

While continuing to operate the machinery of apartheid the ZLA has established, outside that machinery, a movement which rejects apartheid and by whose views, it seems, its own actions will be guided. Inkatha, it appears, will be the Assembly's self-appointed watchdog, reminding it, whenever necessary, that its obligations are as much to the people outside its own homeland as they are to those living in it.

The Aims and Objectives of Inkatha, as set out in its constitution, show clearly its Zulu origins, but show equally clearly the direction in which it wants to go. Thus, for example, the first aim is "to foster the spirit of unity among the people of KwaZulu throughout Southern Africa and between them and all their African brothers in Southern Africa and to keep alive and foster the traditions of the people", while the second is "to help promote and encourage the development of the people of KwaZulu, spiritually, economically, educationally and politically". But amongst its other aims is one "to establish contact and liaise with other cultural groups in Southern Africa with a view to the establishment of a common society", and another "to abolish all forms of discrimination and segregation based on tribe, clan, sex, colour or creed." The intention, then, is to use a Zulu organisation to press for the establishment of a non-racial, common South African society. For that goal to be attained the leaders of Inkatha are obviously going to have to keep it very much before their supporters. It is easy enough to whip up group enthusiasm for a group cause but not nearly so easy to carry that

enthusiasm over group divisions to embrace people who are in some way different from yourselves.

There is another point. As Dr Bengu pointed out in his article Inkatha does not feel itself bound to the Western Party political system and intends investigating fully the relevance of indigenous African democratic systems to our situation. Presumably he is referring to the "consensus" politics of African tribal society. We think such an investigation could be most valuable. The rigidities of the present party system, with members bound by secret caucus decisions, need very critical examination. But we also have a concern about the application of consensus politics to our situation and that concern is for the dissident voice. Will it be heard? Would, for instance, the voice of SASO and BPC ever be heard? Their members may say a great many things which we find unacceptable but that they are brave and thinking members of our society with ideas that the rest of us should know about, we have no doubt. Though they will reject Inkatha, we hope that it will not reject them, that due allowance will be made in its development for all dissident voices to be heard.

Reality will watch the progress of Inkatha with the greatest interest, and will hope that it will soon grow from a purely Zulu organisation into one in which any person committed to the ideal of the common society to which it subscribes will be welcome and able to make a contribution. □

PERSECUTION AND TERRORISM

Dr Monty Naicker, former President of the South African Indian Congress, is 65 years old. For one quarter of his life (16 years) he has been banned. When the most recent of his bans expired three years ago he and his wife applied for passports, hoping, one suspects, to be able to get away for a while from the suffocating restrictions of apartheid. They were refused, as they have been twice since then, most recently this September, when they hoped to have a holiday in Mauritius. Is this not vindictive persecution?

On or about September 23rd Mr Lindeliwe Mabandla and his wife Brigitte, both of Durban, were served with three-year banning orders and banished to the tiny Transkei town of Tsolo, where they are not likely to find work. On or about the same date Mr Mapetlo Mohapi was also banned and banished, in his case to the Zwelitsha and Kingwilliams-town districts of the Eastern Cape, and Mr Steven Carolus of Cape Town was also banned. All four have a common history. They were associated with SASO, were detained for between five and six months each at the time of last year's

Frelimo rallies, and were released at the end of these periods without charge. Presumably they were only released because their prolonged secret detention and interrogation failed to produce evidence that they had committed a crime. One must assume that they have been banned and banished because there is no evidence of the commission of a crime. After the terror of detention comes the persecution of banning and banishment.

Of the many people detained at the time of the Frelimo rallies last year thirteen eventually appeared in court some six months later. The charges were thrown out by the court. Two of the thirteen were then released, two had their cases separated from the others and, a year after their detention, are still waiting for their trials to commence, the other nine are appearing on newly-framed charges before the court in Pretoria. Recently they celebrated the first anniversary of their detention by producing a cake in the court and asking the embarrassed State prosecutor to blow out the candle! A symbolic act; for the Terrorism Act under which the

prosecutor has framed his charges is what makes possible incommunicado detentions of six months or more and trials which don't come to court for a year or more; in other words, the snuffing out of the Rule of Law.

It is anybody's guess how many Terrorism Act detentions there have been in recent months. One only hears immediately of those that somebody knows and talks about. Breyten Breytenbach, the poet, was held for over a week before anybody knew about it. How many members of the South West African People's Organisation are detained? Nobody knows. What one does know is that a series of

detentions of young White people has followed on that of Breyten Breytenbach. What one has heard is the anguished cry of Horst Kleinschmidt's weeping wife, as her husband was taken away "How long are they going to hold Horst and what will they do to him?" The answer is "Nobody knows," And the father of Jenny Curtis "She has a lot of spiritual courage, but at the same time we can't discount the possibility that she will emerge from detention mentally scarred for life."

These are the words of people who know what the Terrorism Act, and its by-product, terror, mean. □

“DIVIDED WE STAND, UNITED WE FALL”

by Peter Rutsch

Wherever one group of people deprives others of a rightful say in the government of their country, the principle of divide and rule is employed. This is true in South Africa. As an example of this principle in action in the administrative sphere, Reality will in subsequent issues, investigate the bureaucratic set-up in the Pietermaritzburg Area and in the lives of people living there.

Without delving too deeply, the following statutory bodies control the daily comings and goings of all of us:

- The Pietermaritzburg City Council
- The Drakensberg Bantu Administration Board
- The Development and Services Board (formerly the Local Health Commission)
- The South African Bantu Trust
- The KwaZulu Government
- The Natal Provincial Administration

various smaller local authorities such as:

- Hilton
- Howick
- Camperdown

and so on.

In addition, Coloured people fall under the Coloured Representative Council; Indians under the South African Indian Council.

The Group Areas Act and the Community Development Act control where Indian, Coloured and Whites live and

work, the Department of Bantu Administration and Development rules the lives of all Africans. In education, a different department determines the educational system of each "separate racial group". The Africans have two systems—one falling under the Department of Bantu Education—the other falling under the KwaZulu Government.

Does this incredible jumble of authorities lead to efficient government; government in touch with the people, respondent to their needs?

No South African with any insight into the South African way of life can answer that question in the affirmative. A simple example is labour, and the right to seek work where you wish. How many of us have had to undergo the indignity of dealing with the Labour Bureau? How many break the law in this regard?

Incredibly, a baby born at the Edendale Hospital cannot be adopted by a couple living in Imbali 'twenty minutes walk away', unless they get a permit under the influx control laws. Incredibly, thousands of citizens pay rates, yet have no meaningful say as to how that money is spent.

In the next edition, Reality will look at these statutory bodies, explain their aims and objects and try to relate the one with the other.

Thereafter, we will look at life under this umbrella! □