

Democracy means freedom to choose

e INKATHA

W Inkatha Freedom Party

IQembu leNkatha Yenkululeko

#### INAUGURATION OF 20 IFP BRANCHES IN THE WESTERN CAPE

ADDRESS BY MANGOSUTHU BUTHELEZI,  
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA FREEDOM PARTY

CITY HALL, CAPE TOWN : JULY 14, 1993

Mr Master of Ceremonies, Cape Town Town Councillors present, IFP Central Committee members, IFP Branch Chairmen, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. This is a great day for the Inkatha Freedom Party. It is with a sense of pride and deep appreciation that I address you after the inauguration of 20 IFP branches in the Western Cape. This moment bears testimony to the belief South Africans hold for a future of peace and harmony in a new democratic society - a society which upholds the principles of equality and justice which the IFP has always stood for.

I am standing before you today, hundreds of miles from my home and base addressing a vast array of valued supporters who are located in the Western Cape Region, whose population is largely White and Coloured. Throughout my political career, I have always operated on a national basis. There have been many occasions on which I have come to the Western Cape to attend the old Progressive Party meetings. I have also been invited by many different black communities, such as the Muslim Congregation and many others. At the time when Inkatha had only been in existence for about three years, I was summoned to Pretoria by the then Minister of Police, Mr Jimmy Kruger, who was disenchanted by the fact that Inkatha yenkululeko yeSizwe, (The National Cultural Liberation Movement) as it was then known, was not restricting membership of the organisation to Zulu-speaking South Africans only. He in fact threatened to take action against me, if I did not stop at once recruiting other Black people who were not Zulu-speaking. I told him point-blank that as long as the National Party recruited Whites from all white ethnic groups, I had the same right to recruit any Black person into my organisation.

It will be remembered that it was about this time that the Bergstrasse Institute at the University of Freiburg in Germany carried out a survey which showed that more than 40 per cent of our members were non-Zulus - this was when Inkatha was about two years old. This is why I am often surprised when the media goes out of its way to portray our organisation as a Zulu Party, which it is not. The fact that I am also the Chief Minister of KwaZulu does not then make the Inkatha Freedom Party

erty a  
Zulu Party. When the Improper Political Interference Act was removed from the statute books  
, we  
immediately opened up our party to South Africans of all ethnic groups. I have just been to  
o  
overwhelmed by the extent to which many of my fellow South Africans other than Black South  
Africans are joining us in droves literally every week, hence my visit here today to inaugu  
rate our  
branches.

It was I as Chairman of the-South African Black Alliance who tried to forge unity amongst t  
he  
oppressed. Some of you may remember that the Labour Party of South Africa was a member of t  
hat

President: The Hon. Prince Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi  
National Chairman: Dr. F.T. Mdlalose

Alliance and may recall that when we were trying to get a name for our organisation, it was in fact the leaders of the Labour Party, and Mr David Curry in particular, who suggested that it should be called the Black Alliance. Some people even at the time wanted it called the South African Alliance. Some of the parties that later went into the Tricameral Parliament in both the House of Delegates and the House of Representatives were members of the South African Black Alliance. It is therefore disinformation and propaganda on behalf of my adversaries which try to reduce me to size by making me a regional leader when for decades my approach was always national.

I've always opposed segregation and apartheid as a South African, and I am glad that my national approach to politics is being demonstrated through the support that spans regional boundaries and racial divides. I was the first Black leader to be invited by students at the University of Stellenbosch to address their current affairs society. I was fetched from Bishopscourt, where I was staying with the then Archbishop, by very angry students who told me that Mr BJ Vorster, the then Prime Minister and Chancellor of Stellenbosch, had approached the Rector and Vice-Chancellor at the time, questioning my invitation to speak in Stellenbosch. The students held the view that it was not Mr Vorster's business to decide for them who to invite, merely because he happened to be both Prime Minister and Chancellor. It was also here in Cape Town in 1974 at the Jameson Hall that I delivered the Hoernle Memorial Lecture, on South Africa possibly becoming a federal state.

I want to add in passing that no regional political force would survive for any length of time if it could not hold its own at the national level. It would be suicidal of the IFP to confine its interests to the region of KwaZulu/Natal. We are a national force, and a national force to be reckoned with. Both the Buthelezi Commission Reports and the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba show evidence that we have never thought of ourselves as a regional force only. In both these exercises we refused to give any credence to those who sought to portray us as an "ethnic" force only. We in KwaZulu and the IFP have never done anything else than seek to produce a sound South African democracy in which we

would have to face all-comers both at the national and regional level for our place in the South African political sun. '

Our objective in politics is to develop a national power base. We are aware of the fact that after the next elections the only parties which will be in the running are parties which have deep roots into the 80% of the electorate who will be Black. There are no prospects whatsoever that a new political party could emerge which will have national acceptability during the next year.

In my elected role as the President of the IFP I attend to the interests of all South Africans, irrespective of race, cultural, or language affiliation. As you have heard, this is not something new. The policies that my party holds are designed to meet national needs and aspirations. The pragmatic, well-considered and enduring beliefs we share, have evolved with all South Africans in mind. When individuals, the press, or opposing political parties attack the IFP, the effects of this r

everberate to  
all corners of our nation. Our defence comes from a united voice. It combines the views shared by  
IFP supporters in the Cape, Transvaal, Orange Free State and Natal. It is this sense of common  
purpose that heralds the Inkatha Freedom Party as the growing mighty force that it is. And  
it is with  
this spirit of unity that we must face the future together.

Most South Africans are overwhelmed by the momentous political changes that have rocked our  
country, especially after the State President's address at the opening of Parliament on February 2,  
1990. The period of rapid change following the State President's opening address renewed the hope  
and confidence of the South African people.

This was based on the belief that the period of apartheid rule had to be replaced by a period which  
enhanced the quality of life of most South Africans, allowing greater participation in social and  
political life, and unleashing productive and creative forces long stifled by decades of minority,

central government rule and racist oppression. Yet those of us who truly believed that the unbanning of the ANC, PAC and the SACP would herald a new era of democracy in this country, are now sorely disillusioned by events that have followed.

For many South Africans President de Klerk was regarded as the true saviour of the Black people and of South Africa. He was seen as the key to democracy and equality which at last cut across the barriers of race, culture and ethnicity. Alternatively, Whites in this country initially regarded his progressive overtures with deep suspicion and fear, but they too were soon overcome with the euphoria and optimism surrounding the prospects for a future democratic South Africa. They soon accepted that what Mr de Klerk proclaimed seemed to represent the only way forward for our race-torn Nation. There was euphoria that from being the pole-cat of the world, South Africa was now being welcomed back into the comity of nations. South Africans blinked and could not believe it when our Head of State, President de Klerk, received red-carpet treatment in all Western capitals by Heads of State in the civilised West. This was something that had not been seen since Smuts. I myself said to Mr de Klerk that I was proud to call him my Head of State, even though I had not elected him.

But what of recent events. The National Party government we see today is a far cry from the South African saviour it was portrayed as in the early 1990s. The rhetoric of democracy has been exploited by the government, leaving South Africans with an obscure range of interpretations, but no clear vision for the future. Hence, one is forced to view the unfolding events and agendas at multi-party negotiations with critical circumspection.

The lack of clarity concerning the future policies of the National Party extend to its internal leadership. There are elements within the South African Government who clearly have their own agendas - agendas that are creating serious divisions within their ranks, and accounting for the waning support and confidence of its members. The resignation of senior members from the National Party, many of whom can be described as the most enlightened and pragmatic representatives the government has, is fast becoming a generally accepted norm. And the attraction the IFP holds for some of these disillusioned politicians, has become an issue that the National Party can no longer overlook. I wish that the National Party could accept that I have not targeted their members, in particular, to join my Party. I have waged no such campaign against the National Party. This is a question of choice on the part of those members of the National Party who have joined us - democracy is after all very much a matter of choice.

Whilst this trend serves as a welcome gain for the IFP, these defections also serve as clear evidence of profound shifts within the National Party itself - political rumblings and upsets that are likely to continue for as long as the government continues on its wanton and undemocratic path of bilateralism with the ANC. When the Record of Understanding was signed by the State President with the President of the ANC on the 26th of September 1992, that is what started the first crack in the Party.

Following the signing of the Record of Understanding by the South African Government and the ANC in September last year, where these two parties alone decided upon national binding agreements which affected all South Africans, there has been increasing concern within government circles regarding the apparent convergence in the position of the Nationalists and the ANC. When South Africa was first given a hint of the government's and ANC's five-year plan for the transition, this concern became alarm.

Last year the government received the referendum go-ahead from White South Africans to embark on a process of negotiations which would lead to the constitutional entrenchment of power-sharing with, among others, the ANC. This commitment was spelt out in their campaign literature, as well

as in speeches by President de Klerk himself. Pamphlets circulated by the South African Government prior to the referendum set out eight specific minimum requirements including built-in guarantees and mechanisms which would make domination by a majority impossible. A letter to voters from the government's chief negotiator, Minister Roelf Meyer, said that all parties with sufficient support have to share the power of decision-making.

In a contradiction, the Government/ANC five-year plan embodies a two-stage transition process which will empower an elected Constituent Assembly to draft the final constitution during a transition period of five years. The formal endorsement of this proposal would mean that the South African Government would be acting outside the mandate of the referendum agreement. The reason for this is, that in order to accommodate these proposals, the Government would have to abandon its original referendum directive to negotiate for a fully-fledged constitution detailing the powers and boundaries of the regions and the states in the transitional constitution, prior to the election of a new government.

The Record of Understanding was a big surprise to us in the IFP as well. At CODESA II we had held the same positions on these issues with the National Party and the Government. I remember Dr Gerrit Viljoen assuring us that they also rejected the idea of a Constituent Assembly. What most South Africans seem now to forget is that the Constituent Assembly idea came out of the Harare Declaration which was authored by the ANC in Harare, while they were still in exile. It is the Harare Declaration which prescribes the Constituent Assembly route. It is the Harare Declaration that the National Party and the Government accepted through this two-phase process.

This is exactly what happened two weeks ago at the Multi-Party Negotiating Council - an event surprisingly overlooked by the South African media. In a dramatic about-turn, the National Party openly reneged on its commitment to its supporters, and formally accepted a compromise with the ANC at national level, for the election of a Constitution-Making Body, or Constituent Assembly, which would have the final over-riding powers at legislative level. This compromise was made as an alternative for entrenched constitutional guarantees for all South African citizens.

What does the National Party hope to gain by this compromise? The answer is simple, and one many might find shocking. This two-phased transition deal merely ensures that certain key government members will be able to retain senior positions in the government of transition, or as they call it, a Government of National Unity. In their typical high-handed unilateral manner, the Government has sold out its constituency in order to save its political skin for the next few years. This they have gladly done at an enormous cost to the people of this country. This is what has actually happened, to put it bluntly.

It is this same powerful element within the South African Government who are bent on sacrificing their working relationship with the IFP in order to appease the ANC, at the cost of peace in South Africa. These opportunists are relentless in their persistence to break down the IFP, because the [FP

is the only political force which has the representative force to stop under-handed, secretive deals between the South African Government and the ANC - a ploy which could only backfire on the National Party itself.

I am told from reliable sources in ANC circles that there are some MPs in the National Party who, because of defections of their members to the IFP, have told people that they are now going to fight dirty with the IFP and Buthelezi; that gloves are to be taken off on a national basis. As you know, this is not news to me as dirty tricks have been going on now for quite some time, starting with the so-called Inkatha funding so-called scandal. All sorts of insinuations have been made by some National Party MPs via the media to fight dirty with me and the IFP. I am only concerned about this on-going campaign because it will not reverse the political haemorrhage. All it will do will be to



deepen political differences into unbridgeable chasms of enmity between us. That will not be good for South Africa.

The interests of too many South Africans have been sacrificed in the struggle for political hegemony. The rift in National Party ranks is the concrete manifestation of this problem. There are many members of government who are naturally opposed to the clandestine deals struck between the official government negotiators and the ANC. I have also been notified that there are many Cabinet Ministers who are deliberately kept uninformed about compromises that the government is prepared to make, in order to avoid the show-down this would cause.

These government members form a growing body of disgruntled politicians who genuinely believe that multi-party negotiations will be the only way to reach a solution in achieving a lasting political settlement in South Africa. It is statesmen within these ranks who have drifted over to the IFP. They share our very real concerns for the future democratisation process, and endorse our call against the failure to take cognisance of South Africa's plural society.

My fears concerning the election of a Constituent Assembly are not unfounded. Just like the apartheid government of the past, the ANC is promoting a unitary state power for a new South Africa, which can be concentrated to such an extent that it can so easily be abused, that even the best protective measures can be overridden, either by unconstitutional action or under the pretext of emergency measures. The election of a Constituent Assembly would pave the way for the ANC alone to decide on the structure of the future constitution of this country. This new parliament, or Constituent Assembly, would then draft the new constitution, armed with the vested powers to overrule any agreed-to transitional constitutional principles - unilateral and undemocratic decisions which would no doubt be labelled the "will of the people".

If this two-phase transition deal had to be endorsed by the parties at the Multi-Party Negotiation Forum, the process of exclusion would be entrenched in any final government emerging after the transition. This high-handed strategy would leave the most intractable questions - those concerning the distribution and control of power - to an elected Constituent Assembly, to be settled by the South African Government and the ANC alone.

This is why the IFP has demanded that the issue of the form of state, which allows for the federalist option, be decided upon as a preliminary substantive issue before an election date can be established. In addition, there must be an entrenchment of rights and civil liberties in the constitution through ground-up democracy building process in the regions before elections are to take place. A voting system must be constitutionally entrenched which remains consistent with accepted democratic practices, and which will in no way impinge upon the rights and prerogatives of the member states to which residual sovereignty is reserved.

The IFP has recommended a single phase process where a draft constitution is negotiated and agreed

to by all representative parties at the Multi-Party Negotiation Forum. This draft constitution, written by nationally acceptable constitutional experts, would then be put to the people of South Africa, the ordinary man in the street, in a referendum for acceptance or rejection. The drafting of the future constitution for South Africa will, therefore, be an all-inclusive party affair. The shape of our destinies will not be subject to the whims and vested interests of one or two parties alone. And only following nation-wide acceptance, could an election for a future democratic government take place.

In this way South Africa could conceivably hold elections by the end of next year, and have a democratic government, and just constitution, firmly in place. The difference between our proposed constitution and the unilaterally imposed constitution proposed by the ANC and the South African

Government, is that ours will have been negotiated and accepted by all relevant political and other formations, and hopefully respected and upheld by the majority of citizens and generations to come.

So let the reasoning behind the IFP's rejection of an elected Constituent Assembly be clearly understood. Our sole motivation is to protect the citizens of this country. I will not renege on my role as a responsible leader in South Africa. The National Party leadership has allowed its negotiators to follow along with the notion of a Constituent Assembly, elected in farcical elections in the current climate of chaos and violence, allowing such a body to decide on the boundaries, powers, functions and structures of our region. This would bring the ANC to government in a constitutional framework which preserves the unitary state and provides no effective guarantees against any abuse of power, but would rather prolong the intimidation and ruthless domination we are witnessing in our townships today.

I have never had it easy in my entire political career and I swam against the currents for decades when I stood against the government forces' concerted efforts to implement their grandiose apartheid plans. After several decades, the Government now admits that I was right and they were wrong.

I opposed revolutionary violence when it was popular even for churches to play along with revolutionaries on the basis of the old theory of a just war. As a result, I became unpopular even in the highest echelons of the churches. I opposed the State's institutional violence against my people, and stood against the best armed regime in Africa. I stood against sanctions alone. I was not intimidated then, and I will not be intimidated now. I do not care what this fight will cost me. There are things that one must pay for, even with one's own life.

There is enough turmoil and strife in South Africa to warrant the establishment of a just and equitable Constitution with utmost urgency. A two-phase process for the drafting of a final constitution and for the election of a final government, as suggested by the ANC and the South African Government, which incorporates a lengthy period of transition, will only serve to prolong the misery of my people and increase the possibility of the abuse of state power. We have had a low intensity civil war in this country for years now. Protracting this process through a two-phase process can only increase the violence.

It is therefore imperative that all representative parties make their stand now at the Multi-Party Negotiating Forum, and resist all attempts by the Government and the ANC to install a unitary state ruled by a majority government which offers no protection to minority parties. The drafting of the future constitution for South Africa must be an all-inclusive party affair, not subject to the whims and vested interests of two parties alone.

A form of government must be set in place which can peacefully accommodate the divergent interests of our plural society. The IFP firmly believes that federalism is the only form of government that

will best equip South Africa to address the anomalies and tensions that exist. World trends in constitutional developments have moved away from unitarianism and gravitated towards consensus politics and federal arrangements. Through my own years of experience which I have gained as the leader of the KwaZulu regional government, and through my daily interaction with people at grassroots level, I can fully appreciate the reasoning behind world consensus.

The IFP's opposition to the ANC's proposals are based on our insistence that the ANC takes cognizance of the complexity of our society, and finally comes to accept the necessity for durability and stability in the future of our country. These goals could never be achieved by following the Constituent Assembly route they are demanding. Genuine regional empowerment could never grow out of a central constitution-making body. The ANC is clearly trying to establish a transitional process which will serve to entrench centralised power.

For economic stability to prevail, democracy must succeed, and democracy cannot emanate from a government structure with all the power concentrated at the top. If the IFP was forced to surrender to the pressures of certain major players at the World Trade Centre, allowing for the reins of power at the centre to be strengthened, this would have devastating implications for future democracy in this country. For the voice of the people to be heard, government must be situated at the heart of our regions.

We are convinced that a government works best when it is more answerable and in closer proximity to the people it governs. If power is devolved to the regions, more political actors are able to exercise power over the country. Hence, regional interests will be better represented, and at the same time more attention can be given to the diverse array of ethnic and cultural differences.

We in the IFP maintain that federalism, which embraces the notion of genuine regional empowerment, and which addresses peoples' real needs, demands and aspirations, will be a positive step forward to removing the tensions in our society, and to paving the way for economic growth and development. By giving people genuine decision-making powers to control their future destinies, the frustrations and anger generated from repressive government rule will subside, allowing our country to move towards a normalised situation of peace and stability.

Federalism is guaranteed to build social justice. It is the one government which will bring to our land a commitment to freedom, equality, democracy, pluralism and equal access to opportunities for all. It is designed to assist those less advantaged people in our society who are the victims of apartheid and who have suffered years of poverty and deprivation in their lives.

The advantage of federalism lies in its ability to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of state expenditure by fine-tuning expenditure with the needs of the community. Federalism alone reconciles the need for bottom-up community participation in development with top-down resource allocation. Federalism is about practical, sensitive development, and most importantly, it is about even development. It creates structures which are at once politically accountable and economically sensible. The hallmarks of the centralist past, where genuine political participation even amongst Whites was increasingly remote, and where regional economic development programmes were sacrificed at the whim of central decision-makers, is eliminated with federalism.

Democracy embodies a spirit of accountability to the electorate. It means being near the people and being able to satisfy their wants and needs. Democracy therefore incorporates the principle of federalism and will thus never again allow some authoritarian government ensconced in Pretoria to decide on what is good for the regions which, in South Africa's case, are ethnically and culturally very different from the centre.

In order for the foundations of peace and stability to be established, every attempt must be made to broaden the political terrain, giving attention and understanding to the people on the ground. If we

are to make the process of nation-building a process of entrenching democratic rights and values, then we need to regionalise debate and decision-making structures, so as to widen the base for participation and control across the nation. Federalism would be the start of a new beginning - a beginning that will see the Black and White communities of South Africa join forces to map out a common future.

My friends, I offer a way forward. It is the IFP's prime responsibility to see to it that South Africa becomes a federation, because only federalism can produce the peace, economic growth and democracy the people of South Africa need. 1993 must be the year in which federalism triumphs. It must be the year the IFP fought and won a just cause, not only for the IFP, for South Africa.

- 5516 0