

"Democracy means freedom to choose"

INKATHA

Inkatha Freedom Party

IQembu leNkatha Yenkululeko

INAUGURATION OF IFP UMGENI NORTH BRANCHES

BY MANGOSUTHU BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU
AND PRESIDENT OF INKATHA FREEDOM PARTY

DURBAN CITY HALL : NOVEMBER 22, 1993

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to preside over the opening of the IFP's Umgeni North branch. It is truly heartening for me to know that the IFP has support amongst the communities of North Durban. Indeed, the fact that I have opened scores of new branches in all corners of South Africa over the last few months, proves that the IFP is the fastest growing political party in South Africa. Small wonder. It would be puzzling indeed were our staunch defence of federalism, free enterprise and true democracy not to strike a chord amongst the majority of South Africa's people.

The IFP certainly takes pride in the fact that while many other imposters say they believe in these most fundamental and necessary of values, you the people of South Africa know that it is only we who have stood by our guns. When the National Party, the Democratic Party, and the other so-called federalists, were selling federalism down the river, it was we who withdrew from negotiations rather than compromise on the only thing that will bring peace to our country. Although this has of course made us unpopular amongst the ANC, the National Party and their press, our steadfast fight for federalism has seen us gain the respect of the vast majority of moderate, peace-loving people of South Africa. As a consequence, we are literally picking up hundreds of new recruits every day. Indeed, it is due of this very fact that we are of course here tonight.

I thank you for supporting me, not just in word as many people say they do, but by actually joining me, by taking up membership of the IFP. Thank you to all those who have not been deceived by the calculated and concerted campaign that the media has been conducting against me and the IFP ever since the time of CODESA. From the very beginning, when our delegation objected to the Statement of Intent at the Plenary Session of CODESA on the 20th of December 1991, the whole press climbed on me and the IFP. Our objection was that the Statement of Intent did not make provision for a federal formula. That is all we objected to. But as far as the press was concerned, we were quibbling; we were delaying the process; we were being unreasonable, and we were being 'obstructionists.' And yet later, the participants agreed to the Statement of Intent being amended as our negotiators had suggested. The media would not concede that we were right from the beginning.

When CODESA II was destroyed by the ANC/SACP alliance last year, no hard words were levelled at them in the way in which I and the IFP are being lambasted day in and day out. Even when the ANC resorted to mass action, something that further damaged an already fragile economy, no harsh words were directed at them. This applies also to diplomats and foreign governments.

When the Record of Understanding was signed by President de Klerk and Mr Mandela, on the 26th of September last year, something that has landed us in the crisis in which we now find ourselves, this was hailed as a break-through. An agreement by a government in power with one of the parties on things that affect all other parties, signed in a huddle between them, was hailed as a good thing. When we objected, we were again attacked and it was pointed out that these gentlemen represented the biggest parties in the country and what they have agreed upon should be accepted by the rest of us.

I will say more on this later. For now, I just wish to pay tribute to those South Africans who have not been fooled by this sort of propaganda. It is a miracle that so many South Africans still join us in droves in the light of so much adverse propaganda against us. As far as most of the media is concerned, we can do nothing that is right. Thank you for your support in spite of this kind of onslaught we are being subjected to for standing for federalism, free enterprise and true democracy.

It is unfortunate, however, that on this joyous occasion that I need to dwell on the crises that our country is facing. Of course, were I not to do this, then you would be able to accuse me of keeping you in the dark about the threats to peace that the interim constitution poses.

In the early hours of Thursday morning a "truly historic" event was said to have taken place at the World Trade Centre. According to the media, with the agreements struck between the ANC and the National Party, South Africa had finally taken its last, irreversible step away from domination towards a new era of power-sharing. With the final agreements reached during the early hours of the morning, this was supposed to symbolise the dawning of the new era of democracy and prosperity.

If the media can call a deal struck between the ANC and the National Party an historic agreement, then we have truly sunk to new lows. The fact that these two parties can strike deals to the exclusion of the IFP and other important parties, is truly disturbing, if not preposterous. With such major players as ourselves excluded, these deals will bring us no closer to peace than the disastrous Tri-cameral Parliament or the Peace Accord.

Despite the so-called euphoria around the agreement on an interim constitution, the vast majority of South Africans are ignorant of the happenings at the World Trade Centre. They are confused and fearful. Yet this confusion serves a purpose. It is through this ignorance that the media can hoodwink you, the public of South Africa, into believing that democracy is best served by a blatant deal being struck between the Nats and the ANC. In so doing they are not of course pulling South Africa from the edge of a precipice. Need I remind you that the only reason why the ANC and the Nats have come together to agree on a pact is to suit nobody but themselves.

Before I tell you why these two parties have joined forces, let me explain why I constantly refer to only the ANC and the National Party. After all, the Nationalists and the ANC only two parties to the negotiation process. The fact of the matter is that the other parties which occupy chairs at the World Trade Centre are there to give the impression that talks are multi-party in nature. The other delegations of other parties represent virtually no one but themselves. Again this serves the purposes of the ANC and the National Party. The large number of parties represented gives the illusion that the talks are inclusive, and that those who are not taking part in negotiations are therefore spoilers. This view is promoted here and abroad despite the fact that most of these parties represent very small constituencies.

We in the IFP strongly object to this propaganda. We withdrew from talks precisely because we knew that democracy and federalism would not result from the charade at the World Trade Centre. On the contrary, thanks to a secret pact between the ANC and the National Party, all that would result would be the installation of central domination under an ANC/South African Communist Party government. Under this arrangement there would be no room for either federalism or democracy.

While the other parties might not be able to add much to the forging of a new constitution, we in the IFP demand that our voice be heard and our constitutional proposals be taken into account. Along with the other members of the Freedom Alliance we believe that we represent more than 50% of South Africa's population. If the National Party and the ANC ignore the majority of South Africa's population, then we are indeed heading for an abyss that I have warned about.

But let us return to the so-called historic agreement on the interim constitution. What is this so-called political breakthrough supposed to represent, you might ask? What is the truth about this interim constitution? What are the facts? Let me explain. First and foremost what the ANC and the Government have agreed to is an interim constitution. It is not a final constitution as the Freedom Alliance demands. It is a constitution which after the elections will not be worth the paper it is written on.

According to agreements between the ANC and the National Party, a final constitution will only be written in the second phase of a two-phase transition to democracy. The first phase is now in the process of being completed. What this first phase involves is that an interim constitution would be agreed to at multi-party talks. This interim constitution would then empower a Transitional Executive Council which would then rule together with the Government until the elections on April 27, 1994. The elections will be for a Constituent Assembly which would be charged with writing South Africa's final constitution.

What this means is that if the ANC wins the elections, and then resorts to tactics which use the deadlock-breaking mechanism, they can scrap the interim constitution and write up their own constitution without let or hindrance. In effect, the National Party has virtually given the ANC a blank cheque to write South Africa's final constitution.

But how, you might add, can the National Party agree to this suicidal process? How can the National Party accept that the ANC and their SACP partners could alone write South Africa's final constitution? I will tell you why. The reason why the Government has

capitulated to the ANC/SACP alliance, is that Mr de Klerk, Mr Roelf Meyer and a few others have been assured of cabinet positions in an ANC/SACP government.

According to their so-called Record of Understanding which was signed on September 26, 1992, the ANC agreed that the National Party could enjoy a few more years in power in exchange for their agreement that a Constituent Assembly writes South Africa's constitution. Simply put, what a Constituent Assembly means is that the winner of the election writes South Africa's final constitution.

So the next question is, why does there have to be two phases to writing a final constitution. After all, have not other countries written their constitutions in one single phase. The answer is course yes. So why the two-phase approach? The two phases have been allowed so that the ANC gets to write South Africa's final constitution without the National Party having been seen by its supporters to have capitulated to the ANC's demands that they alone write South Africa's constitution. Remember that this is the same National Party which vowed that they would never unban the ANC, let alone negotiate with them. It is the same National Party leaders who assured us that they would not accept the ANC's Harare Declaration, which was authored while they were in exile, which decreed this two-phase process.

Remember then, that this was the same party which vowed that they would never allow a Constituent Assembly to write South Africa's constitution. As I have already mentioned, the Constituent Assembly was enshrined in the ANC's Harare Declaration - the same declaration which called for the overthrow of the South African Government. The Government rejected that Declaration and said that it was a recipe for conflict. So what has changed? What has of course changed is that the National Party has lost all will to govern. Instead of having to fight the ANC, the National Party felt that they would rather strike a deal which will secure them a few cabinet positions, secure the civil servants their jobs and the army their future livelihood. This, the ANC was only too ready to accept.

So the National Party and its supporters get what they want, but what about the rest of South Africa, you might ask? What do we get out of the deal between the ANC and the Government? The answer is nothing. The next question is: are we to suffer under ANC domination because the National Party wanted to survive a few more years on the political scene? The answer is yes. So you might ask yourselves, what right does the National Party have to hand over South Africa to the ANC/SACP alliance? Certainly the National Party do not speak for the people of South Africa. Indeed, they no longer even speak for white people. This did not of course stop them away from selling out our future.

In any case with their goals now accomplished, what does it matter whether South Africa is to have a federal system of government or not? As blatant as their sell-out is, the National Party could not of course say that to you, the electorate. So President de Klerk appears on television and tells the nation that the government had secured federalism and achieved all of its goals. Although they certainly achieved their goals all right, Mr de Klerk was telling an untruth when he said that federalism was secured, and he knew too that what he was saying was not the truth at all.

According to the draft constitution the regions do not enjoy one single original power. Instead the powers of the regions are located concurrently with the central government.

What this means is that the powers and functions of the regions can be over-ridden by central government. In fact central government can intervene in more instances than under the present system of government. Specifically, they can interfere in the affairs of the regions under no less than five criteria. These five areas are where a regional government cannot handle a matter 'effectively', where central government intervention is necessary to maintain 'uniform' or 'minimum' standards, or where 'provincial law' prejudices the economy or security of another province or the country as a whole.

If this sounds reasonable to you then think again. It is the central government which is left to define what is an 'effective' management of regional government. Again, it is central government which decides what 'minimum' standards are and what is considered 'prejudicial' for the economy.

This is of course far removed from a genuine federal system where exclusive powers to make decisions are ceded to the states. With these qualifying clauses in the interim constitution, the ANC was therefore ensuring that all hopes for a genuine federation will be destroyed.

There are eminent academics who argue that the proposed constitution could however not be seen as anti-federal, but as 'embryonically' federal, and that it has the capacity to develop into a federation provided that the regions vigorously exercise the power ceded to them. These people believe that it is up to the regions to persuade the Constitutional Court, and not the central government, whether regional governments are exercising their powers competently and judiciously. At the same time, the regions, through the Constitutional Court, could strive to ensure that they can assert and defend the autonomy granted to them. This I take with a pinch of salt, knowing that Mr Mandela told me that he rejects a Federation when he talked to me on the 23rd of June.

A blow to federalism is the fact that the constitutional principles which bind the Constituent Assembly in the writing of a final constitution do not provide for federalism. They are vague enough to be open to interpretation by the Constitutional Court. Again, herein lies the rub. As I have told you, for those of you hoping that an independent Constitutional Court will be able to prevent the ANC from abusing their power, you must think again. Through his power to appoint the majority of the Constitutional Court judges, the next President will be able to make sure that they are all his party yes men and women.

This all points to the need to resist the implementation of the interim constitution. Although the work of the Negotiating Council is said to be completed, we in the Freedom Alliance will continue to meet with the Government in the hope that sense will in the end prevail. Our arguments to the Government will be that the only way we are going to achieve peace and stability is for South Africa's negotiators to draw up a final constitution before elections next year.

This therefore means that we adopt a single phase process to writing South Africa's final constitution. As part of our proposals we believe that the purpose of the multi-party negotiations should be to agree on the fundamental constitutional principles, which are to be handed to a body of constitutional experts to prepare the draft constitution. This draft would be returned to multi-party negotiations for approval or rejection in its entirety, and once approved would then be submitted to national referendum. It is argued furthermore that both

the constitutional principles and the draft constitution would reflect the constitutional inputs provided through the ground-up democracy building processes conducted in the regions. Only after a successful popular referendum would elections then be held for a future democratic government.

We in the IFP believe that this process will do away with much of the uncertainty and violence which will result from a period of transition and an interim government. We believe that an interim period will provide scope for political manipulation and abuse and only serve to prolong South Africa's political uncertainty and economic stagnation.

I feel that I must comment on The Sunday Tribune lead story in yesterday's edition. The main headline is DANGER POINT and the strapline is, " But the good news is Buthelezi looks like jumping on board." I repeat what I have said in the past - I will not lead the IFP into an election under a constitution such as the present draft constitution which provides for a two-phase transition to democracy. It is mischievous and worse to suggest that I may think otherwise because the South African Government and the ANC/SACP Alliance chose to attempt to go on without me.

I have stood by principle the whole of my political life and I do not intend forsaking principle for expediency now. I will not be a participant in the two-phase process advocated by the World Trade Centre. In my judgement that would be tantamount to endorsing a constitution which I am convinced will polarise the country and even possibly lead to transforming the violence we as the IFP now experience into full-scale bloody confrontation of wider proportions.

The constitution is for me fatally flawed. I will be calling a Special General meeting of the IFP. I will put the position to delegates and listen to their response. It will be unfair of me to say much more right now. There would be no point in calling for a special IFP meeting if it was just to instruct delegates what to think. All I do now is repeat something I said at a rally in Pretoria on Saturday. I have said in the past this may well be a time after such a conference for me to reconsider my own position. I now repeat that statement.

I said that I had lead the IFP in the first phase of the struggle to reject the Constituent Assembly's two-phase approach, and that I would be seeking a mandate to continue the struggle for democracy in a second phase struggle. Those who will be with me will be with me, and those who move to oppose me will be against me. That will be their prerogative. All I want is clarity to know who is with me. I am confident that I am likely to get the mandate I will be looking for. In the meantime we will continue preparing for elections because there will be elections next year once we have reached true multi-party consensus on the way forward.

My friends, we have a fight to put up against a fatally flawed constitution. We have to put up a fight to make the first free and fair race-free election we have been waiting for for more than a 100 years, worthy of the historic acclaim that should be given to it.

Alow me to remind you that when all has been said and done it will only be parties with deep roots in black society which will survive elections. Let us get it right the first time. Let us not make a false start which will break the IFP. Nothing that our enemies can do will

break the IFP. Only our own blundering can do that. Let us not blunder into an election which will end up negating federalism and establishing a unitary state for generations to come. The people of the region of KwaZulu/Natal have suffered under-funding for decades and this can only stop if we become a federal state within a Federation of the Republic of South Africa.

The IFP is committed to furthering economic growth to underpin any negotiated settlement which might be agreed to. This is of particular concern to the IFP. We know as well as you do that we need economic growth to uplift our disadvantaged communities who have borne the brunt of National Party apartheid and ANC-inspired sanctions. We know, as well as you do, that without economic growth in our country there can be no peace. We therefore want to have an economy where each individual can create wealth according to his or her ability, and just as importantly, be allowed to keep that wealth. We want to create a society where the haves do not have to lock themselves behind high walls and security gates. We want to create a society where it is safe to leave your doors unlocked at night. We want a society where all have an equal chance of success, a society where all our children are spared the pain of hunger and poverty.

Because we also believe in the power of the market, we want to limit the power of politicians to meddle in the economy. We stand for small government and a clean administration. Our detractors may accuse us of many things. What they cannot accuse us of, however, is unfettered corruption. Unlike the National Party government, and some self-governing regions, we have run a clean administration. Despite the fact that we have been under-funded by Pretoria we in the KwaZulu government have used our scarce resources to their fullest and have spent them where they are meant to be spent. Where individuals have been found misappropriating funds, we have thrown the book at them. It is this belief in good governance which allows us to point fingers at others. We are at this moment engaged through our Departments in unearthing some fraudulent practices of certain civil servants. It is not strange that one of those involved in this scam is a well-known ANC official here in Durban. It is our record of being accountable to the people that allows us to say that when you vote for the IFP in the elections next year, you will be getting a good, clean administration.

Yet it remains our businessmen who provide the stimulus for economic growth to fund government. For that growth our businessmen will need to be able to invest with degree of certainty and confidence. Our businessmen therefore need a stable environment in which they can invest time, money and effort with confidence. This environment demands prudent economic policies, with low taxation levels, low inflation and rising levels of productivity. But equally important are guarantees that their investments will not be tampered with by any new government.

Going a long way to ensure this, we believe, is the need to enshrine property rights in the new constitution. What needs to be recognised is that the individual has an inalienable right to own property and to exchange that property. It is the IFP's view that it is the inclusion of this clause protecting property rights which is crucial for South Africa's future prosperity. It remains our view that it is no coincidence that the most powerful and prosperous democracies are those which have the greatest respect for private property.

Despite the fact that we, amongst many others, fervently believe in the private ownership of property, the right to own property is not shared by the ANC. Indeed, the fact that there is a watered down clause in the interim constitution which protects property rights, is illustrative of this point. To explain this we need to go back in time. A few months ago negotiators hurriedly appointed a technical committee to draft an interim Bill of Rights. The reason for this haste was that this interim Bill of Rights was regarded as a minor issue to be dispensed with quickly. After all, an elected Constituent Assembly would draw up a final Bill of Rights after the election.

Whilst we in the IFP believe that those who have been dispossessed of their land are entitled to have their land restored to them, unlike the ANC, we do not believe that this right be cemented in the Bill of Rights so that it effectively compromises all other property rights. Although we are adamant that the injustices of the past must be addressed, we do not believe that this should be done by destroying the very foundation on which a prosperous economy is based.

It is, however, not the interim Bill of rights which is at issue here. It is the fact that a final Bill of Rights can only be agreed on and entrenched by a Constituent Assembly. So with the final Bill of Rights being written by an ANC/SACP government if they win the election, we might not after all even have a watered down clause protecting property rights. At a bare minimum, with the right to draw up a final Bill of Rights being the prerogative of a Constituent Assembly, we are again left with a process which is bound to heighten uncertainty regarding investment. We are reminded that just because the ANC/SACP no longer mentions nationalisation, it does not mean that they have given up on it as their policy. This is not even quite correct, as in a recent SABC-TV interview, Mr Mandela stated that they will nationalise the mines and what he called 'monopolies.'

Despite the quite predictably malicious way in which the media have covered our stand on multi-party talks, we in the IFP nevertheless remain committed to a speedy negotiated settlement to South Africa's problems. Although I have repeatedly warned of the danger of the present civil war escalating into a more devastating conflict, you can be assured that the IFP will not be in the forefront of that. We remain committed to peace and reconciliation in our country. We do not even have a private army like the ANC or the PAC. We know, as much as you know, that it is only through peace and prosperity that all South Africans can attain the freedom we have fought so long and hard for.

The deliberate distortion by the media of my predictions to suit the propaganda war boggles my mind. We are in a mood to fight for democracy, real freedom, and justice. With your support I feel certain that we will win that fight through peaceful resistance and possible civil disobedience. In life there are things that people must struggle for with all they have. These are things where people should not be afraid even to pay the supreme price with their lives. I am convinced such a battle has begun in South Africa, and your support therefore means a lot to me. Thank you again, all of you, for your support.

-----0-----