camp during the white referendum, has pledged himself to steady rattling assegais.

And so, with four months to go, the elections for the other two-thirds of the Parliament that will run this country plods on as hermetically sealed as a CRC or SAIC election of the past and with small sense of either urgency, profile or moment.

UPON arriving at the Republican National Convention in Detroit in 1980, Mr Ronald Reagan told reporters: "I had a dream the other night."

"I dreamt that Jimmy Carter came to me and asked why I wanted his job?"

"I told him I didn't want his job ... I want to be President."

These words, though light-hearted at the time, have proved auspicious.

The future President had unwittingly pinpointed the source of his success and continued popularity with American voters in the face of a continuous stream of domestic scandals and policy botches.

Mr Reagan, unlike Mr Carter, has successfully avoided becoming embroiled in the details of the "job".

Instead, he has achieved a lofty imperial stance which has helped him side step the myriad land-mines which have come his way.

Even now, as an irate Congress rages about the dubious Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) mining of Nicaraguan harbours, American voters are being treated to an undiluted diet of Mr Reagan, every inch the imperial President, advancing the cause of world peace in China.

"He is responsible for nothing"

So successful has he been in remaining above the fray that Democratic Representative Patricia Schroeder, a strident critic of the Reagan Administration, accused the President of "perfecting the Teflon-coated presidency."

"He sees to it that nothing sticks to him."

"He is responsible for nothing civil rights, Central America, Middle East, the economy, the environment."

"He is just the master of ceremonies at someone else's dinner," Congressman Schroeder said.

A Reagan supporter phrased it differently.

"Let me tell you two things about this guy," Republican strategist and former South African Government lobbyist, Mr Stuart Spencer, said about Mr Reagan in 1976.

"The first is that he's lucky. The second is that he can walk away from things that would sink any other politician."

The number of "things" the President has walked away from in the past three years staggers the imagination.

Consider the following:

● Even though Mr Reagan accepted responsibility for the poor security which contributed to the deaths of 241 American servicemen in Beirut last October, his standing in the polls remained unaffected.

● The subsequent withdrawal of U.S. forces from Lebanon, which amounted to tacit agreement that the Reagan policy in the region had failed, was miraculously turned into a "smart

move", thereby cancelling out the unmitigated disasters of the previous 18 months.

● CIA meddling in Central America, strong Reagan support for a string of right-wing dictatorships and an increased U.S. military presence in the region — all politically unpopular — have failed to tarnish the Reagan veneer.

● The complete breakdown of arms control talks with the Soviets, due probably as much to Mr Reagan's anti-communist sabre rattling as anything else, left the President looking like the cowboy in the white hat.

On a more personal level, Mr Reagan's administration has been fraught with in-house scandal.

The National Journal, a much-respected Washington-based weekly, listed no less than 40 instances in which political appointees or nominees cast a potentially shabby light on the President.

The more serious cases include: ● Mr Richard Allen, Mr Reagan's former National Security Adviser, was forced to resign in 1982 after 10 \$100 bills were found in his White House safe.

He claimed to have intercepted the money from Japanese journalists who tried to offer it as a present to Nancy Reagan.

The problem was that he forgot to turn the cash in to the treasury.

● Mr William Casey, director of the CIA, was found to have traded more than \$3-million (R3.6-

million) in stock in 1982.

Most government officials put their holdings in a "blind trust" to avoid charges that information gained on the job is being used for personal gain.

Mr Casey avoided doing so until July, 1983.

● Anne Burford, former head of the Environmental Protection Agency, and her deputy, Rita Lavelle, both lost their jobs in 1983 when it was discovered they were turning a blind eye to certain corporate violations of EPA standards.

Miss Lavelle received a six-month jail sentence for contempt of Congress.

● Mr Robert Nimmo, former Veterans Administration chief, was forced to reimburse the government \$6 441 for improper use of a chauffeur-driven car.

More popular than his policies

He also spent \$54 183 (R65 000) to decorate his office, then sent the old furniture to his daughter.

● Mr Richard Perle, assistant Defence Secretary for International Security Policy, wrote a memo calling for the department to buy munitions from a company that had paid him \$50 000 in consulting fees.

● Mr Charles Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency, se-

cretly taped telephone conversations with other government officials and then lied to reporters about it.

● Mr James Watt, the former Secretary of the Interior, committed a string of politically-embarrassing faux pas.

The final straw came when he pointed to the representative nature of an Interior Commission by describing it as consisting of "a woman, a black, two Jews and a cripple".

● Mr Edwin Meese, one of Mr Reagan's closest advisers and his new nominee for the post of Attorney-General, is currently under investigation after it was revealed that he gave a series of people jobs after receiving personal loans from them.

The key to the President's ability to come away from every debacle with each hair in place can be found in a reluctance on the part of voters to hold Mr Reagan accountable for his policies or his appointees.

Public opinion polls have consistently shown that the President is more popular than his policies.

In February, a Washington Post-ABC TV news poll showed that Mr Reagan had a 59 percent approval rating despite negative ratings for his policies in the Middle East and Central America.

Television show host

His ability to carry this off appears to rest on his consistency, his lack of involvement in the details of day-to-day policy making and his personal likeability.

A Washington Post reporter, Mr Lou Cannon, who has covered Mr Reagan since he first entered politics in 1964, attributes the President's ability to stand outside the political system to the fact that he was a well-liked actor and television-show host before he became a politician.

Because of this, people still do not view him as a politician.

In his first campaign, the President billed himself as a "citizen-politician".

When he became Governor of California, Mr Reagan became the "citizen-Governor".

Even today, Mr Cannon points out, Mr Reagan always refers to government as "them" and never "we".

The President's pollster, Mr Richard Wirthlin, points to Mr Reagan's sense of humour and optimism as contributory to his personal appeal.

"Politicians who make good use of humour tend to be more trusted," Mr Wirthlin said.

In addition, voters tend to respect Mr Reagan's efforts to carry out the convictions he has held all his political life even if they do not agree with those convictions.

Said one critic: "With Reagan, it's like two guys who go to a bar regularly to have a beer."

"They trust each other even if they don't see eye to eye."

"Somehow this is the relationship that Mr Reagan has been able to establish with the voters."

"They just like him."

The thing about Ron is that they just LIKE him

By PATRICIA CHENEY: Washington

St Wendolins zone decision welcomed

CAPE TOWN: The Government announcement that St Wendolins Ridge and Klaarwater are to remain black areas was welcomed today.

Under the threat of removal for many years the residents of the area have been told the Cabinet has reversed its earlier decision.

In a deal to allow the areas to remain black, the Catholic mission at St Wendolins will invest R20 million in a devel-

Political Correspondent

opment programme.

Mr Ray Swart, Natal leader of the PFP, today welcomed the decision, announced by Dr Piet Koornhof, Minister of Co-operation and Development.

Mr Swart said it was pity the situation had been allowed to arise, but commended the authorities "for reass-

sessing the situation and coming to a realistic and compassionate decision".

Under the agreement the mission will develop properties while the Department of Co-operation and Development will handle daily administration.

Dr Koornhof said running of the town would be given to a community council when development had reached a certain stage.

Chief urges action against new deal

Daily News Reporter

ULUNDI: Continued opposition to the new constitution, including the possibility of consumer action, was advocated by KwaZulu's Chief Minister, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly here yesterday.

In concluding his policy speech, the Chief said his people must be prepared for campaigns which might have to be stepped up in opposition to the new constitution.

"I think we should study ways and means of using consumer power to indicate revulsion to those who will participate in the denationalisation of 22 million Africans," he said.

Chief Buthelezi said he anticipated difficulties in implementing such plans because of the present economic climate.

"We need a long and thorough preparation and I think the time for making a beginning in that direction is right now," he said.

He also pointed out that KwaZulu was being deliberately lumped with Pretoria by some groups to be portrayed as an enemy of the people.

"This may turn out to be our Achilles Heel," he said.

"Because whatever effort we make is underfinanced, these groups aim to foist all blame on us for the poor quality of the services we render on a shoestring budget."

1984
APRIL
1984

KOORNHOF GIVES JOB ASSURANCE

Political Correspondent

CAPE TOWN: Claims by opponents of Government plans to incorporate Lamontville and Hambanati into KwaZulu that people living in the area would lose their jobs have been rejected by Minister of Co-operation and Development, Dr Piet Koornhof.

In a statement Dr Koornhof said: "I wish to give the assurance that any rights acquired by residents of the areas in the past in terms of Section 10 of the Black Urban Areas Consolidation Act to work in a particular prescribed area will not be jeopardised in any fashion as a result of the new status."

Mr Ray Swart, MP, Progressive Federal Party black affairs spokesman, welcomed the assurance. He said the claims had been one of the main reasons for opposing the incorporation.

Chief warned on his attacks against Botha

Political Correspondent

CAPE TOWN: Dr Piet Koornhof, Minister of Co-operation and Development, has warned Chief Gatsha Buthelezi that attacks on the Prime Minister, Mr P.W. Botha, were not in the interests of himself or the people of KwaZulu and South Africa.

Dr Koornhof's warning follows a report that Chief Buthelezi had refused to meet Mr Botha if he "was to be treated like a political juvenile".

South African Cabinet Ministers customarily opened sessions of the KwaZulu legislative Assembly "but no longer had the courage to come because when they did the leaders of KwaZulu spoke openly about the South African situation".

Dr Koornhof said in a statement that he had "for a long time refused to react to statements by Chief Buthelezi.

"He has now once again made an attack on the Prime Minister.

"I want to make it quite clear I resent these unwarranted, unfounded and unnecessary attacks on the Prime Minister very strongly.

"I know it is neither in the interests of the people of KwaZulu nor the Chief Minister, nor the people of South Africa.

"Personal discussions to obviate differences of opinion will be far more beneficial than making statements of this nature.

"I appeal to him to bear this in mind."

'Inquiry was not voluntarily abandoned'

Daily News Reporter

ULUNDI: The South African Government did not voluntarily abandon a judicial commission of inquiry into last year's violence at the university of Zululand at Ngoye.

This was the reassurance given to KwaZulu's Chief Minister, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, in a message from the Minister of Education and Training, Mr Barend du Plessis, the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly was told here yesterday.

Chief Buthelezi said that according to Mr du Plessis the move had been forced not only by the

withdrawal of former Natal Judge President Mr Justice James but also by the refusal of all other judges to accept nomination.

The judges, he said, were not prepared to accept the financial remuneration set for the commission.

He said Mr du Plessis had appointed Professor A.J. Middleton, head of the department of Criminal and Procedural Law at the University of South Africa, to inquire into the events on the university campus in October last year and the emotional issues involved.