

Chapter Five

GOVERNMENT-CREATED PLATFORMS BANTUSTANS

Background

THE BANTUSTANS in South Africa are administered under the Department of Bantu Administration and Development. To date eight Bantustans have been set up and are at various stages of 'constitutional development'.

Over the period 1970-72, South Africa has intensified its scheme of total segregation of the African population into ethnic groups living apart, educated apart and having separate political rights.

In terms of the separate development policy, all Africans are citizens of one Bantustan or another in spite of the fact that only 7 million out of a total of about 15 million Africans actually live in the Bantustans. All urban Africans are thus legally described as temporary sojourners in the 'white' areas, who may only live in these areas for as long as they are employed in these areas.

SIZE AND SCOPE OF BANTUSTANS

There are at present eight officially instituted Bantustans in South Africa. These may be described as follows:

Transkei and Ciskei

- (a) Transkei lies between the Mzimkhulu and Kei rivers and is constituted of 2 pieces of land in which several white spots are found;

the districts of Elliot, Maclear, Matatiele, Mount Currie, Umzimkhulu and Port St. John are all white spots and have been the subject of land disputes between the white government and the Transkei's Chief K.D. Matanzima;

the total Transkeian territory consists of 4 680 578 hectares;

the 'capital' of Transkei is Umtata;

together with Ciskei, Transkei has 2 206 691 Xhosas living in these areas, whilst a further 1 723 231 live in white areas;

- (b) Ciskei lies mainly within the Border region but stretches out towards the Eastern Cape (Peddie etc.) and North Eastern districts;

the actual historical boundaries of the Ciskei are the Kei on the East, the Fish on the West and the Orange in the North;

the Ciskei consists of 17 pieces of land carved out of an areas which is predominantly white;

the total Ciskeian territory consists of 867 987 hectares;

the 'capital' of the Ciskei is Zwelitsha, near King Williams Town.

KwaZulu

Kwa Zulu is the homeland designed for Zulus. It lies mainly in Northern Natal and has a few spots around Durban and in the Natal South belt;

the 'capital' of KwaZulu is at present Nongoma;

KwaZulu consists of 29 pieces of land which are currently in the process of consolidation by the Bantu Administration Department;

the total KwaZulu area consists of 3 182 642 hectares;

a total of 2 135 448 Zulus live in KwaZulu while a further 1 890 634 Zulus live in white areas.

Bophuthatswana

stretches roughly from Kuruman through Zeerust and Rustenburg and includes parts of North Western Transvaal;

the 'capital' of Bophuthatswana is Mafikeng;

Bophuthatswana consists of 19 pieces of land;

a total of 610 528 Tswanas live in Bophuthatswana whilst a total of 1 107 980 Tswanas live in white areas;

the total areas of Bophuthatswana consists of 3 305 965 hectares.

Lebowa

Lebowa includes areas in Sekhukhuniland lying between Pietersburg and Lydenburg and extending to the Kruger National Park;

the 'capital' of Lebowa is Seshego near Pietersburg;

Lebowa consists of 3 pieces of land;

a total of 1 001 181 Pedis (Northern Sothos) live in Lebowa while a further 602 349 live in white areas;

the total areas of Lebowa consists of 1 773 360 hectares.

Gazankulu (Machangana)

Gazankulu is thrown between Bophuthatswana on the North East Transvaal south of Vendaland and Lebowa and borders on the northern boundary of Swaziland;

the 'capital' of Gazankulu is Giyane in Louis Trichardt district;

Gazankulu consists of 4 pieces of land;

a total of 392 910 Shangaans live in Gazankulu whilst a further 344 068 live in white areas;

the total area of Gazankulu consists of 891 910 hectares.

Vendaland

stretches from east of Messina nearly to Tzaneen in the North-Eastern Transvaal;

the 'capital' of Vendaland is Sibasa in Louis Trichardt district;

a total of 251 235 Vendas live in Vendaland whilst a further 10 640 live in white areas;

Vendaland consists of 3 pieces of land;

the total area of Vendaland consists of 804 146 hectares.

Basotho Qua Qua (Basotho ba Borwa)

situated just outside Lesotho extending into the surrounding areas of the Free State;

a total of 144 060 Southern Sothos live in Basotho Qua Qua whilst a further 1 309 294 live in white areas;

the 'capital' of Basotho Qua Qua is Witsjieshoek (Qua Qua);

Basotho Qua Qua consists of 1 piece of land.

STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT

The Bantu Homeland Citizenship Act (No. 26 of 1970) was promulgated to provide, inter alia, for citizenship of certain Bantu Homelands, issue of citizenship of 'Bantu persons' and for the promulgation of regulations in consultation with the Homeland governments. This Act has been used in speeding up the process of 'political development' of the Bantustans, except for the Transkei which had its own Transkei Constitution Act (No. 48 of 1963).

The pattern of 'development' of all Bantustans, except for the Transkei, has been made similar by usage of the Act referred to above. The first step is the creation of a Territorial Authority with limited powers over a wide range of topics. These are listed as follows:

educational institutions

construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, drains, dams and furrows considered necessary for proper sanitation, for satisfactory water supply and prevention of soil erosion.

etc.

The next step is creation of the 'first phase' of semi-self-rule. In this stage the Territorial Authority is transformed into a Legislative Assembly which is completely nominated and has no real powers. The Executive of the Bantustan is then given some executive powers over a range of topics. Each of the 'semi-independent' departments is headed by one of the Councillors of the Executive. Normally these are:

- Authority Affairs and Finance
- Community Affairs
- Justice
- Roads and Works
- Agriculture
- Education and Culture

The third step is the creation of the 'second phase' of semi-autonomy. In this stage the Legislative Assembly is partly elected and partly nominated (usually fewer elected members). It is further given 'full control' over some departments and a Cabinet with ministers in control of each department.

Usually the departments concerned are:

- Chief Minister and Finance
- Interior
- Justice
- Roads and Works
- Agriculture
- Education and Culture

Transkei

The Transkei Legislative Assembly came into existence in 1963. Unlike other Bantustans, Transkeian 'development' is in terms of the Transkei Constitution Act of 1963. The Act provided for a Legislative Assembly

consisting of 64 chiefs and 45 elected members. Paramount chiefs retained their seats indefinitely whilst the other chiefs, according to the 1967 amendment to the Act, are elected by the chiefs themselves and retain their seats for the duration of the Legislative Assembly, normally for 5 years. The Assembly elects a cabinet consisting of the 'Chief Minister' and 5 other ministers. Chief Kaizer Matanzima is the Chief Minister of the Transkei.

The Legislative Assembly has powers over portfolios of:

- Finance
- Justice
- Interior
- Education
- Agriculture and Forestry
- Roads and Works

The Republican parliament still retains control over:

- Defence
- Prisons
- External Affairs
- Postal Services
- Security
- Currency, banking, customs and excise
- Railway
- Health and Hospitals
- Immigration
- Information

and in addition also has authority over the Transkei constitution itself.

According to two Bantu Laws Amendment Bills piloted through Parliament by the Deputy Ministers of Bantu Administration and Development, Piet Koornhof and A.J. Raubenheimer, additional powers for the Transkei have been proposed. These cover the following:

- Handing over of Prison and Health services to the Transkei government

- Transfer of prisoners between South Africa and the Transkei (not extradition)

Legal Aid Schemes

Control of horse-racing and other racing

Control of tourism

Control of housing schemes

Control of libraries, museums, auctions and cemeteries

Application of entertainment taxes.

Ciskei

The Ciskei Legislative Assembly was opened in April 1972 in Zwelitsha by Chief Justice Mabandla, who is its Chief Councillor.

Ciskei is at the 'second phase' of its development, i.e. it has its own constitution, a Cabinet with ministers, a Legislative Assembly which is partly elected and partly nominated and 'complete' control over some portfolios.

KwaZulu

KwaZulu is at the 'second phase' of its development and has been rapidly up-graded in terms of the Bantu Homeland Constitution Act of 1971 to acquire a Legislative Assembly having authority over a limited number of portfolios.

The KwaZulu Legislative Assembly was formally inaugurated at Nongoma on 1 April, 1972 and consists of 130 members: 55 elected and 75 nominated from tribal authorities. Chief Gatsha Buthelezi is the Chief Councillor.

Bophuthatswana

The Tswana Legislative Assembly became self-governing on the 1 June, 1972, with 72 members - 24 of them elected. Chief Lucas Mangope is the Chief Councillor.

Bophuthatswana is in the 'second phase' of its development.

Lebowa

The Lebowa Legislative Assembly met for the first time in July, 1972, and expects Transkei-type autonomy by 1974. Chief Maserumule Matlala is the Chief Councillor.

Lebowa is in the 'second phase' of its development.

Gazankulu

The Gazankulu Legislative Assembly was opened in April, 1972. Professor H.W.E. Ntsanwisi is the Chief Councillor.

Gazankulu is still at the 'first phase' of its development.

Vendaland

The Venda Legislative Assembly met for the first time in Sibasa in May, 1972. Chief Patrick Mphephu is the Chief Councillor.

Venda is at its 'first phase' of development.

Basotho Qua Qua

Basotho Qua Qua was constituted as a Territorial Authority on a federal basis in 1969 for the two Southern Sotho Tribal Authorities. Basotho Qua Qua was instituted into a Legislative Assembly at the beginning of 1972. It is still at the 'first phase' of its development, is the newest and least 'developed' of the Bantustans.

Chief W.S. Mota is the Chief Councillor.

ACTIVITIES BY LEADERS

The leaders of the various Bantustans have, particularly over the past year, increasingly demonstrated a willingness to test the commitment of the Nationalist government to their policy of separate development. This has taken the form mainly of demands for more land, demands for more powers and independent planning for possible black coalition amongst them at a later stage.

KwaZulu

(a) Public Statements

As early as the time of his election, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi had spelt out the following as what the government should do to make separate development meaningful to Africans, particularly the Zulus of whom he was head:

- more territory for the Zulus
- representation of urban Zulus
- more pay and rate for the job
- tolerance in application of influx laws
- free and compulsory education
- war on malnutrition and disease.

Since then Chief Gatsha Buthelezi has consistently been critical of the application of the separate development policy and the tendency by the 'all powerful Republican government' to want to retain as much power as it can.

Speaking at Nongoma on 29 February, 1972, he said (1):

'We think that it is vital, despite all the doubts many Zulus have, that we should establish Zulu solidarity as 4 250 000 people, so that we can speak with one voice. Once this happens, we citizens of KwaZulu can then be in a legal position to foster bonds of union with other blacks in exactly the same way that whites have established bonds amongst themselves, in spite of different language and cultural barriers. We have no doubt that once that stage is reached, we will be in a position to speak to white South Africans as equals, and our combined voice will then have reached such a volume that they will no longer be able to ignore our voice about our rights and our future'.

Chief Gatsha Buthelezi has demonstrated during his term of office an unorthodoxy unparalleled amongst any of the Bantustan leaders through his acceptance of speech engagements from all segments of the community. To date he has spoken to Zulu political gatherings, black political gatherings, black university students, white university students, white political parties, youth groups, women's clubs, Jewish clubs, Chambers of Commerce, welfare organisations and a host of others.

To all groups the message seems to centre around 3 main points:

an attack on the government and its application of the separate development policy;

a plea to whites of liberal opinion to accommodate black demands and attempts at self-reliance;

a plea to blacks to come together and stand as a solid bloc.

This latter issue has been confused by the fact that Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, as a Bantustan leader, is first and foremost a leader of the Zulu ethnic group and often has to speak from that platform.

(b) Constitutional conflict with the Monarchy

One of the first issues that faced KwaZulu was constitutional conflict between the Paramount Chief (now King) Goodwill Zwelithini and the Chief Executive Councillor, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi. The controversy was sparked off by initial moves made by the Minister of Bantu Administration, Mr M.C. Botha, who warned Buthelezi that: 'No member of your government should consider his own position to be more important and exalted than that of the Paramount Chief. Precaution should be taken to make sure that he is not relegated to a mere figure head' (2).

Chief Gatsha Buthelezi then publicly accused the South African government of trying to have him removed and of negating the principle of self-determination.

The issue was then raised at the January 1972 meeting of the Territorial Authority which supported Buthelezi by unanimously voting to exclude the Paramount Chief from the political structure of KwaZulu and merely to make him a constitutional monarch.

In September, speaking to a crowd of about 10 000 people at a Shaka's day celebration, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi once more spelt out to the King Goodwill Zwelithini that he must always remain 'above the heat and dust of politics'. This outburst was occasioned by a difference in views between Chief Gatsha and the King as to how the celebrations should be run. Concessions eventually had to be made by both sides to reach a proper settlement. King Goodwill Zwelithini sat in stony silence as Chief Gatsha Buthelezi spelt out the role of a monarch as he saw it (3).

Earlier on in the same meeting King Goodwill Zwelithini had stated that he had every confidence in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and in Chief Buthelezi.

(c) Creation of opposition in KwaZulu

The establishment of an opposition party in KwaZulu hinged closely on the role of the monarch in that 'state'. The man behind the establishment of the Opposition is Mr Lloyd Ndaba, a strong supporter of the monarch system who feels that the Paramount Chief ought to be 'Head of State' and the Prime Minister should be under him. He also urged the Zulus not to allow the Prime Minister to 'chase the king all over the veld'. This viewpoint was revealed in a circular sent by Mr Lloyd Ndaba to all the chiefs in KwaZulu.

The issue of establishment of the Opposition was discussed in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly in May 1972 where Chief Gatsha heavily

attacked Mr H. Torlage (Chief Commissioner of the Zulus) for supplying addresses of Zulu chiefs to Mr Lloyd Ndaba.

Chief Buthelezi in stating his views regarding the Opposition said: 'It would be childish and ludicrous to create an opposition which would merely lead to petty bickering. At this embryonic stage we should not dissipate our energies in mutual recriminations by creating opposition parties'.

It is difficult to assess the strength of the Zulu National Party (the Opposition) but indications are that it is experiencing great difficulty in getting off the ground.

(d) Oaths of Allegiance

Attempts by the South African government to have the members of the KwaZulu Territorial Authority take an oath of allegiance to the South African government itself met with stiff opposition from the Territorial Authority members. The Territorial Authority unanimously rejected the oath and retained only the oath to honour the State President.

(e) Plans for Consolidation of KwaZulu

On the 6 June, 1972, the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development revealed, in a statement, the government's massive homeland consolidation programme (4).

Regarding KwaZulu the plan was to reduce the existing 24 Zulu areas in Northern Natal into 3 large areas and 1 small area.

Area 1 would include the entire area from just north of Sodwana Bay to the Mozambique border and across to the Swaziland border.

Area 2 would include the area combining Hlabisa and Ulundi and stretching from just north of Mtonjaneni across towards Empangeni but not including this town and then north towards the Swaziland border.

Area 3 stretching from Eshowe but not including it towards Greytown but not including it and up past Dundee towards Newcastle.

Area 4 a small existing Zulu area bordering Richards Bay.

The implication in these proposals was that 530 000 hectares of 'white' land would be exchanged for 449 000 hectares of black land. The Umfolozi Game Reserve would be incorporated into KwaZulu. The Mdumo Game Reserve would probably later be incorporated in KwaZulu.

In his statement Mr M.C. Botha stressed that these proposals were not final and were subject to the representations to be made by the various affected groups. For this reason a Bantu Affairs Commission on the KwaZulu consolidation proposals was appointed to listen to representations by the affected parties.

The Commission sat in Dundee, Eshowe, Pietermaritzburg and Harding and listened to representatives from interested persons including:

Natal Agricultural Union
 KwaZulu Legislative Assembly
 Natal Indian Cane Growers Association
 Representatives of affected companies
 Natal Southern District Chamber of Commerce
 Dalton Farmers Association
 Eshowe Town Clerk.

The people of KwaZulu, who would be most affected by the proposals, were not allowed to make personal representations. The Legislative Assembly of KwaZulu presented a memorandum to the Minister of Bantu Administration, otherwise the hearings were all all-white affair with the only blacks (Natal Indian Cane Growers Association) being allowed to make representations through a white attorney.

Points which came out during the hearings according to the Natal Agricultural Union were (5):

that the consolidation would cost at least 250 million rand.

343 000 Africans, 8 400 Indians, 2 500 Coloureds and 6 157 whites would have to move;

16 000 hectares of established timber land would be lost to the white areas;

affected white and Indian cane growers have an aggregate quota of 196 962 tons of sugar cane a year and this would fall drastically if the land went to Africans;

important communications would be jeopardised and there would be a deterioration in the public good will.

Speaking at one of the hearings, Mr J.E.P. Stevenson of the Ntumeni Planters Association said: 'We have unanimously decided that Ntumeni should remain white ... it would be quite irresponsible to expect blacks to practise agriculture in this type of country ... the country could ill-afford economical or social upheavals ... it would be an embarrassing and irresponsible blunder to turn Ntumeni black ...' He further added that a sophisticated white society had worked the area for 70 years and could not expect an unsophisticated black society to even maintain the norm.

Ultimately the proposals were rejected by all groups although for different reasons. As Gatsha Buthelezi put it, speaking for blacks, 'we are not interested in proposals hatched by whites in favour of whites only; we do not want to soil our hands by negotiating over proposals designed for the benefits of whites'.

It is expected that the proposals will be amended to accommodate the views of the various affected parties before definite legislation can be formulated.

(f) Demands for more land

Chief Gatsha Buthelezi has refused to contemplate independence until his 'State' is consolidated. 'There cannot be a State without boundaries', he said.

Ciskei

(a) Public Statements

As early as April, 1972, Chief Justice Mabandla made a strong plea to the government to decide soon on the proposed new boundaries for the Ciskei. This has to a large extent been the main issue, i.e. the re-drawing of boundaries in this historically disputed border territory now consisting of 17 pieces of land.

Chief Mabandla's claim has been mainly that the boundaries for the Ciskei stretch from the Fish River to the Kei River and from the sea to the Orange River (6). He claimed in July that if the government could agree to these boundaries then East London would be developed as a harbour for the Ciskei. Subsequent to this claim an SABC news report on 3 August, 1972, denied that Chief Mabandla had made this claim. In reaction to this, Chief Mabandla reiterated his claim for vast areas of white-

owned land in the Eastern Cape on 4 August, 1972 (7).

(b) Plans for Consolidation of the Ciskei

In terms of the 1936 Land Act, the South African government is committed to extending the territory controlled by Africans in the Eastern Cape.

On the 19 April, 1972, the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr M.C. Botha, laid proposals before Parliament for the declaration as released areas of 185 385 hectares of land for the better consolidation of the Xhosa Ciskei homeland.

The areas are situated in the districts of Cathcart, E. London, King Williams Town, Peddie, Queenstown, Stutterheim and Victoria East. This was meant to be in part settlement of the land owed by the government in that area and this would leave still another 235 798 hectares of land still to be given.

The Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr A.J. Raubenheimer, said that the whites in the proposed released areas should not panic, the acquisition of land was of necessity a gradual process and the land would not immediately be transferred to the Ciskei Homeland. The whole process would take anything from 10-15 years 'if not longer' (8).

Reactions from whites were quick and sharp. The chairman of the Hamburg Village Board in the Peddie area stated: The whole matter becomes not only confusing but even ridiculous when releases are given first making Hamburg black, then white, then black again, which ultimately and conceivably will not only bring about physical colour blindness, but conceivable loss of faith and political blindness' (9).

(c) Preparation for elections

The Ciskei will have its first elections in February 1973 and already about 500 000 voters have been registered. There are 20 elected and 30 ex officio seats to be filled in the Legislative Assembly.

Already there are rumours of a major surprise for Chief Justice Mabandla, the Territory's Chief Minister. There is evidence to support the view that Mr Sebe is the favourite of the clandestine Rarabe-led opposition movement which wants to fight the elections on tribal lines to oust Chief Justice Mabandla who is a Fingo.

Soon after Mr Sebe's arrival from the United States, in October, rumours spread that he was due for dismissal from the Cabinet. Mr Sebe had already been demoted from the 'powerful' Education portfolio and

was given the Agriculture portfolio. Chief Mabandla, however, discounted rumours as mere mischief-making.

According to observers, in the actual elections Mr Sebe will rely on the Rarabe chiefs including Paramount Chief Mxolisi Sandile while Chief Justice Mabandla will rely mainly on the Fingo chiefs in the Peddie, Alice and Keiskammahoek districts.

Bophuthatswana

(a) Public Statements

In Bophuthatswana two figures emerge as the centre of political activity. On the one hand is Chief Lucas Mangope, head of Bophuthatswana and on the other is Chief Thidimane Pilane, originally allied with Mangope and now head of the opposing Seoposegwe Party.

Chief Lucas Mangope is a firm believer in the policy of separate development. Time and again he has declared that the people of Bophuthatswana are as a group in favour of apartheid.

The first controversial issue in which Mangope got himself involved was the collection of 10c from each of the citizens of Bophuthatswana in an effort to build up a fund to 'combat terrorism'. In an address to the Tswana Legislative Assembly, the Republican Minister of Police, Mr L. Muller, stated that an amount of R3 014 had been collected by the Tswana people towards this purpose.

Speaking at a ceremony at Mafikeng to mark the territory self rule on June 1 1972, Mangope once more stated that separate development was the only policy that would give the Tswana people a say in their own affairs. In the meantime the rift between Chief Mangope who is regarded as a strong pro-apartheid leader and Chief Pilane who is the more radical of the two, continued to grow and to express itself in more definite terms.

A second issue in which Mangope has expressed a very keen interest has been the establishment of a Tswana University. Again it was announced on 21 March, 1972, at the Tswana Legislative Assembly that a handsome amount of R50 000 had been collected by Tswanas towards this project.

On several occasions Mangope has been accused of being a stooge of the South African government, mainly by supporters of the Pilane approach. Speaking at a ceremony at the offices of the Commissioner-general of the Tswana people on 1 June, Chief Mangope denied allegations made by politicians that he was a stooge and said that he would never become one. He predicted that the consolidation of land would be a burning issue in Bophuthatswana politics.

(b) Creation of Opposition

On 29 July the *Rand Daily Mail* reported that Chief Pilane had launched an opposition party, Seoposengwe Party, at Rustenburg. Mr Molele, P.R.O. of the party, said that the new party would follow a policy similar to that of Gatsha Buthelezi of KwaZulu, i.e. one of accepting separate development as the only practical alternative and trying to force the government to match theory with practice.

On 30 July Chief Pilane, leader of Seoposengwe, accused Chief Mangope and his supporters of intimidating the Tswana people to support them. He further accused Mangope of using unfair tactics to be elected the first Chief Minister of the Tswana Homeland.

Early in August in preparation for the elections, Chief Pilane challenged Mangope to a public debate where their policies would be discussed. The challenge was refused.

(c) Elections

On 4 October, Tswana throughout the country went to the polls to elect 24 members to the Tswana Legislative Assembly. The election was fought on party political lines between Mangope's group and Pilane's group.

Chief Mangope's party won 16 of the contested constituencies. Four constituencies returned unopposed candidates all regarded as supporters of Chief Mangope. The other 4 seats went to Pilane.

When the Legislative Assembly met at the beginning of November, Chief Mangope was elected as Chief Minister.

From 1 November onwards Bophuthatswana operated with South African government backing under a Transkei-type system of partial self-government.

Lebowa

(a) Public Statements

Outlining his hopes and aspirations regarding the homeland policy, in July 1971 Chief Matlala mentioned the following points (10):

The ultimate dramatic step of independence for South Africa's Bantustans may be in the form of a federation of black homeland territories;

his homeland was working towards achievement of self-government as soon as possible with representations at the United Nations;

he didn't favour membership of the O.A.U. because although the O.A.U. hit at segregated bodies, it was itself practising segregation.

Speaking in Cape Town in 1972 after consultations with the Prime Minister and Mr M.C. Botha, Chief Matlala said: 'It is necessary that we have more land, but it will only be known how much after certain statistics have been made available' (11).

Addressing the Legislative Assembly on 14 August, 1972, Chief Matlala said: 'We intend being loyal to the honourable Minister, the government and South Africa ... I want to assure the Minister that we stand foursquare behind him'. On this occasion both the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr M.C. Botha and the Minister of Defence, Mr P.W. Botha, and observers from foreign countries had attended the session of the Legislative Assembly.

Defending the homeland's policy and the piecemeal rate at which minor concessions were being granted to South Africa's Africans, Chief Matlala, in his message when Lebowa became self-governing on 2 October, said that an unbiased evaluation of South Africa's policies disclosed that it was not out of step with what was happening elsewhere on the African continent. He said that the only difference was that independence was coming to blacks in an orderly way. This was contrary to the way in which independence was achieved by the former colonies of Belgium, France and Britain (12).

(b) Proposals for consolidation

On 16 November, 1972, a closed commission sitting in Pietersburg in the Tom Naude Technical High School listened to reactions by affected farmers to the proposed consolidation plan for Lebowa and Venda.

The proposals include incorporation of about 80 white-owned farms around Pietersburg and Louis Trichardt. They comprise about 200 000 hectares of land including Soutpansberg near Louis Trichardt, the rich Levubu fruit-growing district east of the town and the land east of Bandolierskop. A large portion of white land in Gilead district north of Potgietersrus is also to be incorporated in Lebowa. Nuanetsi, on the Rhodesian border, is to become part of Vendaland and a small section near Steilhoop, on the Botswana border, will complete the western section of Lebowa.

Evidence was heard from farmers' associations, the Transvaal

Agricultural Union, local Sakekamers and the regional development association.

The fears expressed were that industrial growth and development near Pietersburg would be stunted if homeland borders were drawn too near the town, but others opposed and the proposals because they were going to lose their rich citrus, vegetable and cattle land.

The commission's chairman, Mr P.Z.J. van Vuuren, is reported to have said: 'No one was against consolidation in principle; it was a question of individuals resenting the loss of their land'.

Blacks living in the area who are also going to be affected, were not consulted on the issue.

Gazankulu

Public Statements

Opening the first session of the Machangana Legislative Assembly on 12 April 1972, Prof. Ntsanwisi made the following 3 points (13):

the South African government's approach to development of his territory was lamentably slow;

- the government interfered with decisions taken by homeland leaders;

blacks were as insecure in the homelands as they were in urban areas.

He further said: 'Our homeland is economically unviable and unless this deficiency is put right, it cannot be a natural habitat of its people. It will remain a dormitory for the labour needs of white areas'.

Prof. Ntsanwisi has openly declared himself in favour of a policy of federation and closer unity of the homelands in South Africa. 'We can only be a success if we learn from those who have broken the path before us. I believe in black solidarity, but not in direct confrontation', he said (14).

Venda

Public Statements

Chief P.R. Mphephu from the beginning has always declared himself solidly behind the principle of separate development and has stated that the Venda people will never accept a system whereby a white man re-

presents them in Parliament.

After Chief Mphephu's consultation with the Prime Minister and Mr M.C. Botha on the constitutional development of the homeland, Mr M.C. Botha pointed out that Chief Mphephu had stressed to the Prime Minister the desirability of maintaining good co-operation with the government of the Republic and in this context he had singled out the 'terrorist threat'. (It will be remembered that Sibasa was the area that was chosen by the South African Defence Force for practice exercises against possible armed infiltration across nearby borders).

Transkei

(a) Public Statements

Chief Kaizer Matanzima, Transkeian Chief Minister, has always accepted the policy of separate development and has been quoted as saying: 'I have no doubt that there is no turning back, the policy must be applied. I have not heard one single Transkeian citizen who has repudiated the existence of the Transkeian government' (15).

Most of Matanzima's militant statements have been associated with land demands. On several occasions he has demanded the districts of Elliot, Maclear, Matatiele, Mt. Currie, Umzimkhulu and Port St. Johns. These demands have been constantly refused by the white government and have led to the announcement in the South African Parliament by the Prime Minister that the Bantustans were free to become fully independent before consolidation and before the boundaries were finalised.

In January and again in April 1972, Matanzima suggested that he would not accept independence before the land claims were met. On one occasion he is known to have issued what some people regard as an ultimatum, mainly to the effect that if no progress was made on the land claims, his government would refuse to accept back 'Transkei citizens' regarded by the white government as superfluous to its labour needs.

Following his return from a visit to the U.S.A., Chief Matanzima seems to have decided to be most outspoken on issues relating to the position of the Bantustans and also the black man at large. His 'new deal' plan for a federation of Bantustans as one big solid black bloc is evidence of this.

(b) The Opposition

Mr Knowledge Guzana still remains the leader of the Democratic Party, official Transkei 'opposition'. His party stands for multi-racialism

not only in the Transkei, but throughout the Republic.

Mr Guzana's party has in the past advocated that, rather than allow for the balkanization of South Africa, the Transkei should merely be governed by blacks as another province of the country.

Mr Guzana is known to have opposed the land claims made by Chief Matanzima on the grounds that Matanzima's 3 points on which the land claims are based would make a weak case i.e.

an 1880 map of the area

a photograph taken at a conference of magistrates in the Transkei which included representatives from Matatiele, Kokstad and Maclear

the needs of the Xhosas.

Mr Guzana said in Parliament 'to bring us an outmoded map of 1880 and to seek to define definite boundaries in 1972 is merely to forget the fact that boundaries change from period to period'.

It is known that several members of the heavily outnumbered Opposition Party have wavered in their support of the stand made by their leader against the districts being ceded to the Transkei.

Early in 1972 a rift threatened in the ranks of the Democratic Party and this resulted in a determined bid by a powerful faction of Thembu rebels to depose Mr Knowledge Guzana. It is suspected that the basis for the rift was the policy on the land issue and the unrealistic stance of calling for full political and human rights for Transkei citizens in South Africa while participating on a separate development platform.

It was first reported on 3 March in newspapers throughout the country that the opposition leader had been ousted and the party executive suspended. The party's Deputy leader, Chief Sabata Dalindyabo, would then be interim leader until the opposition conference met on 8 April where a new executive would be elected.

Mr Guzana however refused to recognise this decision, which was taken at a regional conference at Sithebe, on the grounds that the constitution did not allow regions to make decisions of this nature. Specific allegations against Mr Guzana were that:

he was not active enough in party politics: he had not replied favourably to invitations to address public meetings in urban areas;

he was being paid as leader of the party while his predecessor Chief Victor Poto was never paid;

the 3 year term of office for the Executive had expired the previous year (1971) and new elections should have been conducted then.

There was also a dispute between the breakaway group and the party leadership about the venue of the April conference with Guzana insisting on Qumbu while the other group wanted Umtata as venue.

At the subsequent congress of the Democratic Party, Guzana re-asserted his dominance and for a while seems to have healed the rift that threatened the party. In a press interview at the end of the conference, Mr Guzana said 'I haven't patched up the differences with Paramount Chief Dalindyebo. He surrendered by refusing nomination'.

(c) Voting Strength in the Legislative Assembly

At the 2nd general election held in 1968, the following were the figures:

	Chiefs	Elected Members	Total
Transkei National Independence Party (TNIP)	56	28	84
Democratic Party (D.P.)	8	14	22
Independents	-	3	3
	64	45	109

(The TNIP is Chief Matanzima's party).

GENERAL ISSUES REGARDING BANTUSTANS

(a) Calls for closer unity

Following his return from the U.S.A., Chief K.D. Matanzima issued a

statement to the effect that he was in favour of creating a greater Xhosaland in which whites and blacks would have equal rights in a new superstate stretching from the Fish River to the Natal border. This call was quickly picked up and magnified by Chief Gatsha Buthelezi in a call for a confederation of black 'states' in Southern Africa. 'Unless blacks of all ethnic groups adopt a common strategy there is no future for us under this policy', he said, referring to the separate development policy as planned by white South Africa.

Mr Knowledge Guzana supported Chief Matanzima's call on the grounds that it was 'a confession at the altar of multi-racialism'. Chief Mangope, shortly after the victory of his party in the Bophuthatswana elections, stated that his victory showed that the Tswana people favoured separate development, 'and unconditional rejection of unity amongst black people'. Chief Mabandla of the Ciskei has adopted the attitude that amalgamation of the Transkei and Ciskei is inevitable, but beyond this he has not made any clear-cut statement of his stand. Prof. Ntsanwisi of Gazankulu is known to have endorsed the stand. He has said that if homelands don't stand together then they do not constitute a nation. He further affirmed his belief in black solidarity.

In spite of the apparent agreement amongst most of the leaders of the Bantustans, there has been no immediate follow-up of this trend of thought to its logical conclusion.

(b) Investments in Bantustans

Following repeated statements by Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Executive Officer of KwaZulu, that certain overseas countries had made offers of assistance to the Zulu homeland, the Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr A.J. Raubenheimer, said: 'The government certainly welcomes any offers of aid - foreign or local - to the developing homelands. My department is at present busy working out a formula whereby offers of aid can be co-ordinated and channelled to the homelands'.

Mr A.J. Raubenheimer further said that in terms of existing legislation, there was no way of handling aid 'apart from through the Bantu Development Corporation' (16).

GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS AGAINST BANTUSTANS

Reactions to the establishment of Bantustans and to the acceptance of Bantustans have been expressed by several groups and individuals in the black world. These reactions range from opposition to involvement in

Bantustan politics on the grounds that they are a waste of time anyway to a rejection of the fragmentation of both the country and its people by a foreign minority.

(a) *The South African Students' Organisation (SASO)*

Of all groups and individuals, SASO has been most outspoken on the Bantustan philosophy. They have consistently rejected the philosophy as a whole and those who propagate it either consciously or subconsciously.

The following points are raised by SASO against Bantustans:

that these are institutions of oppression designed to cheat people into believing that they have communication links with Pretoria;

that whites have no right to balkanise the country and allocate any percentage of it to blacks;

that artificial division of blacks into ethnic groups is aimed at the fragmentation of the struggle by the blacks towards emancipation;

that participation in Bantustan politics is merely aimed at cheating the outside world into believing that there is validity in the multinational policy of the white nationalists;

that the whole philosophy of separate development is a 'solution' mooted by the same people who have created the problem.

SASO has gone on to argue against participation in Bantustan politics even by those people who believe that they can be exploited in the interests of the black man. Here SASO argues that the architects of the system know it best and hence are always ahead of any black infiltrators in terms of planning. As the SASO columnist says in their newsletter: 'If you want to fight your enemy you don't accept the unloaded of his 2 guns and then challenge him to a duel (17).

SASO spokesmen have accused the white press of trying to make Bantustans appear an accomplished fact by giving extensive and often suggestive publicity to the pronouncements by leaders of the Bantustans whilst not giving publicity to opposition to the Bantustan philosophy.

(b) Black Student Representative Councils (S.R.C.'s)

S.R.C.'s of Universities of Natal Black Section and Zululand have communicated the feelings of black students on their campuses to the 'leaders' of Bantustans. They have expressed the opinion that participation in Bantustan politics is a way of 'selling out' on the black cause. They have also requested these people to stop regarding themselves as leaders of the black community.

(c) Black Peoples Convention (BPC)

One of the basic tenets on which BPC was founded is a complete rejection of government-created platforms.

In a statement issued on 13 January, 1972, BPC called upon all the black people of South Africa to join hands as a solid black unit in the quest for their emancipation and to reject all government-created platforms.

(d) Individuals

Opinion on Bantustans is fairly unanimous in rejection of separate development and all its agencies particularly by urban Africans. Where opinions tend to differ is in appreciation of the theory that one can work within the system to destroy the system. This debate has been highlighted particularly in 1972 where some Bantustan 'leaders' have begun openly to attack the limitations of their platform.

REFERENCES

1. African Bureau Fact Sheet 21, July 1972.
2. African Bureau Fact Sheet 21, July 1972.
3. *Rand Daily Mail*, 25.9.72.
4. *Daily News*, 6.6.72.
5. *Rand Daily Mail*, 12.9.72.
6. *Rand Daily Mail*, 2.8.72.
7. *Star*, 4.8.72.
8. *Rand Daily Mail*, 20.4.72.
9. *Rand Daily Mail*, 20.4.72.
10. *Star*, 27.7.71.
11. *Rand Daily Mail*, 24.2.72.

12. *Rand Daily Mail*, 3.10.72.
13. *Rand Daily Mail*, 13.4.72.
14. *Rand Daily Mail*, 18.9.72.
15. *Rand Daily Mail*, 4.11.71.
16. *Natal Mercury*, 31.1.72.
17. SASO Newsletter Sept./Oct. 1972, Vol. 2. No. 4, article by 'Frank Talk' on 'Let's Talk about Bantustans'.