



---

---

Issue No. 71

September 2003

---

---

# **A DAY OF SHAME TO BE REMEMBERED -**

**Concerning the funeral of Chief  
Kaiser Matanzima.**

**APDUSA VIEWS  
P O BOX 8888  
CUMBERWOOD  
3235**

**e-mail: [Malentro@telkomsa.net](mailto:Malentro@telkomsa.net)**

## **A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON DR. WYCLIFFE MLUNGISI TSOTSI, THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE WHICH APPEARS BELOW**

The writer of the article “A ‘State Funeral’ for K.D.Matanzima – A Loyal Servant of Apartheid” is Wycliffe Mlungisi Tsotsi who was born on the 9th July 1914. He will be 90 years in July next year.

Comrade Tsotsi has had a long and distinguished career. He was an all rounder. He was a freedom fighter of great distinction. He was a highly successful lawyer fighting hundreds of cases in defence of workers, peasants and intellectuals who were victimised by the oppressive regime. He was an all round sportsman excelling in rugby, cricket and soccer. He captained the Fort Hare University soccer team in 1934.

In 1934 Comrade Tsotsi won a first prize in an International Essay Competition whose theme was the working together of youth among all the racial groups on earth.

Comrade Tsotsi became the principal of the Freemantle Boys School in the Glen Grey district. He was, however, compelled to leave teaching in 1945 and began his career in law.

Comrade Tsotsi was a founding member of the Non European Unity Movement and was elected President of the All African Convention from 1948 until 1958. He was acting President of the Non European Unity Movement from 1957 to 1959.

In 1960, Comrade Tsotsi was compelled to flee South Africa and commenced the life of a refugee and lived in Lesotho and Zambia. He lived as a refugee for almost 30 years. Side by side with rendering highly skilled service in the field of law, Comrade Tsotsi served the Unity Movement in exile.

Comrade Tsotsi is a man of letters and has written numerous papers, articles and publications on the struggle in South Africa. He has written three books:

- From Chattel to Wage Slavery

- Human Rights in the Homelands of South Africa
- Out of Court – Memoirs of a Black Lawyer in Apartheid South Africa ( to be published)

Comrade Tsotsi presented a doctoral thesis to Columbia Pacific University. The subject matter of his thesis was “Law Enforcement as an Instrument of Political Domination in South Africa”. His thesis was accepted and Comrade Tsotsi was awarded a Ph.D degree by the above University.

Recognising his contribution to the struggle, Rhodes University awarded Comrade Tsotsi the Honourary degree of Doctorate of Laws.

Seventy years in a person’s life spent in the struggle for the rights of the oppressed and exploited is a prodigious achievement by any standard. But he has not yet finished. He is still in the midst of struggle and by the looks of things he will remain there until the very end.

---

## **A “ STATE FUNERAL” FOR K.D. MATANZIMA - A LOYAL SERVANT OF APARTHEID**

The saga of Chief K.D.Matanzima’s death and burial goes on unabated, not because he was a hero in any sense of the word; on the contrary because he was the embodiment of evil in so far as the oppressed people of South Africa were concerned. From the mid-fifties up to the date of his death, he willingly served as the puppet of the apartheid regime and the hatchetman of British Imperialism.

The policy of controlling and exploiting Africans through their tribal chiefs has long been practised by capitalism/imperialism. In South Africa, Verwoerd copied it from them. It was described by Shepstone of Natal notoriety, as the “shortest means of breaking down the power of the hereditary chiefs, without losing the machinery as yet indispensable to us

(the British), of tribal organisation, the Chiefs and their subordinate chiefs and indunas are all in point of fact officers of the government in active service...they carry out the orders of the magistrates. All their importance depends upon the breath of the Government.”

During the apartheid era the South African ruling class used Chief Kaiser Matanzima and other quislings to foist so-called “Bantu Education” on the African people. Education for African people was used as an instrument to secure the supremacy of the White over the Blacks.

In his notorious policy speech on African education delivered in 1954, Dr. Verwoerd, the architect of apartheid said:

“..my Department’s policy is that education should stand with both feet in the reserves. The basis of the provision and the organisation of education in a Bantu community should, where possible, be the tribal organisation.”

He went on to say that:-

“ There is no place for him (the African) in the European Community above the level of certain forms of labour...Until now he has been subjected to the system which draws him away from his own community and misleads him by showing him green pastures of European society in which he is not allowed to graze.”

Adding insult to injury, Verwoerd further said that African teachers were given the wrong kind of training and he condemned educated Africans as a class which has learnt to believe that it was above its own people and feels that its spiritual, economic and political home is among the civilised community of South Africa, the Europeans.

He further expressed the view that good relations would never exist in South Africa as long as the African did not accept his inferior status. He said it was the duty of the State to control and direct African education to achieve this end. To quote his words:

“Above all good race relations cannot exist when education is given under the control of people who create wrong expectations on the part of the natives if such people believe in a policy of equality...It is therefore necessary that Native

Education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accord with the policy of the state.”

According to Verwoerd the education of the African must be so structured as to fit him for an inferior position in society. It had to be rooted in the “Reserves” where it could be controlled by the State through appointed tribal chiefs by means of a process of retribalisation..

Chief Matanzima exercised his chieftaincy from the area called Emigrant Tembuland. However, when he began to style himself “Chief of Emigrant Tembuland” he was severely reprimanded by the Department of Bantu Administration. At that time he was opposed to the Bantu Authorities system. But he suddenly changed his opposition to active support in the mid fifties, and was only thereafter given permission to adopt the designation. Not only that, he was also used by the Government of those days as a prod against the reluctant Paramount Chief Sabata Dalindyebo and eventually raised to the independent status of Paramount Chief of Emigrant Tembuland.

From here he ruled his “subjects” with a rod of iron of impunity. He used his sjambok freely to bring his men into line. At Mbinzara in the Glen Grey district, he burnt the houses of his villagers without let or hindrance. He even invaded the Queenstown railway station at one time to wage war against people he regarded as his subjects who were on their way from Cape Town to Qamata to attack their chief. He arrested them and had them charged in the Magistrate’s Courts where they were inevitably convicted.

Sometimes the villagers fought back when Matanzima threatened them, whereupon he sought and obtained help from the authorities. On one occasion people regarded as Chief Matanzima’s subjects in the Xalanga district were charged for insulting their chief in that

Upon or about the 12<sup>th</sup> day of August 1958 and at or near Emnxe location in the district of Xalanga the accused did each wilfully obstruct the proceedings of a meeting lawfully convened by chief Matanzima, a chief duly appointed in terms of Section 2 of Act 38 of 1927, in connection with his duty, by shouting in the Xhosa language:

*“Asifuni Nkosi apha voortsek mnka naye ukunya kwe nkosi, umnqundu wenkosi. Thina bantu base Cala sakumbulala lo Kaiser Matanzima apha e Cala”* meaning in the English language :

“We do not want a chief here, voortsek take him away, the shit of a chief, the anus of a chief. We Cala people will kill this Kaiser Matanzima here at Cala.”

Adopting threatening attitudes as a result of which conduct the said Kaiser Matanzima was obliged to abandon the said meeting.

As Shepstone had foreshadowed the powers of the hereditary chiefs were broken down *but the machinery of tribal organisation still exists oiled and kept artificially alive* by the Government and forming a bureaucratic encrustation on the population with little or no economic reason for its existence or popular appeal to back it up as an industrial labour force and a burial ground for thousands of miners who die from miners’ diseases and injuries.

Tribalism as a traditional institution is dead. There are no longer any traditional chiefs. Our so-called chiefs have been turned into a glorified police force endowed with immense bureaucratic powers. This is not said in a carping spirit; it is put forward as a sober assessment of the role to which African chiefs have been reduced by the Pretoria regime.

The fact of the matter is that tribalism is kept artificially alive by the ruling class for the control and regimentation of the African people as a whole into a permanent source of cheap labour for the mines, white farms and industry in South Africa. The ruling class has sought to revitalise its brand of tribalism by enacting the Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 which provides that the State President may establish tribal authorities.

The Bantu Authorities system is foreign to African tribal structures. It is an imposition on the people against their will. The most important function of Bantu Authorities is the recruitment of labour. The façade that they are a fledgling government is false. Their role is to serve as a system of labour bureaux and to regulate the migratory flow of cheap black labour from the Bantustan to the farms and industrial concerns of the whites. They also serve as a cover for the police.

The most intriguing aspect of Chief Matanzima's funeral was the attendance of high-ranking government officials, including the President, and their participation in the proceedings in praise of the late Chief. Their attendance and speeches were not just a social but a political event. They represented the predominantly English-speaking bourgeoisie which, from the beginning of the apartheid regime was a logger-heads with the Afrikaans-speaking petit bourgeois political leadership. The bone of contention was whether what is variously called the free market system or the capitalist system should be allowed to operate freely among white and blacks alike. Both sides were agreed that there should be sufficient control over the blacks to ensure white rule. The Afrikaner nationalists believed that this control should be absolute whereas the mainly English speaking opposition advocated what they called "white leadership with justice" for the blacks. In a speech entitled "Reinstatement of United Party's Pledges" delivered in Johannesburg after his election defeat by the Nationalists, General Smuts said the United Party stood for white leadership in South Africa as being essential in the true interests not only of the whites but also of the blacks. "While it (the United Party) is opposed to equality, it is equally to the purely negative policy of apartheid," he said. Smuts also said Apartheid would cause "resentment" and would ultimately lead to non-European (Black) nationalism hostile to the Europeans and "destructive" of the abiding interests of South Africa. These "abiding interests" could only be maintained if the Blacks continued to acquiesce in their economic exploitation by the whites, hence the fear of arousing their "resentment". Above all, said Smuts, "apartheid policies had been detrimental to one main asset of this country, the goodwill of its black unskilled labour on which the country must rely for its economic and industrial development."

It was reported in the media that at the funeral, President Mbeki advised the people of the Transkei to fulfill Matanzima's dream to get education but that he himself could not do so because he had no means. If the Transkei Bantustan depended on the means of Chief Matanzima for its economic salvation then little wonder it was and is so poor. Owing to the inadequacy and gross poverty of the African reserves, African peasants are compelled to leave their homes in their millions to seek employment in the industrial areas. The impoverishment of African peasants is deliberate Government policy calculated to ensure a constant and plentiful supply of cheap labour for the mines, industry and white farms. The technique employed to carry out this policy is the migratory labour system. Mbeki's advice to the people

of the Transkei to fulfill the dream of the poverty stricken Matanzima is equivalent to asking the oppressed to accept economic impoverishment. But this is not in the “abiding interests” of South Africa as Smuts said, but that of British capitalism.

The official delegation to the funeral might well have carried to the Transkei the slogan: APARTHEID IS DEAD : LONG LIVE CAPITALISM!

---

## **A DAY OF SHAME TO BE REMEMBERED**

**By ALIE FATAAR**

In May 1962 the All African Convention (AAC), an affiliate of the Non-European Unity Movement issued a pamphlet: “SELF RULE IN THE TRANSKEI - A MONSTROUS FRAUD”.

Kaiser Matanzima was regarded as the “chief boss boy” of the government “quisling chiefs”. Today (21 June 2003) his body is being buried at state expense (the taxes of the poor and rich of the united South Africa).

It is hard to believe that this Bantustan collaborator is being buried as a kind of hero when he followed the herrenvolk dictates of the Verwoerds, the Vorsters and the Bothas during the Apartheid regime which was declared internationally as a crime against humanity.

For the oppressed majority of South Africa their atrocities can never be forgotten or forgiven.

To quote only two of his many inhuman actions:

- 1) SABATA DALINDYEBO a chief senior to Kaiser Matanzima, had opposed all forms of bantustanisation and was thus forced to leave the



Transkei and go into exile in Zambia. On Sabata's death, Kaiser sent a plane to bring the body of Sabata with his widow to Umtata for a burial befitting a senior chief – Sabata had been honoured by the ANC in exile in Lusaka and had agreed to the offer of Matanzima. But when the body and the widow arrived in Umtata, Kaiser personally ordered guards to take the body and bury it in an obscure grave. Only after the 1990s was Sabata's son, as chief, able to arrange a suitable burial of his father and to have nothing to do with Kaiser Matanzima. Mandela did on occasion befriend his relative Thembu chief!

- 2) NATHANIEL HONONO, affectionately called “Tshutsha”, was one of the most vocal and consistent opponents of the colour bar and herrenvolk regimes of Jan Smuts/Hertzog and later apartheid Verwoerd/Vorster and company. He organised resistance to all aspects of Transkei Territorial Authority collaboration which brought in its wake the varied bantuisation processes – bantuised schooling, bantuised taxes and the notorious land rehabilitation schemes during the 1950s onwards. A highly respected headmaster at Nqabara Secondary School – with the most excellent results – and holding Executive positions (including President) in the NEUM bodies of the All African Convention, the Cape African Teachers Association and its Federal Council with The Teachers League of South Africa, he was banned by Vorster for five years, dismissed from his school and placed under house arrest. Furthermore, he was the first detainee under Matanzima's Proclamation 400 whereby Matanzima kept him virtually as a dangerous criminal in a closely guarded dungeon, from which he managed to escape...helped it was said by grateful ex-students of Nqabara Secondary School in Willowvale, Transkei. Then he fled past road-blocks to Swaziland and into exile in Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. When he died on 16 January 1987 the Mugabe government assisted in his burial and Minister Nathan Shamuyarira, Brother Ali Halimeh of the Palestine Liberation Organisation and Alie Fataar of the UMSA paid tribute to a fallen liberation fighter. The Movement and the Zimbabwe government did not want a Matanzima repetition of the disgrace when Chief Sabata was so ignominiously buried. Eventually, when the bantustan system collapsed, “Tshutsha”'s body was exhumed with the assistance once again of the Mugabe government and flown with his widow Esi to South Africa. But the post-apartheid government-to-be in August

1992 ignored the re-burial at home of a committed and tortured freedom fighter.

And today, ironically but shamefully, his torturer Kaiser is being given a state funeral... as a hero.

We now learn that P.W. Botha and F.W. de Klerk as ex-presidents of white South Africa have state body guards and will have state funerals when they die, at our expense – all part of the sell-out at the Kempton Park negotiations. What of the other Bantustan “heads of state” and of even that little Helenard of the Colouredstan?

Ever since the new “democracy” dawned in the Republic of South Africa, from our taxes we have been paying all these oppressors the most handsome pensions – some got up to three pensions for the years they were in the all-white parliament, in the tricameral parliament and in the “democratic” parliament after 1994. The total amount of billions of Rand paid to these “heroes” is apparently a well kept secret!

Alie Fataar, Founder and Life long member of the Unity Movement.

Cape Town 21 June 2003 –“ A Day of SHAME to be Remembered.”

The above appeared in the Cape Argus, 27 June 2003

An edited version of the May 1962 ALL AFRICAN CONVENTION pamphlet :

## **SELF RULE IN THE TRANSKEI - A MONSTROUS FRAUD.**

Once more the Bantu Authorities collaborators have betrayed the people of the Transkei in particular and the oppressed people of South Africa in general. This time they have accepted, in the name of the people they claim to represent, a constitution that will ensure the continued domination of the Transkei by the Fascist Republic of South Africa. When the verdict of history is pronounced not one of them can plead mitigation. It is true that Kaiser Matanzima, as the collaborator-in-chief, had to play a leading part in this drama of betrayal and genuflection. He alone has the audacity and aptitude for the role of the Chief Boss Boy.

The constitution that these stooges of Herrenvolkism and Fascism have gleefully accepted must properly be regarded as a body of regulations prepared by the rulers for implementation by their lackeys, in the same way that they prepare regulations to be applied by the Bantu School Boards in the implementation of the vicious policy of Bantu Education. For it must be remembered that the Transkei independence fraud is a blueprint for the rest of the Non-European oppressed peoples in South Africa.

When these creatures assembled at Umtata recently they had before them a ready-made, cut and dried draft by the masters, builders and architects of Bantuisation, who in advance told their stooges and the world alike that nothing more than boss boy duties was to be assigned to these cogs in the Fascist machine.

Thus in advance the Transkei Territorial Authority collaborators relinquish their claims to the rest of South Africa, and confine themselves to Verwoerd's Bantustan which has been devised and designed for the regimentation and control of the Xhosa-speaking species of his vast menagerie. These quislings have rejected the idea of real self-rule and self-determination and are satisfied with spurious self-rule, regimented and straitjacketed in the pattern of apartheid.

In essence the fraud that is being perpetrated upon the people of the Transkei is not new. It is the same old Bantu Authorities system that has been

rejected by the people in no uncertain terms. Only this fraud is now draped in a new kaross. All that the rulers have done has been to change about the names.

The so-called Cabinet Ministers will be charged with the duties of supervisory boss boys to see to the effective and efficient implementation of Bantu Education; bantuised justice; the running of labour bureaux; the development of primitive industries; the mobilisation of forced labour on the roads, bridges and causeways; the infliction of more taxes upon the already impoverished peasants and the peasant-workers – indeed all the activities calculated to force the people to collaborate in their own oppression. It is the same role they played as Bhunga councillors and as Bantu Authorities.

To make sure that barbarism prevails 103 of the members of this glorified Bhunga shall be “recognised and appointed chiefs”, that is, chiefs who are considered suitable for their role by the Broederbond and the rest of the Herrenvolk; only 26 will, in a sense, be elected and merely as a sop to the critics of the Fascist rule that has all but destroyed the elective principle in African affairs, and to serve as a bait to those misguided intellectuals who are already seeing some possibilities for themselves in this fraud.

To make quite sure that Fascism is not disturbed, “internal security”, that is, the Gestapo and the army, is still in the hands of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. In plain language, as at present, there will be no place for the real fighters for democracy in the Transkei. Indeed we can expect the powers that be to be even more vicious and ruthless than they are at present. There shall be no freedom of thought, of speech, of movement, of association and of assembly in the Transkei, as at present. That is the meaning of “internal security”. The phrase is pregnant with dire forebodings.

There will also be no interference with the systematic impoverishment of the peasants behind the facade of the Betterment Schemes; the relations between the Transkei and the Broederbond Republic of South Africa shall remain as before, those between the master and the servant.

In the face of this further onslaught upon the rights and liberties of the Non-European oppressed peoples of South Africa, the position of the people’s organised struggle against oppression and for liberation is clear. Whatever petty differences may exist between the collaborators as to how best to

surrender our heritage to those who would usurp our birthright are of no consequence to us. To both camps we say, “A plague on both your houses”. It is not our task to pit this quisling chief against that quisling chief. That is only the way of opportunists, charlatans and political crooks.

Our struggle lies in the organisations of the people engaged in the titanic struggle for liberation. The Transkei has been the veritable cauldron of the ideas of the All-African Convention and the Non-European Unity Movement. It is the policy of non-collaboration with the oppressor and the boycott weapon that exposed the fraudulence of dummy representation and dummy institutions; it is the ideas of the AAC that killed the former Bhunga and have made it impossible for the Bantu Authorities system to gain root with the people. It is now the Ten-point programme of the AAC and NEUM that we put before the people of Transkei once more. We enjoin them to rally to the call of the AAC to reject this monstrous fraud and expose all the Bantu Authorities together with their accomplices in this heinous crime; to spurn those middle-class intellectuals who will see opportunities for personal aggrandisement in this Machiavellian Plan that is designed for the perpetual incarceration of the minds and bodies of the living oppressed in these territories. There can be no compromise on the score. It is the duty of every true democrat to fight until Herrenvolkism has been liquidated from the face of South Africa; until South Africa is free and untrammelled by the politics of race; until human relationships in South Africa are based upon and governed by the full acceptance of the principle and practice of the absolute equality of men. Such a society can only be brought about as a result of an intransigent and principled struggle based upon the Ten-point Programme of the All –African Convention and the Non-European Unity Movement.

We fight for :

- Freedom of Thought
- Freedom of Speech
- Freedom of Movement
- Freedom of Assembly
- Freedom of Association

We believe that:

- Freedom is Strength
- Freedom is Victory
- Freedom is Life

## **EIGHTY EIGHT YEARS OF ROTTENNESS BURIED**

**By Kader Hassim<sup>1</sup>**

### **INTRODUCTION**

There is the well known saying that “Out of Africa there is always something new.”

The latest novelty flows from the death and resultant funeral of K.D.Matanzima, the most notorious of South Africa’s quislings and collaborators.

The novelty emerging out of Africa on this occasion was the miraculous transformation of a tyrant/traitor into a HERO!

### **HOW TO DEAL WITH A QUISLING?**

“ We were great friends from our boyhood for a period of about 20 years. I terminated the friendship in January 1955 for political reasons, particularly after I received information that he (Kaiser Matanzima ) had accepted the Bantu Authorities Act which both of us has previously agreed to reject. I wrote a letter to him dated 13<sup>th</sup> January 1955 setting out the reason why I could no longer call him friend.”

(Excerpt from a book “OUT OF COURT” written by W.M.Tsotsi and to be published)

That friendship between two young intellectuals remained broken and will remain so until eternity and beyond.

W.M.Tsotsi was, at that time, the President of the All African Convention, an affiliate of the Non European Unity Movement, and an Executive member of the latter body. His action flowed from a principled position and, therefore, did not change with the direction of political winds of change.

---

<sup>1</sup> The writer, a member of APDUSA/Unity Movement, spent over seven years as a prisoner on Robben Island.

## HOW TYRANTS ARE DEALT WITH

In England, during the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the defenders and advocates of liberty were merciless in their condemnation of the tyrant George III.

Shelley in his poem “England in 1819” describes this tyrant as :

“An old, mad, blind, despised, and dying king,-  
Princes, the dregs of their dull race, who flow  
Through public scorn, - mud from a muddy spring, -  
Rulers who neither see, nor feel, nor know,  
But leech-like to their fainting country cling,”

When he died in 1820, George III was still shown no mercy. The kind notion that one should not speak ill of the dead does not apply to tyrants, traitors and other evil persons. George Byron, contemporary and comrade of Shelley, wasted little time in composing his 850 line poem, “The Vision of Judgement”.<sup>2</sup>

“He died – his death made no great stir on earth,  
His burial made some pomp; there was profusion  
Of Velvet, gilding, brass, and no great dearth  
Of aught but tears – save those bought by collusion  
For these things may be bought at their true worth;  
Of Elegy there was the due infusion,  
Bought also; and the torches, cloaks and banners,  
Heralds, and relics of old Gothic manners,

10

Formed a sepulchral melodrame; of all  
The fools who flocked to swell or see the show,  
Who cared about the corpse? The funeral  
Made the attraction, and the black the woe;  
There throbbed not there a thought which pierced the pall,

---

<sup>2</sup> Grateful acknowledgement to P.M. for directing us to the poem containing this quotation.

And when the gorgeous Coffin was laid low  
It seemed the mockery of hell to fold  
The rottenness of eighty years in gold.”

## HOW TO TRANSFORM A QUISLING INTO A HERO

In South Africa, at the turn of the new millennium and 183 years after the death of George III, a leading local tyrant and traitor died. The ruling party of this country governed, by what we are repeatedly told, the most advanced democratic constitution in the world, gave this tyrant and traitor the closest thing to a state funeral. The fact that this tyrant/traitor violated and trampled underfoot just about every democratic principle and value contained in this highly-rated constitution does not appear to have meant a jot to President Mbeki and members of his retinue and others who were present and who also saw no contradiction in honouring this tyrant/traitor with their supposed adherence and sworn commitment to uphold the Constitution.

As stated above, the novelty emerging out of Africa on this occasion was the miraculous transformation of a tyrant/traitor into a HERO!!

How did this miracle take place? Here we are looking at a body of politicians and one Archbishop who are totally devoid of principles and morality. In that sense we are also observing an ethos where the most absurd, the most outrageous and the most horrible can take place with a casualness which makes the blood run cold.

While the leading politicians brought nothing but infamy, it was left to certain journalists and political commentators to save the day. Of note were the editors of the “Weekly Mail and Guardian” and of the Sunday Times. Among the equally important were the following:

Alie Fataar, life long member of the Unity Movement  
Dr. Xolela Mangcu, a political scientist and head of the Steve Biko Foundation  
Professor Tom Lodge, head of the Department of Politics at the Wits University  
Mr. Mkhuseleli Jack, ANC leader and businessman.  
Phakamile Gongu, counsellor at the SA High Commission in Namibia  
Fikile-Ntsikelelo Moya from the Weekly Mail and Guardian



This list is, by no means exhaustive. We are certain that there are numerous decent and honest rank and file members of political organisations, journalists and ordinary politically conscious but honest people who would have been sickened by the unprincipled behaviour of those leading politicians who took time off to pay tribute to this tyrant/traitor. We know that at least in one branch of the ANC there were heated debates about the propriety of their leaders paying tribute to Matanzima. There can be no valid reason for believing that the debate in this particular branch was unique or rare.

### OUTRIGHT LIES – THE ROUTE TO “TRANSFORMATION”

The question is: How was it possible for politicians claiming to be democrats to convert a traitor into a hero?

The conversion took place by the simple but very effective stratagem of TELLING LIES or through a process of falsification.

1. One of the most effective methods of falsification is by NOT SPEAKING THE TRUTH. Not one of the speakers at the funeral of Matanzima had the courage, decency or integrity to speak the truth about Matanzima – about all the foul and rotten things he did in his lifetime – selling out his people to their oppressors; enriching himself and his cronies at the expense of the poor and exploited who constituted the overwhelming majority of his countrymen and countrywomen; engaging in or actively inciting the commission of graft and corruption and selling of the country controlled by him and his cronies for bribes; by plundering the coffers of the Transkei or despoiling others of their possessions; by terrorising those who did not agree with him or who opposed him; the imprisonment of political opponents; the infliction of physical injuries to those who opposed him and finally the NUMEROUS MURDERS<sup>3</sup> and assassination of political opponents.<sup>4</sup>

According to Patrick Laurence, journalist and writer, “Mandela preferred to remember him as a young man with a fine legal brain and an old man who

---

<sup>3</sup> In the Weekly Mail and Guardian of the 20-26<sup>th</sup> June 2003, in an article by Fikile-Ntsikelo Moya, Holomisa is reported as saying that (Matanzima) brutally crushed any opposition to his independence; typified by the numerous murders of anti-apartheid activists.

<sup>4</sup> According to politics Professor Tom Lodge of Wits University, Matanzima’s “regime was brutal, corrupt, despotic, cruel and reprehensible in every way. (From the same article mentioned above)

made a dignified return to his roots.” In other words, the Mandela approach is to say **nothing** about all the vile and evil deeds of the man. Nothing will please tyrants and dictators more than having the record of their activities as tyrants and dictators expunged by no less than an “internationally revered statesman.”

2. Another form of falsification is the speaking of HALF TRUTHS. An example of this took place when President Mbeki stated that his father, Mr. Govan Mbeki was a great friend of Matanzima but “parted ways” with him because of “their differing political ideologies”. The position is that before 1955, Matanzima belonged to the radical Unity Movement via the All African Convention. But the late Govan Mbeki was an intransigent non-collaborationist when it came to working dummy institutions created by the racist and oppressive ruling class. His hatred for those working those institutions, especially the so-called Homeland leaders, was implacable. There was the occasion on Robben Island, when Mr. Govan Mbeki, being critical of Chief Buthelezi narrated how Mozambique and other independent countries refused to entertain Buthelezi. He went on to say: “And they told him to F..K OFF!”<sup>5</sup>

It was not just a parting of ways. It was a fight to the finish!

3. According to President Mbeki, the only proper way to pay tribute to Matanzima “would be to fulfill his dreams.” Mbeki can’t be serious! There was no communication between Matanzima and Mbeki. How on earth can he know what Matanzima’s *real* dreams would have been? We do not believe that any person cherishing liberty and freedom would go a 1000 miles near Matanzima’s dreams. Matanzima has never recanted his activities. He has never sought forgiveness from the people of this country for his shameless betrayal of them. He has never, either verbally or in writing, confessed to imprisoning, torturing and murdering numerous freedom fighters. He has never returned, nor tendered to return, all the riches and wealth he plundered from the Transkei.

Matanzima’s real and true dreams must have been to return to power; to once again rule with a tyrannical iron fist; once again to be feared by his opponents; to be, once again, Quisling Number One! If he had any

---

<sup>5</sup> It was the first and last time I heard him utter an obscenity over a period of seven years when I was imprisoned with him in the same section.

nightmares, ( and he must have had many), they would have been those with a recurring theme of an angry and vengeful assembly of people impatient to mete out justice to him.

The last thing Matanzima would have dreamt about was the progress, development and welfare of the people of the Transkei!

4. According to Mr. Bantu Holomisa, Matanzima provided “financial bursaries to many professionals...and that during his reign, he empowered many people in the Transkei.”

One can understand Holomisa’s gratitude since he was a direct beneficiary of a Bantustan. It was under Matanzima that he was made the General of the army in the Transkei. There is an understandable propensity on the part of dictators and tyrants to fast-track the creation of armies. But these armies were not created to fight against foreign forces from outside the country. Their undisputed function was to suppress the local population in their quest for liberation.

Mr Holomisa further claims that Matanzima “empowered many people in the Transkei.” If we give “many” its ordinary meaning of “a large number”, we will see how untrue Holomisa’s claim is. The Eastern Cape, of which the Transkei is a large part, remains the poorest part of our country. It continues to be underdeveloped, it lacks basic services and there is little prospect of the Transkei part of the Eastern Cape developing in a manner which will significantly improve the living standards of the population.

5. According to Chris Barron, the obituarist of the Sunday Times, Matanzima “gave civil-service jobs to 80 000 Transkeians.” How does a single man give jobs to 80 000 people? He did not use his own money in creating those jobs. It was money of the South African taxpayer in the form of huge grants given to the Bantustans. The civil service in the Eastern Cape is well known for its gross inefficiency. The section of the civil servants in the Transkei is no different. So one wonders what the significance is of mentioning the number of civil servants during Matanzima’s rule. Giving jobs to people is not necessarily a good thing. Surely the crucial test is the productivity of the employees. That is to ask: Was the service rendered?

6. As stated above, Mandela, (who describes Matanzima as his friend and mentor) would like to remember Matanzima , inter alia, “as a young man

with a fine legal brain...” What a strange thing to say! Verwoerd also had a fine brain. That is why he was a professor twice over – in sociology and psychology. Is that how we should remember Verwoerd? And not for his diabolical social engineering called apartheid? Surely we are entitled to ask: What did Matanzima use his “fine legal brain” for? Was it used in the service of his people who were daily oppressed and tormented by the rulers’ foreign legal system? Was it used to defend people charged with the offence of seeking to overthrow the oppressive state by force of arms? Or did he use that fine legal brain to oppress the people of the Transkei?

7. We are also told by President Mbeki that Matanzima wanted the people of the Transkei to get education but could not do much because he had no means! It is not surprising that there were no funds to provide facilities for education. Matanzima and his large army of parasites pocketed a substantial percentage of the annual handout received from the whites-only government of South Africa. In any case what education was he referring to? Remember, it was Bantu Education. It was Brainwashing Education. It was education which was to provide the mindset of a creature called “THE BANTU” who was to emerge by the year 1980 from Verwoerd’s social laboratory. We must also ask about the content of education given to the children of Transkei. What were they to be taught in subjects like English and History? And who was to do the teaching? The finest and most dedicated teachers, many of whom were members of the Cape African Teachers’ Association (CATA) were summarily dismissed and hounded out.

8. The absence of a critical appraisal of the man is attributed to an African tradition of showing respect to the dead. If this, indeed, is correct then it is a case of

The evil that men do is oft interred with their bones  
While the flattery concocted lives after them

There are many things attributed to African tradition, often spuriously. For the record let it be stated that there is no culture in the world, which does not, in general, advocate respect for the dead. This respect is not unique to the African people and it is falsification to make it appear to be so. Respect for the dead however, does not mean uttering lies. Nor does or can respect for the dead mean DISRESPECT for the TRUTH. Furthermore, nowhere is the practice absolute.

We concede that the occasion of death is an occasion of sorrow and mourning by those who were close to the deceased. We, therefore, agree that

on the occasion of the funeral, the truth, which would be hurtful to the bereaved, should be withheld.

But then the correct thing to do is to stay away from the funeral. An appraisal of the deceased and his activities can take place subsequently. Where justified, there must be a proper assessment of the person's activities and where fierce criticism is merited, then that criticism must be made regardless of the pain it may cause to the relatives. Relatives, especially close ones will always feel pain when one of them is publicly criticised. But that is in the nature of things. Public criticism and condemnation is inherent in public political activity. More so when that activity betrays the interests of the people.

#### THE MYTH OF "PARTING OF WAYS" BETWEEN MANDELA AND MATANZIMA

Most of the newspaper articles dealing with Matanzima after his death are at great pains to establish that Mandela and Matanzima took different roads when the latter decided to accept working within the Bantustan system.

1. The truth of the matter is that Mandela for a long time advocated working within the government created institutions. I can vouch for that up to the time I left Robben Island in February 1980.
2. It is recorded history that Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi was advised by senior ANC officials to participate in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly.
3. On Robben Island, the ANC was deeply divided on the issue of whether or not to participate in the government created dummy institutions. There was the one faction led by Govan Mbeki which advocated total non collaboration with the government in relation to the dummy institutions. The other faction led by Nelson Mandela advocated participation or fighting from within. The debate dragged on for long years. The Mandela faction used, inter alia, the example of the Indian National Congress of India working in bodies created before independence as well as the Bolshevik Party participation in the Duma.
4. The Mandela faction went so far as to instruct its members on Robben Island to participate in the dummy institutions. Hennie Ferris, classified

Coloured, was instructed to join Hendrickse's Labour Party, while Joshua Zulu was instructed to work with Buthezi.

5. A plan was mooted to have Mandela released in the 1970s, but this had to be done in the Transkei. Kaiser Matanzima was to be the instrument of Mandela's release.<sup>6</sup>
6. In pursuance of this plan, a meeting between Mandela and Kaiser Matanzima had to take place.
7. In preparation for such a meeting, George Matanzima, a slightly diminished clone of Kaiser Matanzima, met Mandela on Robben Island in 1973 or 1974. There were two parts to this meeting. The one was with Mandela alone. The other, at the instigation of Mandela, involved Govan Mbeki, Pokela (PAC) and Neville Alexander(NLF). There may have been others. They were simply summoned to the office of the Officer Comanding and when they got there, they were surprised to see George Matanzima there. Enforced politeness prevailed and empty pleasantries were exchanged. Nothing of significance was discussed.
8. The sequel to that meeting was unconcealed anger on the part of Govan Mbeki, Pokela and Neville Alexander and the people they represented at their being compelled to meet a sellout. The prisoners of B Section, i.e. the single cells section, took a decision to ensure that in future they would not be dragooned to meet people they did not want to meet.
9. Mandela then got a letter from the Kaiser himself. In that letter Matanzima proposed visiting Mandela on Robben Island. That letter was openly circulated amongst members of ALL political organisations.
10. Mandela sought the views of ALL the political organisations on Robben Island. Quite clearly if he was to meet Kaiser Matanzima, he required the blessings of other segments of the liberatory movement.

---

<sup>6</sup> MHUSELI JACK in an article "DEATH OF AN APARTHEID COLLABORATOR" which appeared in "The Herald" of the 21 June 2003 relates about a Mass Meeting addressed by Matanzima where he, inter alia dealt with the subject of the release of Nelson Mandela. "In a voice of a conspirator he said: '...the keys to free Mandela are here', hitting his pocket. To this there was general pandemonium.."

11. Mandela's own views were that he would like to meet Matanzima as a relative with whom he would discuss family matters.
12. Without exception, ALL the political organisations on Robben Island advised AGAINST Mandela meeting Matanzima. There was the unanimous view that a meeting between two high-profile politicians will never be construed as a PERSONAL meeting to discuss family matters.
13. Mrs. Winnie Mandela in overwhelming probability would have added her not inconsiderable voice against such a visit.
14. It was as a result of very heavy pressure that Mandela did not meet Matanzima and not as Chris Barron of the Sunday Times put it:

“Mandela was happy to see his old mentor but heeded the advice of Walter Sisulu and Ahmed Kathrada that it send the wrong message.”
15. Throughout my stay on Robben Island, I have not heard Mandela speak critically of Matanzima.
16. Since Mandela's release, I came across only one report of Mandela attacking Matanzima politically. I do not know the reason for the attack-whether it was triggered off by politics or by personal considerations
17. As late as early 1980, I got to learn of no difference between Mandela and Matanzima on the question of participating in the government created dummy institutions. Let us be clear that it is not suggested that had Mandela entered the dummy institutions, he would have conducted himself as Matanzima did. I believe that Mandela would have behaved differently. But that is not the point in issue here. The point is whether or not both were in agreement on participation in the dummy institutions.
18. The eighties saw a huge groundswell of resistance to the ruling class. A state of emergency which once petrified a people into inactivity, now was regarded with an equanimity of a people tried and tested in struggle and determined to die for their freedom.

19. All the government created dummy institutions were rejected by the people, especially the revolutionary youth with a ferocity hitherto unknown.
20. It is likely that in that atmosphere, Mandela would have finally abandoned his position of working within the dummy bodies.

## CONCLUSION

The stampede to pay handsome tribute to South Africa's leading sellout was initiated by the Congress of Traditional Leaders of South Africa (CONTRALESA). It was their leading members in the Eastern Cape who demanded a state funeral for Matanzima. Since Holomisa and the UDM were going to attend the funeral and eulogise Matanzima, the ANC feared that it would be a tactical advantage for the UDM when elections in 2004 took place. The UDM would have also won the goodwill of Contralesa. It was this situation which got the ANC, a section of the PAC represented by Clarence Makwetu and Archbishop Ndungane hot footing it to the funeral. They did not want to be left out or be accused of not showing "respect for the dead."

The day the people of this country lost the Wars of Land Dispossession was the day that chieftainship lost its social and political reason for existence. The chiefs, by and large were converted into what I.B. Tabata in his "**Boycott as a Weapon of Struggle**" called "Policeman-Chiefs". Throughout the struggle for liberation, freedom fighters infiltrating the countryside prioritized escaping the attention of the chief of the area and his henchmen. The latter had become the eyes and ears of the security police apparatus. As a segment of the disenfranchised population the tribal structure and its retinue contributed virtually nothing to the struggle.

Since 1994, there has been a recrudescence of outmoded tribalism. Chiefs, who actively worked as policemen or those who did not, but who were deep in funkholes during the struggle, have suddenly become very demanding. Tribalism is making a bid for recognition and power.

The death of Matanzima provided the tribalists with an opportunity to flex their muscle. They barked out the command and the ANC, UDM and others jumped to obey!