

SASPU NATIONAL

Two many deaths at John Vorster Square

ERNEST DIPALE, 21, is the third person to have died in detention this year. He allegedly hanged himself at John Vorster Square on the morning of August 8.

His death has come while the inquest into trade unionist Neil Aggett's death in detention is continuing and follows the inquest into the death of detainee Isaac Mofhe.

In the Mofhe inquest the magistrate ruled that Mofhe had died because of unlawful assault by the security police.

We need to relate these deaths to the large number of detentions which have occurred this year.

How should we respond to deaths in detention, torture allegations, heavy sentences imposed by the courts and the unexplained events such as the death of Griffiths Mxenge and the disappearance of Siphiwo Mthimkulu?

We can't afford to become numbed to state repression or to the growing threat of right wing violence. We need to expose each and every action which aims to undermine the struggle for democracy.

This is especially necessary at a time when the state is trying hard to win over people with talk of reform and proposals for a new dispensation.

This dummy's for real

The latest reforms are not just 'window dressing' The Presidents Council proposals need to be taken seriously. The state is attempting to offer a few concessions to so-called Coloureds and Indians in order to preserve apartheid's power basis.

The Presidents Council is not rejected by progressives because it excludes Africans but because it is fundamentally undemocratic.

It was drawn up by a minority and handed down to the majority of people.

The proposals do not meet the people's minimum demands for a non-racial democracy, freedom from oppression and exploitation.

Along with these demands has gone the call for a national convention involving the legitimate leaders and organisations of all South Africa's people. This is what is needed now — not a Presidents Council.

The commercial press and others have emphasised the power of the proposed Executive State President. But also of concern are the proposals which affect local government. If these come into effect, local authorities will be given more administrative say over housing, rent, transport, community facilities and education — the list goes on.

People will thus be forced to direct grievances at these bodies and their attention will be drawn away from the real causes of their problems.

The proposals will be used to disorganise, confuse and divide people.

But progressives have not been hood-winked. They continue to protest against such moves and commit themselves to fight for fundamental change.

Women up front

NATIONAL WOMEN'S Day commemorates one of the greatest demonstrations this country has ever seen.

In 1956, the government was shocked by the massive march of women who made it clear to all that they would no longer remain silent.

August 9 is a special day because it emphasizes the significance and strength of women in the struggle for democracy.

But commemoration is not enough. All over the country women see the need to organise — both in women's and other progressive organisations — to fight all forms of oppression.

The tradition of the 50's has continued and women have shown their organisations are integral to the democratic struggle.

National unbanned

THIS IS the first edition of *Saspu National* since its recent unbanning.

The newspaper was banned for all future editions at the end of March under the Publications Act.

The South African Students' Press Union appealed against the all future editions ban and distribution ban on the first edition of this year, Volume 3 No 1.

At the appeal hearing on July 9, the Publications Control Board lifted the ban on Vol 3 No 1 and *Saspu National* itself was unbanned.

What's behind the great South African homeland giveaway?



The men at the middle of the 'altered states' controversy: P W Botha, Gatscha Buthelezi and King Sobhuza

Mum's the word on KaNgwane and Ingwavuma

WHOEVER KNOWS the 'real' reason why the South African Government is keen to give away hundreds of thousands of hectares of South African land to Swaziland is certainly not talking.

Ever since Gatscha Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu, lifted the lid on discussions he had with top Government cabinet ministers and officials, there have been plenty of theories and speculations on the deal.

The South African Government has yet, in the words of Prime Minister Pieter Botha 'to put it's case'.

Reasons such as Minister of Co-operation and Development Piet Koornhof's one that they would like to re-unite the Swazis so that King Sobhuza can die a happy man, cannot be the main motivating factor behind the deal.

But while the South African Government sits tight waiting for the Appeal Court's decision on whether the State President exceeded the powers given him by issuing a proclamation handing the control of Ingwavuma from the KwaZulu Government to the Department of Co-operation and Development, the KwaZulu and Swaziland governments have taken up the issue.

Partially due to the fact that the South African Government is keeping quiet, the controversial deal is fast becoming an issue of ethnicity and conflict between the Swazis and the Zulus leaving out the main protagonist in the whole drama.

The Swaziland Government has launched a world-wide public relations campaign to win support for it's controversial dealings with the South African Government. Their claim to KaNgwane rests on the fact that most of the close to one million inhabitants are Swazi speaking people.

The case for Ingwavuma is more complex, and the Swaziland Government claims to have over 20,000 refugees from the area. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has stated that there are 5,000 registered refugees in Swaziland.

There are 5,000 inhabitants in the Ndzevane refugee settlement across the border from KwaZulu. It was established in 1980 by the United Nations (UN) after a feud amongst factions of the Mngomezulu tribe which lives in the Ingwavuma area.

The trouble started in 1974 when Chief Ntunja, installed as a chief by the South African Government, was stripped of his chieftainship, again by the South African Government. One of the reasons given at the time was that Chief Ntunja had Swazi personal documents.

Fighting broke out and Chief



The land deal will give Swaziland access to the sea.

Ntunja along with his followers crossed the border into Swaziland and were recognised by the UN as refugees from apartheid. Since then there have been numerous raids across the border. In 1976 the area was handed over to the KwaZulu Government.

The Swaziland Government is claiming that the refugees had to leave Ingwavuma as they were being terrorised by Inkatha and many had to deny their Swazi heritage and become Zulus. These claims are getting wide publicity including interviews with refugees on South African Television.

For the KwaZulu Government the two important issues are land and citizenship. The KwaZulu Government has organised protest meetings in the area and other parts of Natal. Petitions have been launched to gain more support for their opposition. They have also tried to win support internationally but the Buthelezi Government's position is severely compromised by their participation in the bantustan system of government in South Africa.

Many commentators have said that if the South African Government is able to push the deal through, Buthelezi's argument for participating in government-created institutions as a means to promote change will be severely compromised. Many have also hastened to add that if Buthelezi had accepted independence for KwaZulu the issue would never have arisen. But the land deal must run deeper than the South African Government trying to teach Buthelezi the lesson of what happens to those who do not take

independence when asked to.

Out of the three BSI countries, Swaziland has always enjoyed the closest relationship with the South African Government, and many people have seen the land deal as an attempt to bring Swaziland even closer into the much spoken about 'constellation of Southern African States'.

The South African Government's motives have been seen largely as an attempt to get Swaziland to participate in the constellation and crack-down on ANC guerillas in the country.

Both claims have been refuted by the Swaziland Government who maintain the land deal comes with no strings attached.

One theory is that the South African Government offered KaNgwane but the Swaziland Government said it wanted Ingwavuma as well.

For the Swaziland Government, the deal would mean a significant gain of land to the tiny kingdom. But there is also an even more significant gain in population. If the deal should go through the new inhabitants will outnumber Swazis two to one. The other aspect is that gaining the Ingwavuma area will give Swaziland access to the sea and with outside help, a harbour could be built.

The 'harbour theory' on the deal goes further to involve the United States Government. There have been widespread rumours that the USA would aid the development of Kosi Bay into a harbour. The comeback for the USA would be that it would have a naval base in the South Indian Ocean.

US officials in South Africa have said that they know nothing about the plans and that they 'are absolute nonsense'.

Since the outset the position of the African National Congress has been drawn in. But the reporting on it has been confused. Initially Secretary General Alfred Nzo came out in opposition to the deal saying the ANC viewed it in the same light as Lesotho's claims to the Orange Free State. Then two weeks later it was announced that the ANC would not oppose the deal but negotiate separately with the Swaziland Government. Three days later a statement was released from Lusaka stating that the ANC never supported the move and would continue to oppose it.

Meanwhile, thousands of pamphlets condemning the land deal have been distributed in the Ingwavuma area under the name of the ANC.