

Chapter 2

Bophuthatswana: home for the Batswana

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss how Bop attempted to invite many Batswana to reside within the territory of the homeland. The reason here was to authenticate and legitimate its intention to become an independent state. The focus was mainly on Batswana who were not already within the territory, particularly the Batswana who were residing in the townships surrounding cities in South Africa. For Bop, the diaspora meant people who were mainly living in South Africa. On the issue of 'Independence', the government of South Africa was certain that part of its plan of Separate Development was being achieved and that the needs of one of the South African ethnic groups were being fulfilled. The 'Independence' of Bop did not only seem to be a fulfilment of the apartheid goal but it also meant a new form of struggle, as many people were now beginning to know what it was like to be forced to give up their birthrights as well as their South African citizenship. Not only were these people going to lose their birthrights and citizenship, but they were also required to endure poor living conditions as well as harassment by police from the homeland.

In addition, 'Independence' was something which divided the church along the lines of territorial dominance as well as hindering the fulfilment of the individual's interests. Many of the mainline churches wanted nothing to do with the policy of apartheid, which divided the black people on ethnic grounds, while on the other hand, some churches were in support of the 'Independence' of Bop. Most of these latter churches were African Independent Churches, though not all of them. Bop on the other hand tried to convince the world that it was 'Independent' and that it should be given international recognition, through the expansion of its own trading links and economic viability, as well as of the platinum mining industry in the Rustenburg area. There were some mixed feelings over the short-

lived coup (see below) amongst the different churches, both those which supported Bop as well as those which did not recognise the homeland state.

2.2 Batswana in the 'diaspora'

As in most countries, some Batswana people were in the 'diaspora', which in this case referred to those who lived in the townships of South Africa and not in Bop, and were Batswana and speakers of the language itself. The strange thing was that those across the border in Botswana were not regarded as being in the diaspora. Lucas Mangope, in one of his speeches, pointed out that they should be brought back home where they belonged. He claimed:

Our people (the Tswana) became fragmented and scattered willy nilly across the subcontinent. Our culture, our language, the very fabric of our being, began to be dissipated and lost in a bastardized tapestry exacerbated by the evils of apartheid. But through all this there remained the flickering flame of nation-hood which no amount of abuse or inhumanity could extinguish (Jones 1999: 589).

This reflected Bop as a government which tried to turn back the 'clock' of the cultural borderlines of the region. There were efforts to create a popular nationalist movement in Bop, but these failed owing to the fragmented territorial basis of Bop. In spite of this, the government was able to manipulate historical concerns and engender an ethnic 'rediscovery' by simply embracing the values of the Batswana who lived in the countryside, as opposed to those of Batswana in the 'secular', 'detrribalised' urban areas. In this instance the regime of Bop had carefully selected the history and culture by promoting a form of Batswana nationalism, which was a mechanism used to overcome any opposition and would create an emerging network of patronage. The issue of 'independence' for Bop from South Africa would be viewed as a sham and as lacking capability to deliver sovereignty and to reflect the 'maturity' of the Batswana nation. While these efforts would be overshadowed by the dependence on the South African government, they were at the same time responding to a history of dependency. This ethnic approach was presented under the disguise of the development and material advancement which 'independence'

would bring.

President Lucas Mangope was also trying to win the hearts and minds of many Batswana people by using the concepts of dispossession and upheaval which were associated with the Batswana diaspora during the pre-colonial and colonial periods. Concerns like these had long gained support from among Batswana intellectuals through the organisations which they had formed, such as the Barolong Progressive Association and Barolong National Council in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century (Jones 1999: 589). The ruling party (Bop Democratic Party) managed to distort this history of instability, vulnerability and uneasiness to claim that they were acting on behalf of the Batswana and creating a stable place for them which they could call their own, which was reflected in the name 'Bophuthatswana' (meaning bringing Batswana together).

On a number of occasions when addressing the people, Mangope would present a 'history' of the Batswana as fundamentally different from other nations. He described these differences using religious imagery in which he portrayed himself as a 'messiah' leading his people out of the darkness of colonialism and apartheid. In other words, Batswana people were likened to the lost children of Israel and Bop was seen as their promised land. The use of Christian discourse was a means to win the Batswana because they embraced Christianity as their religion: as he (Mangope) would say, he would take them to Canaan.

At the same time Mangope, in his speech at the opening of the second National Assembly was of the opinion that all Batswana who were in South Africa should indicate their desire to be counted in and branded as 'citizens' of Bophuthatswana by making their way to the Embassy in Pretoria, or a consulate or magistrate's courts where they would fill in and sign a renunciation form as a prerequisite to approaching South Africa for the necessary 'citizenship documentation' (Mangope, 1988:67).

For Mangope, the idea of 'citizenship' in Bop meant that it was, in accordance with the tenets of international law, an issue between the country and the individual. This was an implication of the individual's discretion to lose his South African citizenship or that it was

not voluntarily given up. Terms of agreement between the two governments were included in the *Status of Bophuthatswana Act* of the South African Parliament and was also in the Constitution of the Republic of Bophuthatswana Act or its Citizenship Act (Mangope 1988: 66). The issue of citizenship was received with mixed feelings: many Batswana people were not too happy with this arrangement because it meant losing their birthrights as South Africans, while on the other hand many of the Batswana people who were trapped in the territory of Bop were to assume 'citizenship' by virtue of owning property. On the other hand the negotiations for 'Independence' agreed that those who were not interested in becoming 'citizens' of Bop were to just fill in the form and renounce citizenship. An important issue regarding citizenship basically concerned those Batswana who resided in South Africa and had not taken Bop 'citizenship'. Among them were those who possessed dual citizenship and those who only possessed South African citizenship but owned a property in Bophuthatswana territory. For the authorities of Bop this meant that these people were denigrating them while they were benefiting from the best of both worlds.

Irrespective of Lucas Mangope's intention to create an 'Independent state' many Setswana speaking people opposed the idea of independence. In certain instances some of them wrote to a number of newspapers voicing their disapproval of Mangope's intention. One of the letters in The World, went on to suggest that the notion of independence was never even put to the test to determine if the Batswana were interested in the idea:

I and hundreds of others are concerned that Chief Mangope has not had the guts to test our opinion by putting the independence issue to a referendum (The World: 13 February, 1977).

Another letter commented:

The cabinet accept this empty echo because they are not going to suffer like us (The World: 7 March, 1977) and added:

Many urban Bophuthatswana are going to lose their jobs just like the Xhosa and be sent home back to their poor, unfertile homeland (The World 7 March, 1977).

There were similar calls by others for the rejection of the 'Independent' homeland states. One of the Movements to send an open letter to Chief Mangope was the Black

Consciousness Movement in July 1977, appealing to him not to sell the souls of Batswana, by accepting a fraudulent independence. And they added that people like him were being used like pawns in the white man's intention of continuing the status quo, and that he was inherently part of South Africa (The Guardian: London, 25 July, 1977). There had never been any consultation on the part of Bop leaders to determine whether the Batswana were interested in 'Independence'.

2.3 'Independence'

The political momentum for Bantustan 'independence' was increasing, and the limitations of the South African government were now beginning to reveal themselves. The National Party could not be shifted from the territorial allocations of the 1913 Land Act and the intended divisions within the politics of Bop. The South African government's refusal to grant Mafikeng, which was a white town, to Bop to be used as a new 'capital' sparked debates concerning the proposal for a new 'capital' and this led to a deeper tension over territory, the 'purity' of Batswana cultural identity and the attainment of 'independence'. In the debate some of the members of the Bop Legislative Assembly claimed that the ethnic mixture, the failure of influx control, and cultural decline affected Batswana in the urbanised areas, and the Bafokeng tribe was singled out in this instance as a result of their platinum mines. The 'impurity' mentioned was related to Setswana: it was said to be an 'undeniable fact' that it was impure and that it was affecting culture (Jones 1999: 590).

The apartheid policy in South Africa meant that homelands were to become 'Independent' and to be used as labour reserves for the Central Government. This led to Transkei being the first homeland to opt for 'Independence', later followed by Bophuthatswana in 1977, when Chief Minister Lucas Mangope decided to accept the offer from Pretoria (National Land Committee, undated, 8).

Prior to the 'Independence' of Bop Chief Lucas Mangope addressed the Lutheran Theological College in Maphumulo on the role of the church in the homelands, on 11 September 1972. In his opening remarks Mangope said:

That he can speak as a politician and a statesman about the programme for peace and reconciliation and seriously meaning what he says, while on the other hand a priest may speak in contempt and arrogance and shout out at the top of his voice a different programme. This programme may differ in words like 'peace, love and reconciliation' and be replaced by words like 'violence, bloodshed and machine-guns' because he does not hesitate to end up his message with the solemn pronouncement: In the Name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and to the greater Glory of God and the Almighty. Amen (Speech by Lucas Mangope: 11/9/1972).

According to Mangope the ministers were no longer preaching the gospel and making Christian converts but preaching violence and hatred. In his perspective the church was not supposed to be involved in social, political and economic issues but only to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. To him Christ had brought only the gospel, as he refused to create a worldly power-bloc, with an institutionalised power structure (Mangope: 11/9/1972). In addressing the topic of the role of the church in an 'independent' Homeland, Chief Lucas Mangope said that he saw this role as challenging, important, creative and pace setting, as well as fostering spiritual norms and the norms of the value systems (Mangope: 11/9/1972). Further, it should adhere to the principle of proclaiming the human dignity of the individual and comprise a group which was going to contribute to the quality and dignity of existence. In mentioning some of the few areas which he (Mangope) felt were of primary importance to the church, he said that it should not tolerate any compromise. This stand was to be followed by what he called education programmes, health and welfare services. Mangope stressed that the role of the church should not begin with the day of 'independence' but that it was already in place. This role had clearly and loudly stated that any involvement, leadership and participation in the development of Bop should not be undertaken by the church (Mangope: 11/9/1972). In this context Mangope was reverting back to what he had earlier said about the priests speaking the language of violence, bloodshed and machine-guns. He was asking, what prevented the church from spending huge sums of money on instruments of violence and bloodshed, to set instead a practical example in the Homelands of 'social justice', a principle to which he said they gave cheap lip service. Mangope, then spoke about the stipends of the Black ministers and other church workers, saying it was fine to spell out a self propagating and self-supporting church

in developing countries but that this did not boil down to making a plan for Christians to aid the destitute. He made the accusation that the church could not close the gap between Black and White priests in the homeland, and made embarrassing comparisons with the discriminatory wage structure in the South African public service. Yet for him the church all over the world enthusiastically wished fire and brimstone to consume all white South Africans (Mangope 11/9/1972). He quoted the black staff that were employed in the hospitals which were run by the church in the homeland and asked what it was that the church was going to do if the staff wanted a raise in their wages. How was the church going to raise the funds to meet such demands? What was going to be the church's justification if the contributions were to suddenly run dry? He added that the accusing finger was equally pointing to the church in terms of unequal stipends and wages the same way the church had been doing to the South African government.

Mangope did not just end with health issues but also touched on educational matters. He said that there was no provision for adult education as the Department of Bantu Education provided only for children of school going age, and that this field was presenting a challenge to the church by way of supplementing the shortfall (Mangope: 11/9/1972). Another question Mangope raised concerned the illiteracy statistics of the adults which the church had to deal with. He added that the church was fully aware of the social welfare needs of the Black people and yet it sent out social workers some of whom were not well trained to handle problems of misplaced people, alcoholics, homeless and disabled people. To Mangope's mind the church did not have any role in social, political or economic involvement except to be honest, simple, tenacious, fearless and to humbly serve God in its endeavour to read the gospel. This would be vital for the church in an 'independent' homeland, as it would not be subject to any questions

After the 'general election' in 1977, with a turnout of less than 12% of people eligible to vote, Mangope was urged to 'listen to the people' (Jones 1999: 591). However, it appeared that Mangope was only listening to himself and the Legislative Assembly, which comprised mainly his own party (Bophuthatswana Democratic Party). To him independence was imperative, as it was a tool which could deliver Batswana from

apartheid. The 'Report of the Committee on a Constitution for Independent Bophuthatswana' late in 1977 clearly showed that a decision had been taken to create an 'Independent' Bantustan. Many Batswana opposed the logistics and details of agreements that were reached between Bophuthatswana and Pretoria as falsifying 'independence', arguing that the ruling party had elevated this idea to mystical proportions. It was portrayed as a movement from underdevelopment to brightness. Transition was justified as an achievement by the Batswana, as a demonstration of their capability to move into development.

The 'independence' which apartheid South Africa granted to Bop in 1977 was the creation of a nation state within a nation. This view was characterised by the western discourse of modernity, in conjunction with that of identity formation. The Bantustan nation-building attempt must be located in the context of apartheid's discriminatory and discerning logic (Jones 1999: 579). The 'Independence' of Bop was celebrated annually: it became the custom to recognise it and inculcate the notion of identity among the Batswana and their children. The celebrations of 'Independence' annually claimed that it was God's ordained state, and churches within the homeland were invited to pray for the blessing of this state and its leaders, anointed by God. Individual clergy, people, but not churches, responded approvingly to the call from the government of Bop to bless the state and its leaders. Some ordained ministers from different denominations were members of the Cabinet of Bophuthatswana. Some had left their churches to join the government. The annual celebration of the 'Independence' of Bop meant that it could be seen to be on the same 'wavelength' as Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. In other words this was 'equivalent' to the neighbouring states, according to the apartheid legislation.

2.4 What did the church say?

The position of the church on the 'Independence of Bop was divided along two lines. The first was based on church affiliation: there were those who belonged to the ecumenical movement known as the South African Council of Churches (mainly the mission churches) and those which were not affiliated and came mainly from the African Independent

Churches (although not all of them supported the move by Bop). The second comprised the individual ministers from both the SACC affiliated churches and from the AICs. This situation saw the church being divided by the founding of the Bop Ministerial Fraternity (BOMIFRA) which was joined by individual ministers, some of whom were appointed to the highest positions in the homeland government.

Before Bop gained its 'Independence' Chief Lucas Mangope, together with his cabinet, called together a group of ministers, some of whom were from the mission churches which were affiliated to the South African Council of Churches. Many church leaders who attended this meeting came from the African Initiated Churches, with a few individuals from mainline churches. They were apparently told to go and pray for the forthcoming acceptance of the offer of 'Independence' from the South African government.

The Rev Kgobokwe (interview, 8 October, 2003) who at that time was the minister of transport in the cabinet of Bop and also a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church in Africa, argued that before Bop could become 'Independent' they should pray to God and call the ministers of the different churches to pray with them as well, for the success of the anticipated 'Independence'. After the request by the leaders of Bop to the leaders of the churches the government was convinced that it was doing the right thing by opting for 'Independence'. In Kgobokwe's mind there was no way in which the 'Independence' of Bop could have not received the blessing of God as it had been prayed for by the ministers of the churches in Bop. Kgobokwe maintains that there was no relationship between the state and the church, except that the state was Christian. Even though this was the case, when the government of Bop celebrated its 'Independence' annually there was a slot in the programme for the churches to pray for the government. In some instances the members of the churches were instructed to put on their church uniforms to attend these celebrations as a symbol of honouring the 'Independence' of Bop. Rev Kgobokwe kept on emphasising that even in the different government departments the day would begin with a prayer before work could be started but that this did not mean that the state had a relationship with the church. However, the presence of individual ministers in the cabinet did suggest that there was a relationship between the church and state, as they were still involved in their

church work.

Rev Kgobokwe was supported by Rev Zebediela, who was appointed chaplain of the Bop Ministerial Fraternity (BOMIFRA) and was in charge of the Chapel which was built for their meetings and conferences, as well as for their gatherings with the government. In his words Rev Zebediela (interview, 8 October, 2003) said that in scripture there was a form of apartheid, which meant that races were never meant to live together (he could not quote a scriptural text to justify his statement). He remarked that this was why there were ethnic groups which could speak different languages, with different cultures and traditions. Zebediela maintained that it was the Christianity which was brought by the missionaries which had taught them (Batswana) that they did not have to stick to their traditional belief, and that it was owing to the blessing of God through his son Jesus Christ that Bop gained its 'Independence' which was later stolen by what he termed criminals.

However, the 'Independence' of Bop was not easily accepted by many Batswana, nor by some people who were not Batswana. It meant that they were now going to lose their birthright which many had been struggling to maintain in the past. This created a new form of struggle for people, particularly those who were living in the Mabopane, Odi and Winterveld areas around Pretoria, mainly non Batswana, as they were forced to either apply for Bop citizenship or leave the territory. In that context church leaders found themselves having to take a stand on the side of the people of Winterveld. Many residents of Winterveld were North Sotho and Shangaans who were in conflict with the Bop authorities. The Catholic Church and the Justice and Reconciliation Division of the South African Council of Churches wrote a letter to the Rev SS Seane, who was the Ambassador of Bop in South Africa, dated 31 January 1979, in which the issue of citizenship was raised with the ambassador concerning the other ethnic groups. Incidents that were mentioned by the Catholic Church and the Justice and Reconciliation Division related to the arrest, detention and prosecution in the courts of Bop of people who were not willing to apply for citizenship, as well as of those who lived without permission in Winterveld.

The church also raised the issue of the forced removals which were taking place although

no alternative arrangements were made for accommodation by either the South African Government or the Bop government. Some of these people were born in Winterveld and had inherited land in that area but they were forced to apply to the Winterveld Community Authority (which President Lucas Mangope established and appealed to the community to join) for a temporary residence permit. This permit was to be renewed on an annual basis and people could decide after five years if they wanted to become citizens or permanent residents of Bop. At first many thought that if they applied for citizenship of Bop their problems would be solved, but only a few were to be granted citizenship while others had to wait for a long time including those who were married to Batswana people, those who own property and even professionals. At the same time some 9000 non-Batswana who were employed at the industries in Babelalegi decided to go back to work after the employers were ordered to fire them for refusing to take Bop citizenship. Many of these people were Ndebeles who had vowed not to apply for Bop citizenship but changed their minds because they were intimidated by President Lucas Mangope (Mmabatho Mail: 19 January, 1979).

In response, the ambassador, Rev Seane's, letter dated 22 March 1979 stated that in Bophuthatswana there were no 'non-Batswana or non-Bop citizens'. Rev Seane added that the 'non-something' negatives of some people, stigmas which insulted human dignity and personality, were not known in Bop. Bop was a non-racial state with a constitution for the creation of a non racial society. According to Seane, Bophuthatswana citizens included Batswana, Bapedi, Batshangana, Basotho, Ma-Xhosa, Ma-Zulu, English and Afrikaner people. All of these people were welcome to apply for the citizenship of Bop. Rev Seane further commented that his conviction as a Minister of Religion was that:

There were basic principles and convictions of my life which, I pray, should never be undermined in my life. The basic principles and convictions spring from my understanding of the Christian doctrine of creation; the Christian doctrine of man; the Christian doctrine of the incarnation; and God's purpose for His church, and for her mission and evangelism.

When I respond to the call to go and serve my people in Bophuthatswana (and they are black and white) this was a decision in obedience to God's call, and the decision was not made lightly, or overnight. Here were a people who had decided

to open their own road, agonising, travailing, searching for liberation, for their birthrights freedom and independence. Whether some people agreed with them or not they had made their decision; to determine and to decide on their own destiny themselves, and not other people for them; deciding to constitute a new state, a new society, a non-racial society, where there are equal opportunities and not legalised racial discrimination based on skin-colour. When the people of God, and Bophuthatswana people are also the people of God, called me to identify myself with them as they so travailed, as they were humiliated and rejected in search of their birthright, I saw this also as an open door for the witness of the church in the life of the nation because the presence of the church should always be with God's people "where they are" and "as they are" (Seane: 22 March, 1979).

At the end Seane quoted one of South Africa's Black Theologians but did not mention his name except that it was published in the Post newspaper of January 17, 1979 in which he said: 'It is important for the church to move beyond words, to devise a Ministry beyond the Ministry of the church. By that I mean establishing a Christian presence in a situation of crisis'.

Some of these ministers used their authority to influence their church members to support the state, and this was made clear by Rev Diamond Atong (interview, 8 October, 2003) who said that people followed what their leaders were doing, and in this case those ministers who were in the Bop cabinet used their power for that purpose as they were benefiting from the situation.

According to Rev Atong (interview) this was a practice inherited by Bop and other homelands as they were doing what the mother state was doing. For Bophuthatswana to call upon the church to support it, was to win the hearts and minds of the Batswana as many of them embraced the Christian religion. As a result the government of Bop adopted a state theology and followed the pattern of South Africa. In Atong's opinion the church was used by the Bop government without defining its meaning and role. Atong argued that the church is the body of Christ and can therefore not be used for evil purposes. He maintained that the church in that territory was supposed to have stood up against the evils of

apartheid and to have shared in the breaking of the body and shedding of the blood of Christ, as apartheid was destroying South African society in separate ethnic groups. In support to Rev Atong was Rev Mongwaketse (interview, 9 October 2003) who pointed out that Bop attempted to group Batswana, who did not even make a nation but were an ethnic group from the South African nation. Mongwaketse argued that the church's duty at that time was to be a prophetic voice for the voiceless in South Africa; however, the greed of some ministers had led them to misleading the people of God into believing that Bop was their sovereign government where they could rule themselves. In his words these ministers had back slidden (particularly those from the Independent Churches) and those individual ministers from the mainline churches had betrayed the prophetic voice as well as the ecumenical doctrine that apartheid was a heresy. The Rev. Tselapedi (now the speaker of the North West legislature) argued (interview, 8 October, 2003) that there never had been any 'Independence except to elevate Lucas Mangope as the self appointed and white imposed leader of Batswana who was to lead them from the land of captivity'. Tselapedi said that this was an anathema from the beginning because 'Independence' had never been acknowledged by the Batswana except for what had been said by Chief Lucas Mangope. If 'Independence' had been what the Batswana wanted from the beginning they would not have been involved in the struggle for liberation in the first place. Secondly the Batswana would not have attempted to topple Mangope from his 'Presidency' as the leader of Bop. And thirdly, the South African government would not have interfered with the affairs of the legitimate government; therefore it was clear that Lucas Mangope was pursuing his own interests and not those of the Batswana. To call a state a Christian state was at the same time another means to maintain stability because not all the churches in Bop supported it except for the few individuals who later formed what was called the Bop Ministerial Fraternity. Theirs was to safeguard their own interests and not minister to their flock as was emphasised by Rev Tselapedi.

The Winterveld problem was serious: people saw the area as a dumping zone people were neglected. This was discovered by Rev. Jimmy Palos of the Methodist Church who toured the area with Dr Roos (Sunday Express 5 March, 1981). Palos said that the fault was not only with the bureaucrats but the land owners found that it was more profitable to

farm people than to farm the land. The other problem was that the main road to Winterveld was passing through Mabopane, half of which was South Africa while the other half was Bop. The most shocking discovery by Palos was the overcrowding of people in one shanty, some numbering twenty. In some instances only the relics of the destroyed mud houses were to be found, where door frames and windows were removed because the owners had left the place to move back to the centre of town. What Rev Palos found was that most of the people living in Winterveld were Ndebeles, Zulus and Shangaans, while the Batswana living there made up only 10% of the population in the area. All these people, including the Batswana, were resisting applying for the citizenship of Bop (Sunday Express 5 March, 1981). Most of these people feared losing their South African citizenship as well as their jobs. There were also schools which were illegal because they were not registered with the Bop Government: they were not teaching in the medium of Setswana because they were intended for the children of non Batswana people. A further discovery by Rev Palos was simply that some of these schools had been closed by the police but the teachers and principals had obtained court interdicts to reopen the schools. The South African Council of Churches also found that people expressed the same problems about fear of losing their South African citizenship and jobs, as well as their pensions (Sunday Times 4 February, 1979).

On 16 March 1982 the Rev SS Seane wrote a letter to the South African Council of Churches, requesting a meeting on behalf of the Bophuthatswana President Lucas Mangope. The meeting was to be held in Mmabatho, the capital of Bophuthatswana, and the suggested date was 21 April, 1982, at 10h00. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the problem of Winterveld. In response to the letter, the General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, Bishop Desmond Tutu, acknowledged the opportunity of a proposed meeting and added that the delegation from the South African Council of Churches would be made up of church representatives together with representatives of the Winterveld Community. In this letter Bishop Desmond Tutu indicated that he was not going to be party to the delegation but that the Vice President of the South African Council, Mrs Sally Motlana, Rev Austin Massey, Chairman of the Justice and Reconciliation Division of the SACC, Deacon Hans Hlaethwa, Chairman of the Winterveld Committee, who was also

a member of the Pretoria Regional Council of Churches, Mr Abel Motshoane, Vice Chairman of Winterveld Committee, Rev Jimmy Palos who was the secretary of the Winterveld Committee and Mr K Nyamakazi, who was the Convener of the Water Subcommittee of the Winterveld Committee, would form the delegation.

On 21 April 1982 the meeting took place in Mmabatho: the delegation of the SACC was present, while the government of Bophuthatswana was represented by several Ministers from the cabinet and a few members of the South African Foreign Affairs department were present as well (Minutes of the meeting: 21 April, 1982). Chief Lucas Mangope in that meeting asked Rev Seane to read the letter from Bishop Desmond Tutu. In that letter was a statement in which the South African Council of Churches made it clear that they were not going to Bop in recognition of its 'Independence' and that they did not recognise bantustan territories. In his response Mangope emphasised that he did not make any apology for running a government or taking 'Independence'. In spite of, his emphasis on being an 'Independent' government, the SACC maintained its non recognition of Bop as a state and the meeting continued.

There were a number of issues which were addressed among which was the contested one of citizenship; some issues affected the land, pensions, education and schooling as well as water and health. Some of these issues I will discuss in later chapters, when considering the issue of citizenship. Mrs Motlana stated that there was a need to take into consideration the different interest groups in the area and to outline their presence there; however, before she could finish what she was saying, Chief Mangope interjected by saying that history of Winterveld was already known. She went on to say that the non Batswana were insecure and again Chief Mangope interjected by asking if it was the intention of the delegation that Winterveld be excised from Bop. Mrs Motlana pointed out that these people were not secure because they were losing their jobs as a result of their not being citizens of Bop and not permanent residents either.

Rev Jimmy Palos stated that people who had Section 10 rights, who had been removed from Lady Selbourne and other places to Winterveld under the Group Areas Act, could

have affidavits made available that they had been relocated to Winterveld by the government trucks which had dumped them there. Chief Mangope dismissed the affidavits as valueless and demanded a proof that these people had been moved to Winterveld by the South African government. He further demanded that they obtain a statement from South Africa. In response, Rev Palos asked if this was in dispute with the fact that people had been removed from Pretoria. In spite of the fact that Winterveld was a heritage from the South African government, it fell within the jurisdiction of the homeland, and the forced removals programme still persisted under Bophuthatswana as an attempt to rid itself of the slum conditions. The other issues in this meeting will be dealt with in the next chapter, particularly those of the land, residence and plot-owners.

2.5 Tshwaraganang lo dire pula ene: unity and progress

After negotiating for its 'independence' in 1977 the Bop government tried to reclaim the British Protectorate of Bechuanaland and this caused a number of misunderstandings, particularly on the definitions of the boundaries. Not only were the boundaries to be redefined, but citizenship was also a cause for concern especially amongst many of the Batswana people who remained within the South African boundaries. Though Chief Lucas Mangope allegedly expressed his concern over the forced removals of Batswana from their own land he never in any way stood against ethnic, territorial and racial segregation. In spite of the alleged concern of Mangope (Rand Daily Mail 28 May, 1977), forced removals were endorsed between 1968 and 1971.

The highlight of tension was in 1976 during the student uprising in Soweto, spreading to Bophuthatswana in Montshiwa, when many of the young people burned down the Bop Legislative Assembly in opposition to the intended 'independence'. The protest by young people against the perceived 'autonomy' was also picked up by the opposition party of Bop, known as Seoposengwe National Party, under the leadership of Chief Maseloane. He strongly opposed the notion of independence and demanded equal status with white people in South Africa. For Maseloane it looked as if Mangope had already accepted the status of 'Independence' in collusion with the Prime Minister (B. J. Vorster) of South Africa

at that time, and that this was another way of giving Mangope the powers to rule the Batswana as he wished (The World 11 March, 1977).

Mangope was willing to go the extra mile to recreate a Batswana National group in South Africa within the territory defined and dictated to him by Pretoria. From the experience of many Batswana people in the urban areas, he was urged to reconsider 'independence' based on the first 'Independence' of Transkei. Many of those who thus urged him, advised him that 'independence' had been rejected by the international world and that his children would be ashamed to admit that he was their father (The World 11 March, 1977). Despite opposition from the majority of Batswana most of those in the ruling party aspired to the notion of 'independence' as a stepping stone along the road to the 'maturity' and 'development' of the Batswana.

2.5.1 Economic viability

Like the other 'independent homelands', Bop could not be regarded as economically independent because it was receiving a substantial grant from the South African government. However, it was more viable than the other three 'independent' states because it had in its possession mineral resources which other Bantustans did not have. A large part of its economic base was derived from the taxation which it levied on mining and tourism. From the mining tax its revenue was almost 50% of the budget of R380 million. Tourism was also generating a sizeable revenue: Sun Bop was paying R59 million in company tax and the casino tax was expected to bring in R60 million (Bauer and Wessels 1992: 29). On the other hand Bophuthatswana had a debt. of R600 million due to overspending and the low mineral prices.

However, people (including the minister of finance, Mr Lesley Young) who were in the Cabinet of Bop were hopeful that the economy would render the government fully independent of South Africa within five years (The Star 5 October 1989, 15). Mr Young had stated in the same newspaper that the government was going to make much money through mining, the same way the South African government did. Despite this, the South

African government at that stage was still obliged to keep supplying the Bop government with money so that they could continue to develop the territory. Further money was still to be obtained from the adult citizens of Bop who were working in South Africa. Also, the Bop government had common borders with some Southern African countries and as such it took certain responsibilities of maintaining these borders off the shoulders of the South African government. About R13 million a year was required to maintain these borders (The Star 5 October 1989: 15). According to Devenish (Vorster, 1983: 19) it was important to see Bop as economically viable because lack of viability would affect the legitimacy of the Constitution. Meanwhile Mr Mangope maintained in his speeches to the House of Assembly that Bop during international isolation had through non-recognition in its early stages, managed to come to terms with the realities that it had to do things on its own without help from the First World and with little help from South Africa (Malan, 1989: 35). With this in mind, the thought was to embark on trade.

2.5.2 Trade

Like an island that is surrounded by water, the government of Bop was ambitious to trade with the international world, without considering that it was a creation of apartheid. Despite this, it went on to compile its own balance of payments and its own trade statistics, through a survey which covered the economic sectors of external trade. This survey was however, not very significant as Bop was dependent on South Africa. Many of its imports originated from South Africa and other countries and they were delivered to Bop through the ports, and by road and rail from its 'big brother' (South Africa).

Most of the goods that were imported were consumable, like foodstuffs as well as merchandise for personal consumption. Weidemann (1977: 56) says that only a small quantity of these imports were from outside South Africa, and that these were products such as rice, tea and coffee. It was only due to the fast 'development' of the mining industry and the expansion of transport that the amount of capital goods such as machinery and equipment increased. This form of 'development' triggered off greater demand to 'improve' the infrastructure of Bophuthatswana.

Regarding exports, the South African government was an important trading partner of Bop. However, the products that were produced by or in Bop were re-exported by the South African government to other countries. A good example of this was the high proportion of the output of the mining industry. In this sense Bop had already built up trade with countries other than South Africa (Weidemann, 1977: 56). Most goods were exported to South Africa. Many of these goods were textiles, clothing, furniture, jewellery, engineering products and building material. A lot of the mining income was exported to South Africa between 1974 and 1975, in which Bophuthatswana managed to make R78,3 million and R90,1 million respectively

On the other hand products such as meat, sisal, and maize (though maize was also imported) were not exported. Most of Bop's export trade was with South Africa, where its earnings stemmed from migrant labour and commuters employed in South Africa. However, the dependence of Bop's economy on the foreign exchange which was earned by migrant workers and commuters was reduced by the growing mining industry in the following years, i.e. from 1976 onwards. Due to its desire to trade with some of the countries other than South Africa, the government of Bophuthatswana sought for international recognition.

2.5.3 Quest for international recognition

Bophuthatswana had thus far only been recognised by the government of South Africa and some of the bantustans such as Transkei, Ciskei, and Venda, as well as self-governing states like Qwa-Qwa, Kwa-Zulu, Gazankulu, Kwandebele and others. President Lucas Mangope blamed the outside world for non recognition. He said:

'Our particular path of liberation and independence has not been enough for the world ... a world that is historically used to bloodshed preceding recognition of independence or nationhood. Because our independence was not the result of a bloody war of liberation, we have not received, as yet, the recognition we deserve. But no matter, we will eventually earn this. When recognition comes to us, it will be recognition with great respect ... the respect that is afforded to a nation

that is capable of standing on its own feet. For this we are prepared to sit and wait'
(Bauer and Wessels 1992: 30).

After its independence Bophuthatswana was visited by politicians from Britain, most of whom were Conservative members of the British House of Commons, with the controversial figure like Mr Andrew Hunter, who had visited Bophuthatswana seven times already. Hunter's justification for his visits to Bophuthatswana was that being among the Batswana gave him the chance to learn at first hand the indignation they experienced at Britain's past actions and current attitudes. He felt a deep sense of shame that the British government had not given recognition to this Southern African nation that had contributed so much towards 'peace' in the turbulent continent (Bauer and Wessels 1992: 31). In Hunter's opinion recognition for Bop meant that it was going to have access to the world financial markets, to soft loans, to the development programmes of developed countries, which would have meant an immense difference to the two million Batswana (The Weekly Mail 21 April 1988: 5).

The other leader of a foreign country to visit was the late Prime Minister Franz Josef Strauss of Bavaria, a supporter of Bop, who held talks with President Lucas Mangope.

The independence of Bop was condemned both in South Africa and elsewhere. In the continent, the Organisation of African Unity was vocal in condemning it. The OAU describes Bop as a:

Pseudo state which did not serve the cause of peace and was clearly designed to apportion poorer land to the blacks and the best of everything to the whites ... the self-appointed ruler of Bophuthatswana should be condemned for the traitorous nature of his acceptance to fragment South Africa (Bophuthatswana Research Bulletin 1977: 467).

Some countries in the continent, like Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Senegal, also voiced their condemnation and commented that 'the refusal by B.J. Vorster regime to recognise, as being anything more than temporary sojourners, those who sell their labour to the white

man for as long it is needed, must be vehemently condemned ... Africa has a duty to support the struggling people of South Africa and must engineer a campaign against any move to recognize the enslavement of our brothers and sisters' Bophuthatswana Research Bulletin 1977: 468).

The attempt by Bop to forge links with Botswana backfired as that government refused to recognise them. The position taken by Botswana was very clear from the beginning: that they did not recognise any Bantustan (The Star, 19 May 1988: 9). The foreign minister of Bop at that time. Mr Solomon L Rathebe, maintained that they would not rest until the world knew that Bop existed He said: 'It won't be easy for us to get what we want. The journey is still very long. But we are prepared to walk every mile of it' (City Press 10 April, 1988).

While some historical events were unfolding in other parts of the world, like the collapse of Communism in the Soviet Union, there was a revival of nationalist notions which also provided the actions and material for nationhood and ethnicity in Bop. This was not clear whether it was a phase in search of a respectable political discourse. This was giving rise to new examples of political arguments for nationhood. The nationalist sentiments in the Soviet Union constituted a powerful justification for Bop to be an independent nation. Israel was also a good example, because of its determination to preserve its identity as a nation, and this served as a source of inspiration for Bophuthatswana. At an independence day celebration at the Bophuthatswana Trade Mission which visited Israel in 1992, the Bop Minister of Information made a comparison between the two countries, based on the experience of the Batswana regaining their promised land the same way as the Israelites had done (Lawrence and Manson 1994: 457). Israel also saw the parallels, because from 1977 there had been regular exchanges between the two countries, with Israel sponsoring the development initiatives of the homeland. This was further evident in the frequent visits of Israeli business people and advisers, with some of them being given positions in Bophuthatswana.

In 1992 there were visitors from Ukraine to the 'Independence' celebrations of Bop. This was a perfect opportunity to foster links, and likewise a Bop trade adviser 'ambassador'

was despatched to Riga to establish relations with the new state of Latvia. This was followed by a visit by Mangope and several Cabinet Ministers to Latvia to strengthen these ties, which was followed by the opening of the Information Services of Bophuthatswana. In his speech Mangope further reiterated that it was intended to forge relationships between both states, based on the similarities of their historical background. This statement indicated their common fear of communism, which in the South African context was a threat in the form of the ANC.

Lucas Mangope was also campaigning for recognition through other means. His main argument was that merely because the liberation of Bop had been without any conflict no recognition was accorded to them. Irrespective of the fact that Bophuthatswana was a product of apartheid, he vowed to spend sleepless nights fighting for the recognition, and added that his government would wage a war: its own war to be recognised, especially in the fields of education, agriculture, housing and other modern facilities. Mangope's means of doing this, was to 'improve' the quality of life of the citizens of Bop. Some of the visible means which the Bop regime used were gambling (Sun City), cultural activities (Mmabana), the appointment of Ombudsman and Consumer Council.

Sun City managed to draw many people from different countries to gamble, and many of those who came to Bop were Europeans, North and South Americans, thousands of South Africans and Southern Africans. This gave Mangope the upper hand in boasting that there was no apartheid in Bophuthatswana and that people of all races were playing together and being entertained, and even living together (Mangope 1988: 63). Also, there were innovations such as TV stations (known as Bop TV and Mmabatho TV) and a number of radio stations (the most popular being called Radio Bop). For Mangope this was an entrance to the world, as was the establishment of the airport. These were some of the means which Mangope employed to be recognised by the world.

Based on the achievements of Bophuthatswana in a short period the need for recognition was unquestionable. However, it has been embarrassing to consider that these were the 'leaders' put into power by the South African government, which kept them where they

belonged (in the Bantustans). In his own words Mangope (1988: 63) maintained that:

South Africa studiously avoids giving us the vocal recognition of our achievements that we have earned - and in this regard they team up with their opponents: the so-called liberal press of South Africa. This attitude of South Africa has caused us much harm in international quarters since many of our achievements and our resources are deceitfully or ignorantly represented as being part of South African property or achievement. And so, for example, when South Africa talks about her mineral reserves she sometimes includes that which belongs to us. When she publishes her information material, she does not always distinguish her territory from ours. We resent this and will do all in our power to see that this attitude changes.

However, the quest for recognition in South Africa, especially from the ecumenical movement, was a lost cause. The South African Council of Churches had made it clear to Lucas Mangope that they did not recognise Bophuthatswana as a territory with independence that was legitimate, in correspondence between the government of Bophuthatswana and the South African Council of Churches in which the homeland authorities were inviting the church to Mmabatho (the capital of Bophuthatswana). The letter was written by Rev SS Seane (dated 13 March, 1982) to the Council of Churches; at that time Seane had just retired from the ministry of the Methodist Church as one of the strongest opponents of the apartheid policy, a move which surprised many clergy people in the church. Seane was to take up the position of the ambassador of Bop in South Africa. The invitation was to discuss the problems of Winterveld, which involved education, health, land, pensions and many other issues which will be tackled in some chapters discussed below. In response to the invitation, Bishop Desmond Tutu, who was the General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, made it clear that the ecumenical movement accepted, but only on humanitarian considerations, and that this did not imply recognition of the policy of balkanisation of South Africa and the 'Independence' of the homelands.

At a meeting (held on 21 April 1982) in Mmabatho between the Council of Churches and Bophuthatswana, Lucas Mangope added that he did not intend taking back his actions of independence (Minutes of the meeting 21 April, 1982). He referred to the correspondence from Bishop Tutu, saying that he (Bishop Tutu) was totally indifferent to the people who were addressing him in that letter (this letter was telexed from Cape Town by Rev Seane to Mmabatho). Further to this the authorities present including Mangope, wanted to know if the SACC accepted their authority as they were the ones who had invited the SACC to the meeting. If the situation was that they were not recognised as such, then there was no need for the meeting to proceed. In spite of Mangope and his ministers' comments this did not change the position of the South African Council of Churches, and Mrs Motlana, who was leading the delegation, reiterated what the Council was there for, which was to help and not to give recognition to the homeland (Minutes of the meeting, 21 April 1982).

Not only did the SACC reject the policy of the Bantustans and their 'Independence', but the affiliated denominations adopted the same position. The Methodists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, United Congregationalists, Catholics and other denominations did not recognise the existence of homelands (Madise 2000: 64). One denomination which came out openly was the Methodist Church at its conference of 1977, held in Benoni, which decided to discontinue the practice of sending a message of goodwill to the statesmen of both the South African government and those of the homelands. This was during a time of violence and the government of South Africa was clamping down on many African organisations, detaining many people and banning newspapers. It then dawned on the Methodist Church of Southern Africa that sending messages of goodwill would not change the situation in South Africa. The discontinuation of this practice led to schism in some denominations (particularly the mainline denominations) and a good example of this was the Methodist Church of Southern Africa in and around the Transkei at that time (which like Bophuthatswana, had opted for 'Independence'). However, the Transkei situation did not affect the church in Bophuthatswana in the same way. The only problem occurred when the individual ministers from these denominations left their churches to join the government of Bop, as Rev SS Seane did. Some individuals who did so included Rev SS Seodi

(Methodist Church), Rev. S Kgobokwe (Dutch Reformed Church in Africa), Rev L D Lesetedi (United Congregational Church) and many others who felt that there was a need to support the government. The individual ministers who did this later formed a ministerial movement which was known as the Bophuthatswana Ministerial Fraternity (BOMIFRA). Although, mainline denominations may have not recognised the status of the homeland government, many of the African Independent Churches did do so. This was visible in the way they attended government ceremonies and went as far as being given a slot in the programme devotions.

There were also other attempts to gain international recognition. The most notable one which was used was to capitalise on the apartheid context of South Africa. It was not surprising when suddenly Bop was referred to as 'A place for All' this was supposed to mean a secular state.

2.6 'A Place for All'

This phrase had some foundation but was both opportunistic and propagandistic, presenting Bop as a 'liberal democracy', with a Bill of Rights providing inbuilt protection for the rights of individuals. At the same time Bophuthatswana was still in pursuit of international recognition: because in its education system, subjects such as geography and history were providing the curricular foundations for Bop's delimitations. At tertiary level, the establishment of the Institute of African Studies at the University of Bophuthatswana was providing an ideological base for a specific type of Setswana studies which was acting as a cultural intermediary for government.

This was a planned way of appealing to the international community, because it had nothing to do with the people, who needed jobs and security. Foreigners, viewed as competitors, were more likely to buy into the notion of exclusive ethnic nationalism. The statement 'A Place for All' was contradictory because foreigners were expected to apply for work permits and or citizenship and they had no pension funds at all. At 'Independence', many foreigners believed that the Constitutional Act and the Bill of Rights would protect

them. This proved untrue after 'independence' as many of them were harassed. Towards the end of the 1970s many foreigners experienced police raids and other forms of harassment, especially in areas such as Odi and Moretele. In the early 1980s a new form of harassment was started, when foreigners were denied work permits and citizenship. Within the same decade Bophuthatswana changed the Land Control Act as another way of redefining foreigners as squatters or immigrants, which allowed the government to legally evict them. After 1986 the discrimination against foreigners did not stop but continued in a new form as the state was now focussing on adding pressure against people who were opposed to the Bantustan system (Lawrence and Mason 1994: 454).

2.7 A short-lived coup

The existence of Bophuthatswana was not accepted by the majority of the people in that territory. To a certain extent, it should be noted that the interplay between the state and 'traditional' structures was not as simple as it looked. In this instance the chieftaincy of that context was heterogeneous rather than homogeneous. Not all the chiefs were in favour of the government of Bophuthatswana, some resisted the regime while others supported it. Those who resisted were able to build up their support base among their subjects. A good example of this was Chief B. L. M. I. Motsatsi, whom it was thought would take over from or succeed Mangope as the new leader of Bophuthatswana. Motsatsi decided to resign from the Cabinet of Lucas Mangope because of his refusal to undermine constitutional democracy, which was reflected in his decision not to use his powers to harass the opposition party, the People's Progressive Party (PPP). Also, many chiefs rejected the innovations by Mangope regarding traditional etiquette and his self-proclaimed title of 'paramount chief' (Jones 1999: 4.). This resistance saw the formation of a traditionalists' organisation throughout South Africa, which was known as the Congress of Traditional Leaders of South Africa (Contralesa), in 1986. Contralesa was contesting the continuing role of chieftaincy and of local affiliation, which were a significant feature of the political landscape which could probably have also been undermined by the African National Congress.

It became clear that there was no room for any political opposition in Bophuthatswana, because the Bill of Rights in Section (18.1) specified that other laws could override the provisions of the Bill, which included the Internal Security Act and the Security Clearance Act, there was much suppression of the political opponents of the Bophuthatswana government. Such suppression was now focussing on the rise of and popular resistance to the Bantustan system, in the form of movements such as the United Democratic Front (UDF), Congress of South African Trade Unions student organisations. In 1990 the government instituted the State of Emergency as a mechanism to deal with the opposition to the 'independence' of Bophuthatswana, and this added to the exclusion of the non Batswana people and the rural power-base, which was opposed to Mangope. In this context the situation meant that the earlier statement that Bophuthatswana was 'A place for All' was now reversed.

In 1985 further contradictions arose out of the financial crisis, and were also caused by the persecution of the non Batswana minorities as well as by oppression and the increase in political turmoil. The outcomes of this were to separate communities and create a junction between 'state' and 'nation'. As a result, the national development and national identity were basically focussing on the material strengthening of the state and on advancing homogeneity. Later, there emerged some internal differences within the state on 10 February 1988 and this produced a short-lived coup.

Mmabatho, the capital of Bophuthatswana, was aroused by the sound of fighting between 'loyal' and 'rebel' factions of the Bophuthatswana Defence Force over the control of government buildings. Mangope was still in his pyjamas when he was arrested and taken to the 'Independence' stadium. News about the coup was announced after the seizure of Radio Bophuthatswana, which then proclaimed that power was in the hands of the People's Progressive Party, led by Rocky Malebane Metsing. For the citizens of Bophuthatswana this was good news as they took to the streets in celebrations of joy for the downfall of Mangope's regime (*Bantustans in Crisis* 1990:10). However, this moment was short-lived as troops from the South African Defence Force moved into Mmabatho to rescue Lucas Mangope, and within a few hours the coup was over. After his rescue by the

South African Defence Force, many of the 'rebel' troops were arrested, together with the supporters of the People's Progressive Party. Others fled into exile, including Malebane Metsing. A reign of terror ensued with the security forces arresting those suspected of being involved in the coup. Some government officials were fired from their positions, such as the head of Bop TV news, the Director General of Bop Broadcasting Corporation and the Secretary of Agribank. In Mangope's Cabinet the Minister of Internal Affairs (Chief B.L.M.I. Motsatsi) was forced to resign, as well as other chiefs.

Despite the political situation in Bophuthatswana after the coup, the situation in South Africa was experiencing a drastic transformation, while the regime of Bophuthatswana was still attached to the rhetoric of 'independence'. It was however, shifting towards a conservative regionalist alliance; at the same time the discourses of Christianity and progress were refashioned as well as redirected to the Afrikaner-Batswana alliance which was creating an animosity towards the Xhosa - and urban - dominated ANC (Jones 1999). This led to Mangope and his few supporters regrouping to initiate the South Africa-Tswana Forum (SATSWA), the purpose of which was to maintain the territorial dominance of the Batswana, as opposed to a unitary state and the reincorporating of the Bantustans.

2.7.1 The church's reaction to the coup

After the coup, the government of Bophuthatswana was rescued by the South African government. This resulted in the arrest and detention of many people as well as in a state of emergency being declared by the President of Bop, Lucas Mangope. The failure of the coup against the Bop government was seen as a victory from God by the authorities in that state, and not as protection by the South African government. The then minister of transport, Rev S Kgobokwe (in an interview with him) said that the ministers and BOMIFRA met at the Civic Centre in Mafikeng on 14 February 1988, to thank God for saving Bop and its leaders from what they termed terrorists at that time. From what Rev Zebediela said, it was through the grace of God that no one was killed and that the well-trained army of Bop, which later was assisted by the South African army at the request of Bop managed to stop what could have been 'war'. However, churches which were affiliated to the South African

Council of Churches distanced themselves from the involvement of some of their individual ministers who took part in the 'thanksgiving' service which was held at the University of Bophuthatswana Chapel (UNIBO Chapel). In the SACCs' view the attempted coup was an indication of the evils of apartheid and implied that people had enough of being oppressed and discriminated against on the basis of race and ethnicity. According to Rev Tselapedi, this situation led to a form of division among the Batswana as Christians, because those from the SACC affiliated churches were seen to be supporting movements like the African National Congress, which was believed to be anti Christian. For the government of Bophuthatswana which was 'Christian', this was not going to be allowed to happen in their territory. The BOMIFRA did not see the South African Council Churches as a legitimate voice of the voiceless but as an illegal movement in Bophuthatswana because they (BOMIFRA) controlled that territory (Interviews with Rev Kgobokwe and Rev Zebediela).

Rev Tselapedi saw Bop not as a legitimate state but as a place where all Batswana people in South Africa were grouped together and separated from other Africans, simply because they were told that they were different from other people. In his opinion Bophuthatswana's existence was an anathema because it had never been accepted in the first place, because it was a creation of the apartheid government of South Africa. Regarding the issue of the coup Tselapedi said it had always been realistic that people within Bophuthatswana had only been waiting for the right time to express their feelings, for the whole world to see that they had been oppressed. As a result, the church took a prophetic stance on the side of this voice. For the church in Bophuthatswana to be seen to be divided was propaganda, which was spread by both the South African government and Bop, to try and divert the attention of the international community from seeing the truth behind apartheid. He argued that there was no such thing as a Christian who was better than another, though BOMIFRA wanted to paint a picture of two types of Christians (i.e. those who were in Bop being better than those from the SACC affiliated churches). According to Tselapedi, this was a perception which was created by the government of Bophuthatswana because they believed that it was an 'independent' state like Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland, yet lacking international recognition. The point which Tselapedi was emphasising was the fact that those who led Bop were possessed by power and

wanted the church to consolidate it for them because it meant that there would be hostility towards that power. At the same time he pointed out that if the church forsook its prophetic voice and became a state church it would fail to conscientise the state when things went wrong. This seems to have been the case with the Bophuthatswana Ministerial Fraternity, as they could not call the state to order when people were not happy with the state of affairs in Bophuthatswana.

Things did not go according to Mangope's plans, because in March 1994 the government of Bop crumbled. As it spectacularly collapsed, the civil service had already crumbled, with civil servants demanding salary parity, job security and pensions. The situation was not influenced by political opposition to Bop but by the uncertainty of the future of the Bantustan in a post apartheid context. This meant that from that time the government of Bophuthatswana ceased to exist within South African territory as an 'independent' state but became part of the North West Province of South Africa in a post apartheid era. The final nail was hammered in by the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Pik Botha, who was accompanied by Mr Cyril Ramaphosa, who was Secretary General of the African National Congress. This did not go down well with Lucas Mangope, who claimed that he had been robbed of his government by the South African government and the African National Congress. The one thing which Mr Mangope made clear was his lack of understanding of why Mr Ramaphosa and Mr Pik Botha approached him at night to inform him about the end of the Bophuthatswana government.

2.8 Conclusion

The 'independence' of Bop was something which was not at all welcomed by the Batswana. For many of them the 6th December 1977 was the day that began their captivity. At the same time the proclamation by Lucas Mangope that all Batswana belonged to Bophuthatswana was a means to deny them their status as the citizens of South Africa. For him even those who were in the 'diaspora' were supposed to apply for citizenship because there was plenty of space for them to come 'home'. Bop was a hand of apartheid extended

by Mangope, who in many instances was seen as upholding the principles of apartheid by opting for the 'independence' offered to him by South Africa at that time. The extension of apartheid through the Bantustans could easily be seen in the way leaders of this settlement were treating their 'subjects', especially those who they forced to either apply for permanent residence or citizenship and were not ethnically Batswana.

For Mangope there was no way opposition could be given any room to express its opinion. It could be that he was well aware of the fact that more than half of the Batswana were not in favour of the route which he took. The constant harassment of those who stood up against him demonstrated that all was not well in Bop. The artificial picture of 'A Place for All' was made only for those in an elitist environment as a means to access the recognition which Mangope had longed for, during the years of the existence of Bophuthatswana. This recognition was also contradicted by a constant harassment of non-Batswana, who were referred to as squatters and immigrants, while at the same time Mangope was employing the labour of expatriates to take over some aspects of the civil service, especially in the departments of education and health. The two departments saw a great many expatriates taking over, while many Batswana people with expertise in these fields were left looking for employment.

The effort by the government of Bophuthatswana to be recognised as legitimate had little to do with the 'independence' of Batswana but much to do with the fact that individuals in top positions could gain access to resources which could not be accessed by all the citizens of South Africa. The invitations from Conservative Party members from the House of Commons were a way to make friends but not to recognition, as it was clear that there was no way Bophuthatswana could be recognised: not even the South African government recognised the 'independence' of Bophuthatswana as legitimate, seeing it was not at all a government but a labour reserve. Many of South Africa's industrial labourers, especially in the former Pretoria, Witwatersrand and Vereeniging areas came from Bop, as in the case with of the mining industry both in South Africa and Bop. The platinum, which came mostly from the Bafokeng area (near Rustenburg), was exported by South Africa and not Bophuthatswana. Another contradiction emerged from Bophuthatswana's demand for

recognition from the neighbouring Botswana: this is a country which was a British Protectorate and was occupied by Botswana as well.

The rejection of the 'Independence' of Bophuthatswana by many Botswana was reflected in the mobilisation of its people by the local traditional chiefs throughout that Bantustan. The support which these chiefs commanded gave an indication of the feelings of the people towards Bophuthatswana. The 10 February, 1988 coup was a clear indication to the world of what was happening in South Africa with its Bantustans. For many Botswana, the coup was one form of liberation from captivity, and they celebrated the downfall of the regime which they had endured. However, celebrations were shortlived, only to be followed by pain and misery when the soldiers and police arrested and detained the suspected opponents of Mangope. The arrests of these people were related to their 'involvement' in the coup. Others fled from the country, outside the borders of South Africa, because they knew that they would be arrested by the South African government and be taken back to Mangope to face charges of 'treason'. Not long afterwards the plight of people in Bophuthatswana was relieved when the entire civil service collapsed. This situation led to the South African government, which had given him 'independence', nullifying the legitimacy of his leadership as well as the existence of Bophuthatswana as a 'country'. This allowed Botswana people to prepare themselves for elections for a new South African government.

The Bop government exploited the Christian faith and the Christian churches as much as possible to justify its widely rejected 'independence'. It claimed that churches should not be involved in political matters, while at the same time working both openly and behind the scenes to garner the support of more conservative, mainly rural and nationalistically inclined churches. The mainline (mission) churches, in co-operation with the SACC and regional affiliates such as the Pretoria Council of Churches, never faltered in its opposition to Bop's 'independence'. Another related area of struggle was the whole land issue, which is the topic of my next chapter.