

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERED

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE OF THE IFP

THEME:

"WHITHER SOUTH AFRICA?"

***THE WAY FORWARD IN A NEW VISION OF LIBERATING
LIBERATION FOR THE SAKE OF PLURALISM AND DEMOCRACY
FOR SOUTH AFRICA AND FOR ITS PROVINCES, INCLUDING THE
KINGDOM OF KWAZULU NATAL.***

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

BY MANGOSUTHU BUTHELEZI, MP

EMANDLENI MATLENG, ULUNDI : JULY 22, 1995

Mr Chairman and the Premier of KwaZulu Natal, the Hon Dr FT Mdlalose; the Chairperson of the Women's Brigade, Mrs FX Gasa; the Chairperson of the Youth Brigade, the Reverend Musa Zondi; the Rev Dr Sipo Mzimela and other clergy present here today; members of the Royal family present; amaKhosi present; H.E. Mr Manuel A Duarte Rodrigues, Ambassador of Angola; H.E. Mr T Brotherus, Ambassador of Finland; H.E. Mr MK Mangalmurti, Ambassador of India; H.E. Mr R Iskandar, Ambassador of Indonesia; H.E. Mr Shaher Bak, Ambassador of Jordan; H.E. Mr MO Jeichande, Ambassador of Mozambique and Mr G Tamele; H.E. Mr Saloum Kande, Ambassador of Senegal; H.E. Mr SR Mpungwe, Ambassador of Tanzania; H.E. Mr H Atallah, Ambassador of Tunisia; H.E. Mr CS Onaran, Ambassador of Turkey; H.E. Mr JM Dube, High Commissioner of Swaziland; H.E. Mr JM Kabinga, Ambassador of Zimbabwe; H.E. Mr P Dunaiski, Acting Ambassador of Namibia; H.E. Mr V Matthews, Acting High Commission, Canada; H.E. Dr U Kaestner, Ambassador of Germany, Counsellors Mr F Escalona and Mr R Salafia, Embassy of Argentina; Mrs M Maro da Silva, Second Secretary, Embassy of Brazil; Mr Michael Walma, Canadian High Commission; Mr Gary SH Lin, Consul-General, Republic of China; Mr J Waterton, Consul-General, Great Britain; Mr V Atallah, Deputy Consul-General, India; Mr E Sawicki, Counsellor, Embassy of Poland; Dr M de Jesus, Counsellor, Embassy of Portugal; Mr Baxter Hunt, Vice-Consul, United States of America; Mr Isaac A Moyo, Minister Counsellor, and Mr J Chinyama, First Secretary, Embassy of Zambia; Mr C. Stephan, Head of the Office of Interests, Republic of Lebanon and Mr K Saad and Mr M Stephan.

Mr Maxwell Nemadzivhanani, Secretary General of the PAC of Azania; Major-General Tienie Groenewald of the Freedom Front; Dr WJ Sneyman, Advocate Fanie Jacobs and Mr Francois de Vos from the Conservative Party; members of other political Parties present; Mr H-K Hoffman from Young Christians on the Offensive; Mr Frank Spengler, Regional representative of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in South Africa and Ms Lyn Schmitz; Ms Kathy Walther from the International Republican Institute; Members of the Senate; Members of Parliament; Members of the KwaZulu Natal and Gauteng Legislatures; members of the National Council; delegates to this twentieth Annual General Conference; IFP mayors, deputy mayors, Councillors and observers; distinguished guests, brothers and sisters.

On such an occasion when we celebrate twenty years of political and cultural activity of Inkatha, at a time when we are facing unprecedented political challenges and the need to resort to brave and bold decisions to overcome our difficulties, we must consider who we are in the light of where we come from and of the history which has produced us. This is especially important because recently the ANC seems to have the daring of wanting to re-write our national history in general and the history of our Party in particular.

We have not had many friends in all the 20 years that the IFP has existed. But we have been proud and grateful for the constant friendship that we have enjoyed with Young Christians on the Offensive, whose President, Mr Horst-Klaus Hoffman, is with us here today. They have been with us in all our ups and downs and have been attacked by our political enemies most ruthlessly and even by churches for daring to minister to us. We welcome the delegation from Reichelsheim in Germany which has accompanied our brother, Horst-Klaus Hoffman, his son, Frank Hoffman and Dr Christl von Hold who is part of the delegation, and who has served at the Benedictine Hospital as a medical doctor for a number of years. One of our sisters from Reichelsheim also taught at KwaGqikazi College of Education. I cannot quantify all the help that we have received over the years from Young Christians on the Offensive. As we celebrate our 20 years of existence, we cannot help but thank the Lord for these Christian friends who helped and inspired us so much in our long pilgrimage.

I wish also to pay tribute to the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung in Germany whose regional representative in South Africa, Mr Johannes Stoll, is unfortunately not able to be here because he is on leave in Germany, but we are glad that the KAF is represented today by Mr Frank Spengler. I just cannot express in words the extent to which the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung has been such a great tower of strength to us in the IFP, particularly when we tackled projects with them to serve the poorest of the poor in our communities. They assisted us also when we still ran the Inkatha Institute, in ways which are too many to enumerate here. They were attacked even when their help was extended on a non-partisan basis even to other political Parties in South Africa. This year the Institute for Federalism was launched in Durban, and it is not an IFP project but a project which is to assist all those who believe in the cause for federalism in South Africa. We are again grateful to the Konrad Adenauer Foundation for its assistance in the launching of this project. We thank them for all the help they render to South Africans on a non-partisan basis.

PART 1 OUR HISTORY

We are the product of our struggle

Twenty years is a long time in politics anywhere in the world. In South Africa twenty years is more than a life time in politics. Over the last twenty years we have achieved more for the liberation of South Africa than was achieved in the preceding history of the country. Our forefathers and past generations of black people could only dream about what we now have. We have realised their dreams and we can be very proud of ourselves. We could not have realised their dreams had we not built on what they had done. The things they suffered and died for were the things on which we built and developed to shape them into the ever changing circumstances of South Africa. At the outset of my address to Conference this year, in which we rejoice in the 20 years of Inkatha's existence, I want to pause and pay tribute to our past activists, and to our past heroes and heroines. Black South Africa has produced martyrs and heroes and heroines as each decade passed, from the very beginning of our history. There was no time in our history in which black South Africans did not struggle for freedom and democracy. At no time did black South Africa lay down before our oppressors. The struggle for liberation was waged constantly across wide political and economic fronts.

As I say this, I also say that at no time in the history of this country has the black struggle for liberation not produced one crop after another of white and Indian martyrs and heroes and heroines who supported what we as blacks were doing for our liberation. From the very early history of colonial settlement in South Africa, we had the privilege of being supported by missionaries and others who struggled against slavery and the oppression of blacks.

In every phase of our struggle for liberation and democracy we were also supported by the churches and Christian and other religious leaders. Decade after decade, step after step, institutionalised South Africa, bit by bit, added weight to the ongoing struggle. Finally liberation from apartheid came, and in the end no one political Party or movement could claim the victory as their victory. It was an historic South African victory which the population and institutions of South Africa achieved. However, the struggle is not over, for a new struggle has begun to defend our forefathers' sacrifices and dreams from the equally pernicious threats of the new autocratic, centralistic and authoritarian regime which is now taking shape in our country.

I, and all of you here, are the products of this centuries' old struggle. I was born to struggle. From my mother's knee onwards, I was shaped for the struggle. I have known no other life. I have

known no other life. I have only ever struggled for freedom from racist oppression and for democracy. Let there be no misjudgments or misunderstandings: I will die if needs be for the sake of the struggle. I am sick and tired of being slammed and maligned for what I have done and for what I am doing. I will not be intimidated out of the struggle. I will not stand aside and watch the struggle come to nought because others are bent upon appropriating the struggle as their own Party political property. I have always called for the recognition that the struggle would never be won by any Party, movement or organisation on its own.

From the very beginning of Inkatha's existence I called for a multi-strategy approach in which each Party and organisation could do its best in its own circumstances. Inkatha was established to be an internal force doing in this country what the ANC and the PAC could not do here at home where the people were waging the struggle, and where the real struggle was taking place. The struggle against apartheid was not won in Moscow, or New York or Dar-es-Salaam, or Lusaka or anywhere else outside the country. The struggle was won here inside the country by the people of South Africa.

How the IFP's struggle was targeted by the ANC

It is truly tragic that today we are not joined together as blacks who each had their own part to play in the struggle. Inkatha was formed to help the ANC and the PAC in their struggle. During the crucial period between 1976 and 1979 I promoted the value of the ANC. I actually proclaimed it to be "the" liberation movement of South Africa. Wherever I went overseas in that period, I argued that the ANC had no option but to play the role it was playing as a liberation movement in exile. I again and again said that it was forced into exile by hideous oppression and persecution in South Africa.

But because Inkatha doubled and redoubled its membership each passing year after it was established, the ANC took fright and began to fear Inkatha because it was proving me right that it was in the country that the people fought for liberation, and that there was still a vast amount of political work that could be done despite the growth of draconian laws to suppress the struggle here in the country.

The ANC's very existence depended upon the myth that apartheid could not be fought from within South Africa, and they saw the supremacy of the armed struggle being detracted from the internal non-violent democratic struggle. They could not abide the growth of Inkatha and the living, working struggling proof that apartheid was vulnerable from within.

During the 1970's when I resuscitated ANC support in the country by proclaiming its eminence and by quoting publicly from ANC books and literature, which was all banned, I believed in what I was doing when again and again I refused to have any dealings with successive South African Governments on constitutional matters until Mr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners were released from jail.

Now the ANC has rounded on me, and Mr Mandela himself has turned to revile me. The ANC is mounting a massive propaganda campaign to rewrite our history in an Orwellian fashion. I was shocked when I saw the televised BBC series titled "The Death of Apartheid" written and narrated by recently appointed SABC Board Member and ANC propagandist Allister Sparks. He went through the past seven years of our national history describing facts and events which have nothing to do with what I personally saw taking place before my own eyes. The entire purpose of the

programme was to support the theory that before and during negotiations the IFP was an alleged surrogate of the previous regime, and was the cause of an orchestrated strategy of violence, acting on the instructions of the National Party Government to undermine the process of democratic transformation.

I saw in that programme how history can be completely rewritten turning victims into victimisers, and freedom fighters and pluralist democrats into autocratic conspirators. Indeed, this programme is part of a comprehensive strategy underscored by Deputy President Mbeki when in a press interview he tried to rewrite the history of the ANC-IFP London meeting of 1979 and of our rejection of international sanctions, disinvestment and the armed struggle. Moreover, during his budgetary vote in the Senate, when he also claimed personal responsibility for the Shell House massacre, President Mandela created a new hyperbolic theory stating that the IFP was taken over by the National Party and by military intelligence soon after its creation in 1975.

This new theory goes even beyond the absolutely apocryphal statements that President Mandela used when he branded the IFP as a surrogate of the National Party in front of the UN Security Council in June 1992. This outlook on our history is so outlandish that it should not really deserve any attention, were it not for the fact that this new theory reflects the statements President Mandela made on his way to Korea, dreaming up that the IFP and the National Party Government conspired with an identified "third force" to kill peaceful Zulu marchers who were butchered in front of Shell House, when he himself gave the order to shoot to kill. Similar statements were echoed in what Ms Cheryl Carolus, the Deputy Secretary-General of the ANC, said in her address to the COSATU conference in Bloemfontein two weeks ago. I responded to her animadversions in the following statement:

STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO ATTACKS LAUNCHED AGAINST ME BY MS CHERYL CAROLUS, THE DEPUTY SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE ANC IN BLOEMFONTEIN TODAY

At the very first meeting after the unbanning of the ANC in January 1991 between a delegation of the ANC led by its President Mr N R Mandela and a delegation of the IFP led by me as its President, both the ANC and the IFP leadership agreed that at the root of the endemic political violence that is going on since 1985, between members of the ANC and members of the IFP was what we called "killing talk." I had presented to the leadership of the ANC reams and reams of their vicious personal attacks on me from transcripts of Radio Freedom, to "The African Communist" magazine, from COSATU publications and even in books published by members of the ANC.

Recently in Cape Town, I again supplied every Cabinet member with a copy of the same compendium of these vicious attacks on me which go far beyond the kind of robust criticism that one expects as a matter of course, in the heat and dust of politics. Only just yesterday one of our largest newspapers in this country under the heading, "Spoiling for a fight" warned that "The ANC and IFP must pause and reflect on their rhetoric. Unchecked it can lead only to more conflict."

It comes as a surprise that a high ranking functionary of the ANC such as Ms Cheryl Carolus the Assistant Secretary-General of the ANC should go so far as to accuse me of Treason and urge that serious consideration should be given to arresting me in adding to the kind of killing talk I have come to expect from ANC spokespersons.

I have very little respect for Ms Carolus for obvious reasons which anyone can see from tone and perjoratives that she flung at me in her speech to the Food and Allied Workers Union Congress in Bloemfontein today. Only an ill-bred person like Ms Carolus who is obviously without any culture worth talking about could indulge in the kind of insults that she hurled at me in her speech in Bloemfontein. But the fact that she is what she is will not detract from the fact that Ms Cheryl Carolus is the Assistant Secretary-General of the ANC. So the amount of harm this kind of venom will do is quite enormous as it is an example of "the killing talk" that has characterised the ANC's personal attacks on me over decades. It is quite clear that it is the kind of rhetoric that is likely to make reconciliation between the ANC and the IFP impossible and can only escalate the tragic conflict that is going on between members of our two organisations. There can be no peace in this country as long as we have the Cheryl Caroluses of this world indulging in the kind of vicious attacks that the ANC has been launching on me for the last three decades. As long as this does not stop it will

be impossible for my followers to listen to me when I appeal to them, as I do so often, to wave the olive branch and to work for reconciliation and peace.

As for the proposal by Ms Carolus that I must be arrested, that suggestion does not come as news to us, as the ANC has a plan which is known to many of us to cook up trumped up charges against me in the hope, as they say, that they can get rid of me before the next elections. But I say let them dare do it and they may find in doing so that they are writing the contemporary history of South Africa in blood.

I hope that members of the ANC's highest echelons of leadership realise that the consequences of the intensification of this vilification campaign against me by the Jacob Zumas and the Cheryl Caroluses of this world can only fan the flames of conflict between our followers.

12 July 1995.

The IFP came into existence 20 years ago and went on to risk everything it ever had to achieve the time honoured and hallowed ideals of the struggle for liberation. When we came out of nothing to become the political phenomenon of the 1970's and the 1980's as we grew in strength and influence, we were committed to die for our ideals. Indeed thousands of Inkatha members did die for our ideals and continue to die even now. It will be an everlasting shame for South Africa that it was the ANC which hunted IFP leaders down and killed them. This same ANC which I resuscitated in the seventies to assist the ANC in the struggle for liberation did this.

When we began to prove them wrong by massing the power we did mass despite the existence of all the draconian laws apartheid had at its disposal, the ANC took fright and established the United Democratic Front and COSATU to oppose Inkatha which to them had become an even greater enemy than the regime of apartheid. I think it is worth recalling here for the sake of the record that when the United Democratic Front was launched in Cape Town in 1983, I immediately issued a statement applauding its launch. And yet the founders and leaders of the UDF in their very first statement in which they announced the founding of this organisation, stated that they welcomed affiliation by all black political organisations except Inkatha. In other words, as an organisation they declared Inkatha *persona non grata*. It had not even entered my mind to recommend our affiliation to the UDF when this statement was made. Then in 1984 at King's Park Stadium when the Congress of South African Trade Unions was launched, the President of COSATU, Mr Elijah Barayi, made a scathing attack on me. It is important to note these events if we are to understand the roots of the conflict between the IFP and these organisations.

Both these organisations in their founding meetings declared war on Inkatha. The ANC's propaganda machinery went to work spreading the notion that I was a snake that had to be hit on the head and that Inkatha was treacherous to the struggle of liberation. Death followed for Inkatha members. Inkatha was declared fair game for assassination and abominable attack. Over 400 of our leaders and office bearers have since been murdered in a systematic plan of targeted assassination, and over 11 000 members and supporters of the IFP have lost their lives in this low intensity civil war.

By and large many people in this country apportion all the blame for violence to the IFP, completely oblivious of the fact that even just two weeks ago, leaders of the IFP, such as the Rev David Zondi, the Chairman of one of our branches on the KwaZulu Natal South Coast, and Mr Pehlwayo, a security guard for Mr Sigoloza Xolo, our IFP leader in the KwaXolo area, were serial killed in political assassinations. In the Empangeni area, the uncle of Inkosi Cebekhulu, who acted as Regent during his minority, was assassinated subsequent to the South Coast killings. On numerous occasions Inkosi Cebekhulu's car has been fired at while he was being driven home and his home has also been fired at, all in pursuance of an agenda of political violence. Inkosi

Mthembu had his home razed to the ground, allegedly by members of the ANC. All these attacks are part and parcel of the ongoing endemic political violence.

Just this past week-end in Wembezi, in Estcourt, one member of the IFP, Mr Nathi Dlamini, was fatally shot as he travelled with other IFP members to a funeral in Wembezi. Two other members of the IFP, Nathi Mhlongo and Mzumeni Dlamini were wounded in the same incident of violence, allegedly unleashed by members of the ANC against our members.

That is the truth of the matter. We who came into existence for the sake of the struggle and we who came out blazing away at apartheid in support of the ANC, were turned into the target of attack by necklacing and worse. We waged a struggle for truth and democracy from the very beginning of our existence and we are still committed to work with everybody and every political Party to achieve the kind of democracy in this country that will stand the test of time.

Our struggle on the ground taught us what to do and think

Whatever the ANC may wish to say now, the fact is that our work on the ground during the years of apartheid led us to develop a different political philosophy which was more closely aimed at reflecting the true spirit and aspirations of those who were oppressed. We avoided falling into the trap of abstract ideologies and therefore rejected the notions of socialism and communism at the very same time when the ANC began embracing them as its primary ideological framework. After the London meeting in October 1979, we rejected the armed struggle, the call for disinvestment and international sanctions because we knew that these actions would have enormously worsened the conditions of the poor people of our country without ever becoming a determining factor in the final demise of apartheid.

It was also our work on the ground which led us to reject the culture of "Liberation before education" which the ANC enunciated, and that of racist, blind Africanism and the quest for power as the ultimate solution to all the social and economic problems of our people. We identified that the culture of entitlement which was being propagated by those who needed to find recruits to feed the armed struggle would in the end damage our society. Working on the ground, the IFP developed a philosophy of self-help and self-reliance which capitalised on the human bonds of social solidarity to counteract the power of the regime and to make up for its many deficiencies. While KwaZulu Natal became the most under-funded region in South Africa because of our political opposition to the regime of apartheid, we learnt to rely on ourselves to build the schools and hospitals which our communities needed.

Working on the ground we also realised the importance of racial harmonisation and we began developing a culture of pluralism based on the recognition of diversity and on the need to establish proper checks and balances to limit power and guarantee areas of self-determination. Since 1972 when I delivered the Hoernle Memorial Lecture as the guest of the South African Institute of Race Relations at the University of Cape Town, I began promoting in South Africa the notion of federalism as a system which would control and limit the distribution of power, guaranteeing freedom and democracy for all. In 1974 in addressing a Conference of Young South Africans of the United Party at Cato Ridge, I remarked on the fact that racial integration and harmonisation should begin within the parameters of federal structures where it would be more simple to create governments which can respond to the specific needs and fears of the population concerned.

I began then a long march which led me to call the Buthezi Commission into being in 1980 to begin the racial and harmonisation of all the people living in KwaZulu Natal. Out of this process

we convened the KwaZulu Natal Indaba in which all the interest groups of our region, irrespective of race, colour and creed, for the first time came together to take responsibility for the joint governance of this Province and for the formulation of a comprehensive package of federal proposals. The National Party Government allowed us to implement only those proposals which related to a Joint Executive Authority which was the first inter-racial government of South Africa. I ask the question: are these all actions by racists, which is what our political adversaries, aided and abetted by disenchanted former IFP members, are trying to paint us as?

It was not long after this that we founded the South African Black Alliance with the late Y.S.Chinsamy, that great patriot who was such an inspiration to me. This was because the Improper Interference Act forbade interference by one race in the politics of another. One of the founders of this Alliance was Sonny Leon of the Labour Party of South Africa. This was during tough days when states of emergency were the order of the day. Public gatherings were forbidden by law and in order to hold our meetings as members of the South African Black Alliance, we resorted to holding "Prayer meetings." It was tragic that in spite of this non-racial stand, that many of those who were with us in the South African Black Alliance were attracted by the blandishments of the National Party Government and joined the Tricameral Parliament. This was, however, not to last.

It was because of our political action that the apartheid regime experienced contradictions which could no longer be solved within the parameters of the 1983 Tricameral constitution. We had gone beyond and broken the narrow parameters of the regime and at that time we could have heaped the rich but short-lived rewards for our success. The fact is that we decided to invest in our national future and we refused to engage with the apartheid regime in constitutional negotiations which could have immediately ushered voting rights for black people and freedom and democracy because we felt that such negotiations could not take place until and unless all political parties had been unbanned, political prisoners released and Mr Nelson Mandela could participate in the negotiation process. For the same reasons, I, as the Chief Minister of KwaZulu, refused to yield to the strong pressures of the regime which wanted to transform KwaZulu into one of the nominally independent states in order to completed the grandiose scheme of apartheid. We were under great pressure, even from some of our black people who saw "flesh-pots" in the pseudo-independence that was successfully dangled in front of the TBVC states by the National Party Government.

At that time we were looking beyond the politics of the day and conformed our actions to the greater scheme of historical things. We used the same clairvoyance when we rejected the flawed process of constitutional negotiations which developed after the break-down of CODESA II and the signing of the Record of Understanding on the 26th of September 1992.

This was the time that we felt the need to shape our political action on the basis of a far-reaching vision centred around the fundamental issue of how we can create a truly modern and yet truly African State. This was the time when we came together to put forward our own constitutional proposals which the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly adopted on December 2, 1992 as the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal. We knew that we had to arm ourselves with this conceptual, and I would really say spiritual arsenal to oppose a brutal liberation movement which relied for success not as much on ideas and vision as it did on violence, intimidation, rolling mass action, bombing, a culture of entitlement and the systematic killing of its political opponents through the actions of its armed wing uMkhonto weSizwe.

PART 2

THE URGENCY OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

The shaping of the system of government as the determining factor in social delivery

We are operating under the awareness that in the next 12 months South Africa will be shaping a new system of government meant to remain in place for many generations to come. In the last two centuries, our country has undergone many transformations, and yet the one that we are moulding at this stage is likely to remain in place longer than the many unstable institutional expedients which were used in the past. We are also deeply aware of the fact that our chosen system of government will be the deciding factor in determining whether South Africa will be able to win the challenge of coping with its many problems.

At the outset it must be stated that we know that our country will be plunged into social and economic chaos if our fundamental imbalances are not adequately and expeditiously redressed. We must reach into our communities to ensure that our people are freed from the great evils of ignorance for lack of education, poverty, malnutrition, unemployment, lack of adequate medical care, lack of shelter and lack of running water and sanitation. These are the evils from which all other evils germinate, including the social and economic despair and the high levels of criminality which are undermining the future of many of our communities.

We have never accepted or believed that these social and economic evils are here to stay forever as a source of punishment for sins which we have never committed. Our primary political responsibility with respect to each person living in South Africa is to ensure that everybody, irrespective of race, colour or creed, may aspire to a dignified level of life which ensures the fulfilment of his or her God-given human potentials. This objective should not be regarded as a dream, but rather as an ominous impending deadline which we must meet if we wish to make our democracy succeed. I wish to stress in this respect that it must be realised that either we all share in a common solution which marks our success, or we will be bound to share the problems of a common defeat.

Those who have been privileged and enjoy comfortable conditions of life must realise that in the end they will only be able to preserve their comforts if the social and economic conditions of the great masses of dispossessed people of our country improve. By the same token, all those who are struggling to free themselves from the yoke of poverty, ignorance, malnutrition and unemployment, should realise that improvements in their conditions can not depend on the lowering of the standards of lives of those who are more privileged. Reducing the wealth of those who are wealthy does not necessarily make those who are poor any better off. As black people we may find ourselves slipping into a kind of political cannibalism where we turn against those few of our own people who through their hard work and efforts have made it. If others in the midst of the abject poverty of our people have decent houses, let us not target them as if they are responsible for our plight. We have seen much too much of this criminality in the past. I am afraid this unfortunate tendency is again rearing its ugly head in the midst of the current high levels of criminality.

It will depend on the overall structure of our system of government which is being shaped at this juncture of our history whether South Africa will be able to strike a workable balance between

the conflicting needs of our society. For this reason, the IFP has not abandoned the fundamental struggle for the establishment of a just and fair system of government in our country which will succeed in accomplishing that which has been unsuccessfully tried in many other countries on our continent.

In fact, throughout the sub-Saharan continent, following the liberation of African countries from colonial rule, new African governments were established which to a greater or lesser extent had to tackle the very same issues now facing us in South Africa. Unfortunately in most instances, these governments have failed to deliver on the promises of liberation and have fallen into the trap of autocratic, centralistic and authoritarian solutions, creating new forms of human suffering which merely replaced those experienced by the people during colonial times.

Hidden and often subliminal new forms of colonialism have sometimes replaced the rule of European powers, forcing new-born democracies to run away from their African roots, thereby preventing African countries from achieving their desired goals of establishing a true modern and yet true African State. Systems of government in many African countries have too often tried to model themselves after European and North American ideas, and in the end could not apply to African realities, which remained excluded and marginalised from the overall operation of the State, leading to the failure of the post-liberation experience. On many occasions these failures have promoted autocratic rules and one-party regimes into power.

We in South Africa have a great opportunity to establish, perhaps for the first time, a true modern and yet true African State which will harmonise first-world Westernised realities with African traditional realities in a common framework of social and economic development marked by freedom, tolerance and mutual respect. This goal will either be achieved in the next year or it will be foregone for many decades to come, and those who will not be willing to abide by the rule of an unjust and inherently wrong system of government will have no choice but to go into the political wilderness to oppose and resist that to which they so fundamentally object. It is because we do not want this result that we must strengthen our resolve now to resist the shaping of a system of government which will be unacceptable to us.

The making of an autocratic, centralistic and authoritarian State

Unfortunately we already see with sufficient clarity that the system of government being shaped in our country is an expression of an autocratic, centralistic and authoritarian political philosophy. In fact, the ANC has clearly inherited the system of government of the preceding regime and instead of breaking down its centralistic and autocratic characteristics, it has expanded on them to reach into all aspects of social and economic life. This is why the National Party says in one breath that it also believes in a federal formula for our future form of state, and yet seems completely incapacitated to do something to achieve the federal dream. It was after all the National Party regime which destroyed even the limited powers that Provinces had since the time of Union. The IFP has always believed that the first priority of liberation should have been to do away with a system of government which the National Party built since it took power in 1948. This was a system of government specifically designed to allow a small minority to exercise exclusive power throughout all aspects of social and economic life in the country. The ANC leadership has found it very convenient to substitute themselves for the National Party and is actively strengthening its grip on power.

The past four months since our Special General Conference in March have witnessed the unfolding of events which have mortally wounded our new-born democracy, the respectability of our institutions of government and our hopes for freedom and democracy in South Africa. I would dare to say that rarely in the history of our country have so many terrible events taken place in such a short time, and yet the perception of the magnitude of what is happening has escaped the analysis of many commentators. This short-sightedness can be explained, but not justified, by the fact that many of the consequences of what we are experiencing now will be manifesting themselves in a few years down the road. It is also true that for some the overall picture might be too horrendous to consider and they would rather ignore early warnings, hoping that things will come right by themselves.

The dishonouring of the Agreement on international mediation

In the first place we have witnessed the final unexcused and un-regretted breach of the solemn Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace which bound President Mandela and Deputy President de Klerk and their respective Parties to begin international mediation as soon as possible after the April 1994 elections to proceed with the restoration of an autonomous Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal and to settle the outstanding issues which we could not agree on before the April 27 elections.

Just after our Special General Conference in March 1995, the ANC continued for a couple of months to attempt to justify its unwillingness to fulfil the Agreement, and they resorted to a game of words, subterfuges, delaying tactics and political games to avoid making a clear statement on whether or not the President of the country would honour his signature on the Agreement. In the end they just became totally deaf to our echoing demands and chose to ignore the issue, hoping that it would go away.

In compliance with the Resolutions of the Special General Conference, the IFP suspended its participation from the Constitutional Assembly and all its substructures to protest against the breach of the Agreement, and gave notice that it would not accept a Constitution which is being drafted without having first resolved the fundamental issues of federalism and pluralism through international mediation.

Unfortunately, we are now faced with two separate facts of equal damaging and ominous importance. In the first place, the ANC has proven that it has total disrespect for honour and solemn undertakings, having not only breached the Agreement but having also taken a complacent, contentious and careless attitude to ridicule this matter as if it could laugh away the solemn Agreement. Because of the fact that the ANC has tried to attach no importance to such a breach, the respectability of our institutions, of our ruling class, and indeed of our first democratic Republic, is forever clouded, and I do not see how any foreign investor could rely on South Africa honouring major undertakings in the future. I cannot see how any Head of State anywhere in the world should believe that any undertaking or solemn Agreement made by our Head of State is worth anything at all.

The second concerning factor is that South Africa no longer has a legitimate constitution-making process, nor a legitimate unifying constitutional framework. In terms of the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace, the Inkatha Freedom Party and the former KwaZulu Government accepted the legitimacy of the interim Constitution which was drafted without their consent because of the promise of international mediation which has now been breached. The KwaZulu

Government was at the time the temporary historical expression and concretisation of the Kingdom, which at this juncture is being expressed through and by the Province. Therefore, historically, morally and politically, the Province of KwaZulu Natal is the successor in interest of the KwaZulu Government, and as such it has inherited both the KwaZulu Government's fundamental opposition to the interim Constitution as well as its participation in the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace which has now been breached. These considerations may lead to a necessary re-thinking on the relation between the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal and the present constitutional framework.

What makes the breach of the solemn Agreement even worse as an expression of the disdain with which the ANC regards us, is the fact that there has been another breach a few months ago. Professor Washington Okumu happened to be in South Africa, and he continues to be interested in the implementation of the solemn Agreement. He took the terms of reference which were agreed to between the ANC and the IFP on the basis of which international mediators came to South Africa last year, and amplified and amended them. He then discussed these amended terms of reference with Deputy President Mbeki, Mr Jacob Zuma, the National Chairperson of the ANC and the leader of the ANC in KwaZulu Natal, Advocate Danie Schutte, the leader of the National Party in KwaZulu Natal and with myself. There was a general acceptance of these amended terms of reference by all these people. All that remained was to hold a bosberaad at which this document would be discussed with a view to implementing the solemn Agreement of the 19th of April 1994. Deputy President Mbeki then went abroad and Mr Zuma was also on a visit overseas. Mr Zuma even asked that the bosberaad should not be held until his return to South Africa. But what then happened? President Mandela then decided to take away the responsibility of sorting out the issue of the solemn Agreement from Deputy President Mbeki, and without any explanation, gave it to the Secretary-General of the ANC, Mr Cyril Ramaphosa, who ensured that it aborted last year.

Then a three-a-side committee was created which held discussions in Cape Town. Mr Ramaphosa was joined by the Deputy Minister of Home Affairs, Mr Penuel Maduna, and the Deputy Minister of Constitutional Development, Provincial Affairs and Local Government, Mr Valli Moosa. On the side of the Inkatha Freedom Party was Dr Sipo Mzimela, the Minister of Correctional Services, Mr Joe Matthews, the Deputy Minister of Safety and Security, and Dr Ziba Jiyane, our Secretary-General. The meeting lasted for three hours without getting anywhere near the issue of implementing the solemn Agreement. Instead, Mr Ramaphosa suggested that the ANC and the IFP should in these discussions exchange position documents on their respective constitutional proposals. It was strange that Mr Ramaphosa, the Chairman of the Constitutional Assembly, to which all the IFP's constitutional positions have been submitted, should feign ignorance of the IFP's constitutional position. A meeting of the National Council decided that these talks were meant to just string us along, as happened during multi-party negotiations, and passed the following Resolution:

The National Council of the IFP meeting on this 10th day of June 1995 in Ulundi adopted the following

RESOLUTION No. 5

1. National Council condemns the ANC's repeated attempts to elude its solemn obligations in terms of the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace, without even having the decency to honestly and openly state its unwillingness to honour the Agreement.

2. National Council notes that a meeting with the ANC originally scheduled to discuss an agenda for a boseraad between the IFP and the ANC on the issue of international mediation was turned into an opportunity by Mr Ramaphosa for a general discussion on constitutional matters on the pretext that perhaps the IFP misunderstood the ANC's constitutional positions and proposals.
3. National Council notes that Mr Ramaphosa requested that the ANC and the IFP formally exchange their respective constitutional proposals, which was done two weeks ago in spite of the fact that the IFP's constitutional proposals have been long tabled in the Constitutional Assembly and the Constitutional Committee, which are both chaired by Mr Ramaphosa.
4. National Council notes that the IFP has fully reviewed and analysed the constitutional proposals delivered by the ANC and has compared and cross referenced them with its own constitutional proposals. The IFP has determined that a fundamental and irreconcilable difference exists between the two of them in respect of each and every one of the outstanding constitutional issues listed in the Consolidated Terms of Reference for International Mediation previously agreed upon between the ANC and the IFP and referred to by implication in the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace.
5. National Council notes that the ANC proposals would give to Provinces substantially less autonomy than the minuscule autonomy to which Provinces are presently entitled, which fact makes international mediation even more urgent and necessary.
6. National Council mandates its negotiators to kindly request Mr Ramaphosa to put an end to further delaying tactics, for the IFP has no interest in conducting talks about talks and hereby requests that the item on the agenda of the next meeting between the IFP and the ANC be the determination of the date on which international mediation shall commence on the basis of the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace and related Consolidated Terms of Reference.
7. National Council restates the absolute and imperative necessity to commence international mediation as soon as possible, as agreed upon on the 19th of April 1994, on the fundamental issues of federalism and pluralism due to the fact that, irrespective of many ANC statements to the contrary, present constitutional and institutional developments driven by the ANC's desire to crush provincial autonomy and social pluralism are making it even less likely that a constitutional settlement may be found between the ANC and the IFP outside international mediation.

With the absence of the IFP from the constitution-making process which has already gone quite far, a fundamental constitutional crisis has been created for which no immediate solution is foreseeable. We must find and deliver a bold political response to this constitutional crisis which can only achieve the results of international mediation relying on our initiative as a force of government, and in the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal acting as the spearhead of federalism and pluralism in the country.

The deterioration of constitutionalism and rule of law

The past four months have also witnessed a major weakening of constitutionalism and respect for institutional legality within the new South Africa. In fact, President Mandela followed his threats of an unconstitutional house-to-house search and seizure in KwaZulu Natal when he spoke in Parliament on the 24th of February, with the utmost provocative threat to cut off central government funding to our Kingdom, which threat he has uttered on several occasions. This threat was coupled with several utterances by President Mandela in which he indicated his intention to crush any opposition. When the President was confronted with the fact that these threats were utterly unconstitutional he chose not to withdraw them, and he went so far as to threaten to tamper with the Constitution. Here is an untenable situation where the President of the country, who should uphold the Constitution, is now threatening to subvert it, to suit his political plans to "crush" us as dissidents.

The President also gave a clear indication that the ANC is willing to operate outside the rule of law when on June 1, 1995 during a parliamentary debate, he acknowledged that he personally gave the order to shoot to kill the peaceful Zulu marchers who on March 28, 1994 walked by the Shell House building on their way to a scheduled demonstration and were butchered in cold blood by ANC snipers, strategically placed on the top of the building. The President made this admission after having withheld this material evidence for over one year.

Moreover, during a snap debate on this subject, the President refused to answer any of the questions put to him by all other political Parties regarding his personal involvement in the massive cover-up which followed the Shell House massacre. During this cover-up, police investigations were obstructed and delayed by President Mandela's own intervention, the police were prevented from entering Shell House to secure ballistic evidence, the ANC refused to surrender weaponry registered in its name and President Mandela never revealed the findings of the ANC internal investigation which he promised to conduct. The President also refused to appoint an independent judicial commission of inquiry into the Shell House massacre and on the following cover-up, as was unanimously demanded by all other political Parties. In doing so President Mandela gave notice that the ANC believes it can do whatever it wishes and get away with it.

More than anybody else, we have opposed the interim Constitution, and yet we have always believed in the rule of law and constitutionalism which binds us to respect whatever law governs the land until it is changed or its legitimacy is challenged. We have witnessed with increasing apprehension that the ANC not only considered the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace to be a mere piece of paper, but is also developing the same attitude with respect to the Constitution in so far as it does not fit its political programmes. There have been efforts to impose a state of emergency. In fact, the ANC and COSATU in KwaZulu Natal have demanded the imposition of a state of emergency.

During the Special General Conference which we held in February 1994 before the April 1994 elections, we warned of the many flaws and treacherous provisions of this interim Constitution which we utterly rejected to the point of refusing to participate in the electoral process established under it, and yet we would never have believed that this treacherous document could have been abused by the ANC as much as it has been. In every country, the Constitution is the supreme law of the land but it appears as if this is definitely not the attitude of the ANC as far as the Constitution of our country is concerned.

The path to a centralised unitary State

The ANC has always perceived constitutions and the government of a State as tools to be used to achieve its political goals, without ever recognising the intrinsic and inherent value of a supreme constitution which is above parties and of an independent State apparatus which, even though controlled by political power, operates on the basis of its own rules. With the Harare Declaration the ANC identified constitution-making as its primary strategy to seize power to establish an autocratic regime, hence the call for a Constitutional Assembly.

It can be fairly said that the ANC's main goal is to establish a single monolithic centre of political power under its control to the exclusion of any other source of autonomous power. In fact, the ANC's hostility against autonomous power extends both to the power exercised by Provinces, as well as to the power exercised by institutions of civil society. The IFP has always believed in a

plurality of equally strong centres of political power which are coordinated and harmonised by the constitutional framework. For this reason we have advocated the need to recognise autonomous political power at provincial level on the basis of a strong federal system, as well as the need to recognise the autonomy of social, economic and cultural formations which exercise political power as institutions of civil society.

During the past months, in total disregard of the solemn promises contained in the interim Constitution, the ANC has proceeded to emasculate the functions and autonomy of Provinces, ensuring that they are institutionally unable to exercise any type of significant political power in the form of autonomous policy formulation in any matter concerned. The Intergovernmental Forum has been the instrument which has secured this result, which has been achieved in spite of the fact that on two occasions I attended their meeting and spoke very strongly denouncing the breach of the interim Constitution. In the end, in order to protest this status of things, the Province of KwaZulu Natal was forced to suspend its participation in the Intergovernmental Forum and all its sub-structures, including the MINMECs, where agreements on the process of rationalisation of powers between the national and provincial levels of government are reached. On June 12, 1994 the Premier of KwaZulu Natal met with the Minister of Constitutional Development Mr Roelf Meyer and submitted to him a very detailed factual Memorandum outlining the grievances of this Province. Minister Meyer promised to answer this Memorandum in writing but no answer whatsoever has been forthcoming thus far. Instead a Committee, which includes KwaZulu Natal representatives, was set up to go into the matters raised by the Premier of KwaZulu Natal.

The comparison between the list of laws which on May 14, 1994 the Premier of KwaZulu Natal requested to be transferred to his Province in terms of the Constitution, and the few laws which have been actually assigned, indicates the magnitude of the problem we are facing. Moreover, even when a law has been assigned, the central Government has withheld key provisions which ensure that any power of significant policy making remains at central level. This has been done in spite of the fact that the Constitution prescribes that these laws shall be assigned to a Province which requests them.

The central Government has illegitimately withheld the essential competencies on land affairs, water and forestry in their entirety, which action fundamentally undermines the provincial functional areas of Agriculture, Urban and Rural Development, Regional Planning and Development, Environment, Nature Conservation, Local Government, Housing, Soil Conservation, Traditional Authorities, and Indigenous and Traditional Law. One is entitled to wonder what meaning these functional areas have without the full competence on land and water affairs, and what government action relating to land or water would not fall under one or more of such functional areas, or matters which are reasonably incidental to, or necessary for, the exercise of powers in those matters listed in Schedule 6 of the Constitution. Similarly, central Government is still maintaining that Forestry is not part of Agriculture, and therefore, farms in KwaZulu Natal, which are traditionally divided between sugar cane and timber crops, are regulated by two levels of government and by two extension services which shift their competencies when the farmer rotates the crops among his fields.

Central Government also maintains that Forests are not part of Nature Conservation and Environment, and one wonders why. I also wonder why the central government should exercise its powers on water affairs in its entirety to continue to impoverish KwaZulu Natal which is forced to give its water to the Province of Gauteng which uses it to produce electricity which, in turn,

is sold at a high price to KwaZulu Natal. In our context water is more valuable than gold, and while Gauteng keeps its gold we are forced to give away our water so that this Province is not able to bring about that economic challenge which could easily transform it into the most prosperous region in Southern Africa. These circumstances do not in my view represent a situation where any of our Provinces should hold any other Province to ransom, since we are so interdependent, but it does open a way for healthy bargaining.

At present, Education, Health, Welfare and Housing are basically central government functions, and Provinces have no power to decide on basic policy matters. In education they have no power over curricula, syllabi, and teacher training and qualifications. In health they may formulate no decisions on health care criteria or hospital management or doctors' internships; in welfare they have no competence on entitlement schemes, while the entire housing policies is out of their reach. This emasculation of provincial powers may be formally better camouflaged but is in substance worse than that which the National Party did when it destroyed the provincial system set up in 1910 at the time of the Union, as I mentioned earlier in this address.

Moreover, central Government has taken the position that there are no significant functions whatsoever which can be exercised by Provinces in the provincial functional areas of Environment, Consumer Protection, Provincial Public Media, Lotteries and Trade and Commerce. With respect to provincial matters such as Casinos, Abattoirs, Animal Control or provincial Police, the central Government has indicated that Provinces should not use their legislative powers until they are told by national legislation exactly what they can and cannot do, and what policies they should follow. Similarly, provincial autonomy, as granted by the interim Constitution, has been undermined with respect to provincial civil service, provincial auditing functions, Local Government, Arts and Culture and many other aspects and respects which would be too long to mention in detail. Each of these specific aspects is a separate area of crisis which once seen from an holistic perspective clearly shows that the Constitution has been subverted.

The ANC has given clear notice of its unwillingness to tolerate any type of autonomous exercise of legislative powers by Provinces when it reacted to an IFP 20 point strategy document which was leaked to the press. This document entitled "A Minimal Institutional Strategy to Promote Federalism and Pluralism from the KwaZulu Natal Base" contained 20 suggestions on how the Province of KwaZulu Natal could exercise its powers and functions as they are granted in the interim Constitution. And yet the ANC chose to characterise it as a secessionist document creating a huge amount of controversy around it, and intimidating all Provinces from ever contemplating the taking of legislative action without central Government approval. This action follows the fact that the ANC has already prevented all Provinces under its control from setting in place the necessary procedures for the drafting of provincial constitutions. They were given this instruction at the ANC's Conference last December.

This present status of affairs matches the ANC's final constitutional proposals and its submissions to the Constitutional Assembly which will turn Provinces into mere centres of administrative decentralisation with no autonomous policy power. These proposals are in breach of the most fundamental concession which the IFP received when the Constitution was amended on March 3, 1994. In fact, Constitutional Principle XVIII (2) was added to ensure that the Constitutional Assembly could not reduce the powers, functions and autonomy of Provinces granted by the interim Constitution.

In spite of this solemn Constitutional Principle, the ANC is proposing that provincial legislative powers be transformed into secondary, rather than primary legislation, always operating within the parameters of enabling national framework legislation which will contain and express any and all relevant policy-making. According to the ANC proposal, the national framework legislation, no matter how detailed, will in itself become one of the overrides, in addition to the present list of 21 overrides and also in addition to three other broadly worded overrides which the ANC has also proposed.

To complete the emasculation of provincial legislative autonomy, the ANC wishes to eliminate from the Constitution the presumption of validity, in case of a conflict, of provincial legislation, which was another of the fundamental concessions made to the IFP with the March 3, 1994 amendments to the Constitution. Simply put, as long as the Senate has agreed to it, central Government legislation will always prevail. In any case Provinces will only be able to adopt by-laws to implement central Government legislation, rather than true primary legislation. In addition, three of the Schedule 6 functions would be eliminated while the Senate would have no legislative power whatsoever with respect to any non-Schedule 6 matter. This latter proposal will turn the Senate into an extremely weak and subordinate House which will not contribute to other national legislation. This enormous weakening of the powers of the Senate is by no means counteracted by the fact that the ANC proposes to somehow strengthen its composition. This is the often unreported reality of the ANC's constitutional proposals, which give the measure of the ANC reliance on propaganda to hide its real objectives.

The ANC constitutional proposals not only show their plan to centralise power, but also show their unwillingness to limit their power by means of the rule of law and constitutionalism. In fact, there is a repeated statement in all ANC proposals indicating that Parliament should be "the supreme law-maker" with respect to any matter related to social and economic development and reconstruction. It is peculiar how this statement echoes a provision in the Lenin Constitution which caused one of the most democratic constitutions ever written to turn into a mere piece of paper. Similarly, the ANC has proposed to scrap section 26 of the present Constitution which to a very limited extent protects free-market enterprise and which in the past the IFP tried to strengthen.

This latter proposal goes hand-in-hand with the ANC's often voiced idea of limiting the application of the bill of rights to natural persons only, which would allow expropriation without compensation of corporate assets and a lack of any constitutional guarantees, for instance with respect to unwarranted search and seizure of corporate offices and work places.

The path to a far-reaching social autocracy

The ANC opposition to any source of autonomous political power exercised within civil society by its social, economic and cultural formations has been clearly shown in the central Government's policies on land affairs, labour relations and the structuring of rural local government, which the IFP has fiercely opposed. In the first place it is clear that the ANC wishes to undermine traditional communities because it knows full well that it will not be able to control them, and if they remain in their present form and organisation, the ANC will soon lose their support. For this reason the ANC has put in motion a very complex plan of forced modernisation which could create untold human sufferings similar to those generated by other greater modernisers of our century, such as Stalin and Mao Tse Tung.

It must be understood that traditional communities are models of societal organisation which should be given the same equal dignity and respect as Westernised models are. They have always been autonomous entities which organise and determine their affairs on the basis of their own rules of conduct. As indicated by the amaXhosi of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal when they submitted their Manifesto to the Constitutional Assembly on May 13, 1995, traditional communities are based on four fundamental pillars: land, law, consensus and leadership.

The first pillar consists of the institution of communal land which is owned by the entire community and can not be given away, sold, or monopolised by any given individual or group within the community or transformed into private property. This type of land tenure does not know the Westernised difference between land use and land right, and reflects the African viewpoint that access to land is a personal fundamental human right and not a marketable and transferable property right.

The second pillar is our own body of indigenous and customary law which governs all aspects of communal life, including personal, family, property and administrative matters. It must be realised that land administration, family and inheritance law and traditional leadership are inextricable aspects of the same social phenomenon. I wish to stress that this is our law as black people, and, as with indigenous and customary law, it is the law of the majority of the people of South Africa, which of course varies greatly from Province to Province. Until the 1994 elections, our law existed in autonomy, but because of the interim Constitution our law is valid only if it is not in conflict with any present or future national and provincial legislation, with the end result that our entire personal law may have been effectively repealed by the laws adopted by the white Government before elections. This is why we have constantly advocated that all residual powers, including land, property, family, inheritance, contract and delict law should be handled exclusively by Provinces, as is the case in the United States or in the new constitution of the Republic of Ethiopia.

The third pillar of traditional communities is the consensus-driven decision-making process which is expressed through the role of amaXhosi acting through the Traditional Council with respect to all matters affecting the community. In fact, an Inkosi is the expression of the will of the community which is achieved through the direct participation of all the affected interests, rather than by delegating decision-making powers to elected representatives. The fourth pillar is the role of the traditional leader as the administrator of land, especially with respect to land allocation, and as the primary local government authority at community level acting on the basis of a consensus-driven decision-making process.

The ANC policies are specifically designed to undermine each of these four pillars, and I have raised my opposition to these policies both in Cabinet and publicly. I think it is important that everybody realises that this issue does not affect exclusively black people but is truly an issue on which the defence of the entire notion of social pluralism in our country hinges. If the ANC succeeds in taking political control of traditional communities, it will do the same with civic organisations, NGOs, trade unions, universities, chambers of commerce and any other institutions of civil society, and indeed it is already moving in this direction.

To understand what it is happening we must go back to the original white man's difficulty in conceptualising communal land as a third type of property in addition to private and public property. In fact, the little land black people managed to preserve for themselves -- after they were dispossessed by means of colonial rule and racial legislation over what was rightfully theirs --

was organised in trusts and then given to self-governing territories and TBVC states. Because of the interim Constitution, this land has now been transferred to the central government and is classified as State land, in spite of the fact that this land actually belongs to the people who live on it and hold it as communal property through their amaKhosi.

Fortunately, the KwaZulu Government adopted the Ingonyama Trust Act which preserved the land of the Zulu Nation under the control of its King and its amaKhosi. However, thus far the central Government has refused to assign this piece of legislation to the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal creating a crisis which may at any time explode with portentous consequences, for this is the first time that the Zulu Nation does not control whatever land was left to it after colonial conquest and dispossession. In addition, over half a million hectares of land which undoubtedly belongs to the Zulu Nation and which was previously held by the South African Development Trust, is now classified as State land.

We do not need to guess what ANC Minister of Land Affairs Mr Hanekom wants to do with State land, for he has made his intentions very clear on several occasions. For instance, during a recent meeting of the Intergovernmental Forum, Mr Hanekom gave a presentation which in its relevant part was minuted as follows:

"Land tenure reform is one of the most sensitive areas which will have to go through a very thorough process of consultation. In KwaZulu Natal for instance, the customary tenure system in the former self-governing territory of KwaZulu is very strong. The Chiefs and traditional leaders are the people who allocate land. While the value of the customary tenure system is recognised, the need for reform in order to achieve consistency with the Constitution is also important. In Botswana where there are democratically elected Land Boards (sic) have taken over the land allocation functions and the traditional leaders play a dispute resolution role. Those are the kind of changes that are sensible but which could be fiercely resisted because land and the power to allocate land are associated with political power. Tenure reform measures will continue."

Accordingly, Minister Hanekom has introduced a Bill which creates a new type of communal property which is under the control of the central government and is organised by virtue of land organisational charters at community level which are administered by central government officials operating out of central government offices. This will make the central Government the constant indirect administrator of the land of the people, as happened in the former Soviet Union. Moreover, this type of land tenure would completely destroy the inextricable relation between land, the past, present and future generations, the role of amaKhosi as the symbol of unity of the community, and our laws as a living and evolving system of norms. It will also reduce amaKhosi to mere ceremonial figures. Furthermore, a complex set of laws has been approved, or is in the pipeline for approval, which gives the power to the central Government to distribute State land as private and marketable property and to allocate it outside the role of traditional leaders.

Similarly, the ANC has refused to recognise that traditional leaders are the primary local government authority in their communities. Indeed, the present local government revolution has been designed to appoint structures consisting of elected representatives empowered to make decisions which the people of traditional communities have usually made by themselves on the basis of their consensus-driven decision-making process which is expressed through the role of amaKhosi.

The issue of rural local government is becoming a most explosive issue which shows once again the incapability of the ANC to learn from the mistakes made throughout the African continent

when autocratic governments sought to undermine the role of traditional leaders. The political games which have been played around this issue and the treachery that once again we had to experience from the Department of Constitutional Development led by Minister Roelf Meyer and Deputy Minister Valli Moosa, are making this one of the most difficult and explosive issues on the present political horizon. Once again promises have been broken, good faith has been met with misrepresentations, and the rule of law has been trampled on all over to undermine traditional communities.

We must tell this tale of treachery, for the amaKhosi of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal had identified a fair and just model for rural local government which ensures that traditional communities receive the same opportunities for social and economic development and upliftment as other rural areas, while preserving their specific organisational characteristics. In this model, Regional Councils would be elected as over-arching structures, while traditional leaders would remain the primary local government level operating through Traditional Councils and Regional Authorities on the basis of the existing structures.

AmaKhosi did not wish to implement this model in isolation, even though they had the power to do so, requesting the Premier to adopt a Proclamation which in terms of the Local Government Transition Act could shape rural local government in any fashion he deemed fit. For six months amaKhosi negotiated in good faith with Minister Roelf Meyer and his Deputy Valli Moosa to gain their support for that which amaKhosi had the full power to do without seeking central Government's permission. In the end, they were assured that there were no obstacles to the implementation of their chosen model. However, at a certain point amaKhosi were faced with the fact that Minister Meyer proceeded to unilaterally amend the Local Government Transition Act to limit the discretion of the Premier in choosing the contents of the rural local government Proclamation. This was done by removing the Provincial Committees, whose concurrence is required for the issuance of Proclamations, from the area of institutional influence of the Premier into that of the Minister of Constitutional Development. This specific amendment is unconstitutional for it reduces the powers of Provinces - hence the Western Cape having announced its intention to take this matter to the Constitutional Court.

This first unconstitutional amendment was followed by a second amendment to the Local Government Transition Act by virtue of which Minister Roelf Meyer took away the discretion of the Premier to choose the type of rural local government model for this Province, and has imposed all over South Africa a uniform model of rural local government which conflicts with that proposed by the amaKhosi of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal. In fact, the model of rural local government, which has now been imposed, is in violation of the Constitution because it no longer allows each traditional leader to be an *ex officio* member of the elected local structure affecting his community, as provided for in the interim Constitution. Furthermore, this model imposes elected structures at traditional community level and therefore fundamentally undermines the traditional model of societal organisation.

It must be stressed that all these legislative changes have been brought about by presidential Proclamations rather than by Acts of Parliament. There is a growing tendency in our country to rule by decree which is shown also in the fields of land affairs and even in matters such as the establishment of the Council of Traditional Leaders in which the Constitution specifically requires that an Act of Parliament be adopted rather than an administrative action. This is further proof of the fact that our constitution is being violated whenever it is politically convenient to do so.

Against this background the central Government adopted the Remuneration of Traditional Leaders Act which ever since October last year we gave notice that we would oppose. This Act transforms traditional leaders into organs of the central government and expropriates provincial competence in matters of indigenous and traditional communities. It might not seem so, but in the light of its long-term consequences, this Act is a true constitutional coup d'etat for it has been imposed on the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal irrespective of the total documented opposition of the majority of its amaKhosi who would ostensibly be the sole intended beneficiaries of this measure, as far as this Province is concerned. The Act also goes to the very core of the relation between a Province, its House of Traditional Leaders and its traditional communities, without even any shred of legal justification for central Government intervention in the area of provincial competence.

This Act not only authorises the central Government to remunerate traditional leaders but also empowers it to classify and categorise them, which is a matter of customary and indigenous law. It must also be stressed that the process of the adoption of this Act was so unconstitutional that, with a totally unprecedented action, the Deputy Speaker, Dr Badra Ranchod, did not even have the courage to rule on a point of order raised by the IFP which questioned how in fact the Act could be passed without the constitutionally required prior approval of the Council of Traditional Leaders, which is *de jure* already established.

We believe that on that dark late evening in which this Act was passed and the fundamental constitutional objection raised by the IFP was not even dignified with a ruling, the first democratic Republic of South Africa entered into a fatal coma from which it will die unless we resuscitate it through our renewed commitment to oppose the arrogance and prevarication of the ANC.

For this reason the IFP has decided to turn this issue into the true battlefield for the rule of law, and for the protection of provincial autonomy and social pluralism in our country, and has vowed to oppose and resist this Act with all the democratic resources at its disposal. We have also mandated the KwaZulu Natal Government to do whatever is in its legislative and administrative powers to democratically and constitutionally oppose this Act.

Violence, intimidation, misinformation and propaganda

The ANC reliance on propaganda to hide and even subvert the fundamental nature of facts is clearly shown by how the ANC has dealt with the issue of violence in the Province of KwaZulu Natal. The ANC has been claiming that we have been fomenting violence and has used this claim to justify its threat of emergency measures against the Province. The hard fact is that most of the victims of political violence in this Province are IFP victims and IFP communities, and that violence is being utilised to destabilise the IFP-led government. It defies one's understanding how anybody could believe that we in the IFP are promoting violence to victimise ourselves. The fact is that the intensification of the ongoing violence has followed the trail of public gatherings addressed by President Mandela in KwaZulu Natal and that on several occasions those who engage in violence came out of the ANC's rallies.

This violence is used today, as it was in the past, to intimidate us into submission and as a method of political propaganda. For instance President Mandela felt it necessary to call an emergency Cabinet meeting on the situation in KwaZulu Natal, in spite of the fact that all independent organisations certify that there has not been any rise in political violence in this region, which still

suffers from levels of general violence which are lower than those of the Province of Gauteng and the Eastern Cape.

I do acknowledge the fact that the level of political violence in KwaZulu Natal is higher than in other Provinces. One must, however, look at the roots of this violence in the mid-seventies right up to the eighties and extending to the nineties. One must remember that it was stated by ANC spokespersons through Radio Freedom and other means that this country must be made "ungovernable." A text of one of the ANC dispatches from Lusaka dated May 12, 1986 stated that "Chief Buthelezi, the major political foe of the ANC inside South Africa, last week-end appeared to side-track from his political stance of denouncing the ANC by demanding the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and lifting up the political ban on the ANC." I was vilified by the ANC/SACP Alliance even when I was demanding consistently and constantly the release of President Mandela and other political prisoners.

There is a lie which propagandists of the ANC, such as Allister Sparks, are extensively disseminating that violence started in KwaZulu Natal and then spilled over into Gauteng. The truth of the matter is that KwaZulu Natal was not affected by the explosion of violence that started in 1976. It was stated in one editorial after another that the Region of KwaZulu Natal was unaffected by violence because of my leadership of Inkatha and because of our commitment to non-violence.

The UDF violence commenced in 1985 when the so-called "apartheid structures" and those operating within them, were targeted. This started in Lekoa in the Vaal triangle when Councillor Jacob Dlamini was incinerated in his car. We saw the necklacing of Ms Mavi Skosana at a funeral in Eastern Gauteng, which prompted Archbishop Tutu to say that if it happened again, he would collect members of his family and leave South Africa for good. Even this threat by the Archbishop did not in the least concern all the people who were necklaced by the UDF's cohorts even after the Archbishop had made that utterance. In fact, to quote "Umsebenzi" in 1986, this is what was printed under the heading: "The second six months."

The January 8th 1985 call to our people made by Comrade President Tambo to render South Africa ungovernable and make apartheid unworkable is of great strategic significance for the development of our revolution. The manner in which the masses have responded and continue to respond underlines also the correct choice of the movement for making this call.

"Ungovernability" has become the battle cry of our people. As was to be expected, Gatsha Buthelezi front-runner in the service of Botha rushed to claim that the call to render South Africa ungovernable would lead to a situation in which people would also be ungovernable in a future free South Africa. But far from ungovernability being a recipe for anarchy it provided the strategic perspective for our people to go beyond a rejection of the dummy institutions and towards creating institutions of their own.

This ungovernability not only released the people's energy, it unleashed their creativity. In area after area the people began to create their own organs of power. They set up street committees, comrade's committees, people's courts, militia type combat units and similar bodies. In the context of the present situation these are embryonic organs of People's Power. Ungovernability thus created the space for our people to begin to establish embryonic organs of People's Power. Ungovernability in fact has been a necessary condition for the development of the people's committees and similar organs...

According to one transcript of ANC Radio Freedom broadcasts dated the 26th of September 1987, in reference to me it said: "Today with his brutal murder of Victoria Mxenge, who was representing the UDF who was facing death, who as a community leader was active in the Free

Mandela Committee, they gunned her down." This was an accusation by the ANC that I was personally responsible for the murder of Victoria Mxenge. In spite of all the evidence to the contrary, the ANC has never withdrawn this vile accusation.

Today we see gratuitous editorial comment in some of the media in the Province of KwaZulu Natal that the IFP is as equally responsible for this kind of killing talk as the ANC. We have never ever come anywhere near calling President Mandela a murderer, even when he has recently told the whole world that he ordered the killing of Zulus in the Shell House massacre.

The IFP has made a firm and unwavering commitment to non-violence and passive resistance as the only method by which it will express its political opposition and dissent. On many public occasions, I have made it clear that I do not condone any type of violence which is not justified by the need to defend oneself, one's family and community. The philosophy of non-violence and passive resistance is a truly African philosophy which the IFP has intimately experienced since its inception. It is not something in which we merely believe, but is the very essence of what we are.

Irrespective of our commitment, ANC operations are continuing to threaten our communities and MK units are today as much operational as they were before elections. Not even our media questions the fact that it was announced that MK units were dismantled and integrated into the South African National Defence Force, and yet there were units of MK participating in the funerals of both Mr Joe Slovo and Mr Harry Gwala. Not even the fact that Mr Slovo was given a State funeral prevented MK units from participating in his funeral. These are the sort of questions that are just not being asked by anyone. Unfortunately it must also be said that we have incontrovertible evidence which shows that certain sections of the South African National Defence Force have been engaged in politically inspired violence and intimidation against our people to the point that they have killed and tortured several IFP leaders and supporters.

I have publicly denounced these occurrences and I have yet to receive any type of satisfaction from the Minister of Safety and Security and the Minister of Defence. A tragedy is being consumed in the remote fields of KwaZulu Natal which unless stopped may develop into much greater bloodshed. Yet South Africa and the world at large has chosen to cover the truth about what is happening for fear of having to realise how bad the situation really is.

Our communities can no longer remain without adequate protection and the rule of law must immediately be restored even if that means arresting and prosecuting a large number of ANC political leaders. Despite the availability of evidence and witnesses, cases are not brought to trial and no one has been convicted for any of the serial killings of the over 400 IFP leaders and office bearers. In no other country in the world with our level of social and economic development would the serial killing of over 400 members of an organisation remain unresolved for so long. And the slaughter of IFP leaders goes on unabating without a single one being resolved. Where is investigative journalism in our country?

The ANC propagandistic distortions of the issue of political violence have also been reflected in the establishment and operation of the Investigation Task Unit (ITU) established by the Minister of Safety and Security, Mr S Mufamadi. The ITU is nothing more than a special prosecutor which in itself violates fundamental principles of justice and fairness in the enforcement and the application of criminal law. Throughout world history special prosecutors have been employed to bend the system of criminal justice to pursue the interests of the political class in power, and

to achieve illegitimate political goals which could not otherwise be achieved. The ITU is no exception to this rule, as it has shown its clear political mandate to undermine the IFP with a campaign of lies and intimidation. Uncorroborated investigations have been floating around, skilfully orchestrated by the ITU, which has also proceeded to stage politically motivated arrests justified only by a desire for sensationalism. I am sure that as elections come closer we will see more of this twisted political inquisition.

Unfortunately, we must expect that the greatest damage to our culture of democracy will come from the political inquisition conducted by the recently established Truth Commission which we opposed as an evil instrument specifically designed to achieve political objectives. In fact, the Truth Commission is meant to conduct a truth-finding exercise on the conflicts of the past in which all elements of the truth are fed into the process by the confessions of those who will seek amnesty for their crimes and by the pleas of those who seek monetary compensation for the injuries they have suffered.

However, this process is not going to be conducted in a judicial and objective fashion, and any evidence submitted will not be subject to independent and adversarial verification. More importantly, amnesty will not be administered in a judicial fashion, but in a political one. If amnesty were to be administered by a court of law, as we have always strongly suggested, the court would limit itself to determining the facts of the crime for which amnesty is sought and the existence of a subjective political motive in committing such crimes. But this is not the way the Truth Commission is meant to operate, for amnesty will be granted only after the Commission is satisfied that the applicant has made a "full disclosure" of any facts which the Commission may deem relevant to its investigations, which might include a list of accomplices, information on other people, and information on the Party to which one belongs.

This evil and perverted mechanism has always been at the basis of political inquisitions in recent history, as was the crux of the nefarious Spanish Holy Inquisition, and leads to the result that all applicants and deponents tell what they perceive the inquisitor wishes to hear. In this case they would have no doubt as to what the inquisitor wishes to hear, due to the fact that the modality of appointment, accountability and responsibility for members of the Commission and of all committees set out in the legislation, is such that they are meant to be political instruments of the Party in power.

We will need to mobilise to bring up alternative truths and the enlightenment of thousands of points of counter-information which will break the dark blanket of lies and misrepresentation which the Truth Commission has been designed and mandated to lay on our national history.

In fact, we have recently seen what we are faced with, as a few days ago, a certain Bruce Anderson revealed after three years that he lied on the instructions of others when he wrote several affidavits stating that the IFP was involved in gun-running with Angola and Mozambique and was behind the violence in Gauteng. Now the world knows that we were right when we said that Bruce Anderson's statements, which were carried for weeks and weeks on the front pages of newspapers, were nothing more and nothing less than outright malicious lies. The question however arises as to how many Bruce Andersons there are within and outside South Africa operating on the same payroll which financed Bruce Anderson, and how many years it will take for the curtain of lies, propaganda and misinformation to be lifted, so that they can be denounced as the lies that they are.

The twilight of the right of self-determination

While the ANC is methodically establishing a unitary autocratic system of government, it has opted to pay lip service to the cause of self-determination in our country, hoping to string along Afrikanerdom for as long as possible. I must say that I was absolutely shocked when President Mandela warmly welcomed the first interim report of the Volkstaatraad suggesting the secessionist establishment of a virtually independent Afrikaner State. President Mandela went so far as to suggest that the wishes of Afrikaners should be tested in a referendum to be organised on an ethnic basis.

It is very discomfoting to see such high-ranking historical figures playing political charades, being united by the common interest of neutralising a potentially explosive issue on which they know they are politically incapable of delivering. President Mandela knows very well that neither he nor the ANC will ever allow a part of the national territory to be taken out of South Africa and to be transformed into a white independent homeland. General Viljoen also knows that the Volkstaat will not happen, and is banking on the fact that if enough time goes by his constituency will accept defeat and will opt for more achievable political objectives within ANC controlled politics. For this reason General Viljoen is bound to operate only within the parameters of ANC controlled politics, hoping to receive whatever largesse the ANC generosity may give him, rather than engaging in the political struggle expected by his constituency so as to create alternative spaces of political action which can challenge the ANC's grip on power.

In fact, since the election the Freedom Front's political presence in the new South Africa has been saliently characterised by not having firmly opposed the ANC on any single issue and having received acknowledgements, and warm remarks by President Mandela. Clearly, General Viljoen believes that "slowly, slowly, cachee monkey" will pay dividends, but the ironic fact of the matter is that most likely President Mandela believes in the same thing. History will tell us who in the end caught whom. The fact is that both of them are conspiring for different reasons to undermine the righteous notion of self-determination.

We believe in self-determinations, as we know, for instance, that the Zulu Nation has always been sovereign and has an ancestral territory which belongs to it, and yet the Zulu Nation never chose to exercise its right of self-determination separately from the rest of South Africa. It elected rather to claim its sovereignty along with all the other people living in its territory irrespective of race, colour or creed and on the basis of a reasonable and most moderate federal relation with the rest of South Africa. The Zulu Nation has been reasonable, patient and has endured enormous, very long untold human sufferings to defend its freedom and achieve its self-determination, while its claims have been dealt with contempt, disdain and suspicion.

We all know that had the Zulu Nation produced a proposal along the line of some of the chapters of the first interim Report of the Volkstaat Council, merely replacing the word "Afrikaner" with the word "Zulu" and the word "Volkstaat" with the word "KwaZulu Natal", the entire country would have been plunged into total havoc. This proves that the aspirations of white people are still treated differently to those of blacks in our country, who have far more legitimacy than that of white people within an as yet non-existent Volkstaat, in that the territory of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal has well defined boundaries which are well known.

I must say to Afrikaners that the IFP recognises and respects their call for self-determination to be achieved by means of a properly structured federal system and an adequate system of

constitutional checks and balances which protect minority rights and ensures that no government may regulate or determine matters which can adequately and properly be determined by Afrikaners in their own autonomy, unless there is a compelling public need which justifies the encroachment on Afrikaner autonomy by governmental action. This is the type of fundamental commitment to pluralism and self-determination which we have made to accommodate the right of all the peoples of South Africa, because we believe that this formula, coupled with a strong federal system, has a chance of succeeding where calls for self-determination will fail when brought in isolation and outside a broader South African vision. In fact, freedom is either for all or for no one. Our history has taught us that those who sought to escape this axiom have inevitably been met with defeat.

PART 3 THE POLITICAL DOCTRINE OF PLURALISM

An African approach to political classifications

The struggle for liberation in many African countries has focused its attention on the need to overthrow colonial governments and empower those who were oppressed, often without sufficient reflection on the type of system of government which would run the country once liberated. This shortcoming has often led to a substitution in leadership without doing away with oppression. Throughout our struggle for liberation we have focused on the need to transform South Africa once it has been liberated, and we have made this transformation the propelling force of our struggle. The all-encompassing notions of federalism and pluralism have supported us in defining the politics which we wish to employ to achieve our final goal, which is securing better conditions of life and individual and collective freedom for all the people of our country.

On this twentieth anniversary, there might be a need to redefine the doctrinal framework which explains to the world what we have always expressed and pursued during our many years of liberation struggle. In fact, too often political labels and political divides borrowed from European or American contexts are employed to describe what the IFP is all about, and usually such exercises are quite unsuccessful.

In fact it is indeed a fundamental mistake to try and explain the IFP body politic or the political realities we are experiencing in terms of concept and notions which we have inherited from the political philosophy of Europe and North America. The political divides between right wing and left wing, conservatives and liberals, social democrats and liberal democrats, republican and democrats, revolutionaries and reactionaries, or similar concepts, hardly apply to explain the complexities of the realities in which we must operate. To a certain extent all these concepts could and could not apply to the IFP, which in some respect is part and parcel of all these concepts. For instance, the IFP is as much dedicated to the achievement of social goals as any other Party, or perhaps more than any other political organisation in South Africa, and it would be a fundamentally erroneous statement to define the IFP as a right-wing organisation or a liberal organisation in the classical sense. Similarly, it would be erroneous to label us as a left-wing organisation. Therefore, we must acknowledge the inadequacy of these conceptual divides which really belong to past political ideologies which do not even any longer explain the political realities of those countries in which they were originally produced.

Europe itself has realised that the ideological divide between right and left wings is becoming increasingly more uncertain and does not explain how different interest groups organise themselves with respect to significant issues which arise in society. Therefore, we must look at the true political divides of our country to identify those conflicts which generate diversified political groupings. We must seek such divides to create concepts capable of explaining the dimensions of our politics. Clearly a first divide exists between the types of philosophy -- however defined or labelled -- which intend to bring all aspects of social life, and the State itself, under the control of political power, and that philosophy which proceeds from the autonomy and pre-eminence of society over politics. We call this latter philosophy to which we ascribe: pluralism.

From our inception we were committed to one people, one country. From 1975 we recruited black people regardless of ethnicity to join the IFP. The findings of the Bergstrasse Institute at the University of Freiburg in Germany, proved that I had support right across all ethnic divides at that time. I refer here to research that was done by Professor Theodor Hanf, Professor Herbert Weiland and Gerda Vierdag in collaboration with Professor Lawrence Schlemmer, Rainer Hampel and Burkard Kempp. These findings were published in 1981 under the title 'South Africa - the prospects of peaceful change.' It was these empirical findings that established at that time that I was the political personality of black South Africa. That is not the main point of my quoting this empirical finding, but rather only to indicate that most black people at that time appreciated that although I was the Head of the KwaZulu Government, they had no doubts that I articulated the aspirations of black South Africans, regardless of ethnicity.

Then one must of course look at the interview that I had with Mr Jimmy T Kruger, the then Minister of Justice, Police and Prisons in Pretoria on the 19th of September 1977. I had been summoned by the Minister to appear before him. I was accompanied by my colleague, Rev. Celani J Mtetwa, who was a Minister in my government at the time, and by Mr Gibson Thula, the then Principal Urban Representative for the KwaZulu Government. Minister Kruger was accompanied by the then Minister of Police, General Gert Prinsloo and by Mr Coetzer, the then Secretary of the Department of Justice. I had an Aide Memoire which I read out to Minister Jimmy Kruger, and it reads as follows:

**AIDE MEMOIRE USED IN DISCUSSION WITH MR JT KRUGER,
MINISTER OF JUSTICE, POLICE AND PRISONS**

I thank you Honourable Minister for the opportunity you have given me to meet you, Sir. It's the first time I have ever visited any Minister of Justice in the Republic government and as Mr Mtetwa has stated, Sir, my being here today has come about as a result of an invitation which the Honourable Minister extended to me via my Minister of Justice, Mr Mtetwa, when he had an interview with the Honourable Minister of Justice on the 15th of last month. Sir, I would like to say despite the remarks about me by the Minister which my colleague, Mr Mtetwa, conveyed to me, I am making the assumption that the Minister knows where I stand. I have had previous discussions with you, Sir, and no doubt you have attended discussions in which you and your colleagues have examined my position in South Africa. You no doubt, Sir, have observed how over the years my public utterances and my political stance has become increasingly problematic in the implementation of the government's policy.

At the outset of today's discussion with you, Sir, I want to assure you that the process of radicalisation which has embraced me and which in return I embrace is far more than just political stancing. I think it is a serious stage I have reached willy nilly in my long political career. It is a result of my deep concern for South Africa and all her people. I am deeply concerned about South Africa and I want today to share these concerns with you, Mr Minister. I do not want to debate politely nor do I want to score points off you, or have you score points off me. I hope that in the spirit of honest

Christian fellowship, we can talk as two men whose lives are entangled in the issues which are contributing to a rapidly deteriorating situation for everybody in Southern Africa.

It is common cause that South Africa is besieged from without and threatened from within. Your government recognises this to be the situation by the nature of the legislation it passes. We both know that there can be no alliance between the two of us, or between the KwaZulu government and your government, which is based on a hope that people in South Africa of different ethnic origins are going to enjoy separate identities. I cannot admit to a qualitative distinction between myself and any other South African which is denied by our unity in Christ. I therefore believe that it is a faulty analysis of South Africa which makes political distinctions out of racial distinctions. Our brotherhood in Christ and the Christian gospel completely rule this out.

I really do believe that we should be talking today about an impending race war in South Africa. South Africa is rapidly polarising along racial grounds. We are both experienced in politics and today we must avoid rhetoric in speaking about our country. The times through which we are now passing represent only a fleeting opportunity for such wisdom to prevail and would compensate for the errors that we and our ancestors have made and political stupidity by everybody which has created the present South African crisis. I want through this Aide Memoire to define parameters within which today's discussion can be meaningful to both of us.

In talking to you today, I am constrained to make the kind of observations and express personal feelings which have resulted in others being imprisoned. I am speaking as somebody who has a real anticipation that your department will act against me some time in the future. If and when that occasion does take place, I will not then be able to speak to you. In those possible future circumstances to which I am referring, accusations of furthering the aims of communism and unlawful organisations will be levelled against me. This is a reasonable conclusion I draw after the remarks you made to Mr Mketwa about me, Inkatha and the A.N.C. I will then not be able to talk to you about my feelings as a black man. There are some ideals that are dearer to me than life itself and most certainly are dearer to me than temporary political gains. I share those ideals with whomever holds them. Many of these ideals have been expressed by a long succession of those who have gone before me. I believe that these ideals have been embodied in the sentiments and activities of great South African organisations such as the ANC and the PAC. When I further these ideals, I do so not in order to further the aims of banned organisations but to further the only common ground where all South Africans, black and white, can find each other.

If we are too afraid to talk to each other, the only thing left to do in this country is to kill each other. Neither you nor I will willingly be party to killing as a solution to South Africa's problems. The tragedy is however that unless we work together, we will end up killing each other. Working together does not mean me serving your ends to your satisfaction, nor you serving my ends to my satisfaction. If you insist that the only framework within which we can work together is that provided by your government's policy of separate development, then my earnest and direct appeal to you today will be an empty exercise. I am politically too experienced to believe that we can talk meaningfully to each other today. There are too many stumbling blocks and the past is too important. I do however believe that we can talk about talking. We can discuss the problems that we all encounter before we can talk to each other. We can reaffirm our willingness to talk and undertake to remove the stumbling blocks in our way.

I am convinced that at this point in time it is my duty to talk to those in Southern Africa who will talk. I must talk to those who are willing to meet me whoever they are and wherever they may be. I can not undertake to sit at Ulundi and contemplate my impotence to avoid Mr Vorster's future which is 'too ghastly to contemplate.' I feel constrained to say today that the alliances of the future are born out of the understanding of today. I must seek that understanding where I find it. I do not believe that there is deep understanding between you and I and between your people and my people. From my side, I am willing to create such understanding and to work towards a common destiny for everybody in South Africa. This can only happen if you do not make the apartheid framework the only straight-jacket within which we must find each other as fellow-countrymen and as brothers in Christ.

I have been operating within the framework of separate development for the last seven years. This I did not do because I believe that it is a framework within which such a change as is overdue in this country could take place. When your government made it compulsory for my people to have no other option, they called upon me to serve them, in the capacity in which I have been serving them all these years. When they asked me to serve them, they knew that I reject the apartheid ideology. I have spoken at one conference in 1955, attended by the late Dr the Hon. H.F. Verwoerd, M.P. the then Minister of Native Affairs, and at numerous conferences attended by your present Prime Minister, the Hon. B.J. Vorster, M.P., where I have made it clear each time, that my leadership is based on serving my people's interests, just as much as theirs (that is Dr Verwoerd's and Mr Vorster's) and yours, are based on that understanding.

The major problem is to make your people's interests and my people's interests reconcilable, if we seriously want to avoid the Prime Minister's future which is 'too ghastly to contemplate.'

What we do urgently require is a new framework, as it is impossible to avoid Mr Vorster's future within the present political framework. If I appear to you and to your colleagues in the South African Cabinet to be impossible, this is by no means a true reflection of my nature. It is merely a reflection of the fact that your people's interests and my people's interests are impossible to reconcile within your present political framework. The whole Soweto scene at the present moment is a confirmation of what I am saying here today.

I will be grateful if we can talk within the parameters I have tried to define through this Aide Memoire. I would like to make it clear, with all due respect to you, that outside those parameters all our talk today will be no more than an exercise in futility.

— 0 —

The entire interview which Inkatha published at the time read as a whole makes very interesting reading. The main reason why Minister Kruger summoned me to Pretoria on that day was to tell me that Inkatha must not recruit black people other than Zulu-speaking Africans. To quote Mr Kruger he said:

"If Inkatha wants to become a nationalist organisation like my people have had nationalist organisations, then I am not going to do anything against Inkatha. I believe that nationalism is correct. I am nationalist and believe that the Zulu people must have a nationalist organisation but if he wants to broaden his base, like I get the impression that Chief Gatsha Buthelezi wants to broaden the base on to a black polarisation, then of course its going to, there is going to be trouble. No doubt about it. Because you can understand, we've got to react. We cannot sit quiet while the black man polarises against the white man. It will become a life and death struggle then this is our difficulty."

Rev Mtetwa interpolated at this point by saying that we do not want whites to go away. We want to live together. Then there was a long argument between me and the Minister, who further added:

"The things that worried me, I told you, Chief that you were trying to broaden the base for the whole of the black people instead of just the Zulu people and secondly you were allowing an infiltration by ANC members. I say you must be careful of that from the security point of view and particularly the fact that is why I asked you straightforward, what happened in Dar-es-Salaam because of the fact there's a possible link up between those people and the Inkatha, that would be a security risk. And those things I am worried about."

In short I told the Minister that as long as the National Party recruited whites from other white ethnic groups, that I had the same right to recruit any black person into Inkatha. I refused to be intimidated by the Minister of Justice, Police and Prisons. I stuck to my guns. I refused to allow the Minister to dictate an ethnic membership to Inkatha. These are matters for the record. Because I was also the Head of the KwaZulu Government the media in general ignored even this well publicised record of my rejection of ethnicity and kept on calling Inkatha "the Zulu based organisation" and referred to me as "a Zulu leader." We have over the years tried to correct this kind of presentation of Inkatha.

While aware of ethnic and cultural diversity in our country, I have never seen a separate Zulu destiny which is not located within a broader South Africanism. I have never apologised to anyone for being born a Zulu Inkosi, with a clan for whom I have hereditary responsibilities within the Zulu Nation. The Zulu Nation was not created by the homelands policy which is why we talk without any apology of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal, a Kingdom of all the people of this

region of KwaZulu Natal, regardless of ethnicity, colour, creed or religion. This unity we seek in diversity prompts us to accept pluralism, not only based on ethnic grouping, but also on civil society.

Indeed because of our culture of pluralism it would be foolish to pretend that ethnicity is not a fact of life in South Africa, but we are all united through our African roots in which government, collective phenomena and individuality are united by the awareness of Ubuntu/Botho. It is the balance centred on humanitarian respect between what we are and what those who differ from us are, which acts as a balance between freedom and duty. Ubuntu/Botho is primarily a resolution of conflicts by means of respect and harmonisation by consensus, and in this respect Ubuntu/Botho is pluralism, as it reflects the African need to seek unity in the avoidance of unnecessary political and social divides to be used to identify oneself.

This is where we in the Inkatha Freedom Party have always stood, in spite of the propaganda of those who keep on trying to scare away our fellow South Africans from a Party which has always been non-ethnic and South African in approach. Does any honest analyst need more evidence of this than our rejection of the so-called "ethnic independence" and our well-documented stand against any negotiation about the future of our country until the release of Mr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and the unbanning of the then banned organisations.

Our philosophy is a vision germinating out of the land

It is therefore incumbent upon us to clearly spell out before the world our vision of pluralism as a clear vision of the IFP as the Party of the future and as a vision which will underlie our political success during the next twenty years. As we bring forward the vision of a bright future, I see an almost mystical connection between that which we had to endure in the past and our present ability to reap the fruits of our political sacrifices. In fact, it is now much more so than ever before that the IFP has the opportunity of projecting a new vision of the future of South Africa, for this vision is the result of all the battles we have fought, both those we have won as well as those we have lost.

It is common cause to say that we have for years been dismissed as one of the parties that would vanish like mist before the rising sun of a new South Africa. Indeed, it was said that our Party had only one per cent support of the people of South Africa, and that at most we had three per cent support. Although no one acknowledges it, I think that we baffled all pundits, gurus and prophets at some of our universities, the media and some so-called research institutes and international circles, when we garnered more than 10 per cent of the South African vote during the April 27, 1994 elections, despite the fact that we had only four days to canvass. It was a famous utterance of the President of the ANC, to say that I had no political support even in what he called "my own backyard." Our members certainly taught the country a lesson.

Our vision is also the result of our internal political growth over the past twenty years, during which time our role and our mission has grown. Out of, and because of this growth, we have changed. Because of this change we have grown greater and more important for the future of South Africa, but we have not grown to be different from what we were in the past and what we shall be in the future. Because of this, I can feel how our growth has transcended what we were, and now projects the IFP into a bright future as the only Party which will succeed in producing a vision capable of accommodating the needs and aspirations of all South Africans.

The call of South Africa for a plural society

If one could fly so high in the sky that one had an overview of the entire South Africa, and at the same time one could see into the hearts and minds of the many people of South Africa, what one would see is one of the most plural societies in the world. We know that the plurality of our society has been flattened by the armed struggle and the demagoguery of liberation, and also by apartheid. Vast masses of black constituencies came together and rallied behind the ANC. They were blinded by the illusion that only the ANC could overcome apartheid and bring about social justice and upliftment. The ANC had attraction and rightly so, as a Party led by someone whom all black people regarded as our martyr. We were therefore participating in a liberation election.

As the liberation struggle is behind us, the ANC is now forced to face the vast pluralism of our broader society which encompasses many societies within societies, or groups within groups, and its immediate reaction has been to try to flatten such diversity and to bring it under its control or to destroy it. We know that we have very different types of ethnic groups which co-exist within the same national structures. We also have, on a different level, various types of religious institutions which are provided with such a degree of autonomy that not even traditional Monarchs or amaKhosi may ignore. Furthermore, within each ethnic group there is a ritual life which is autonomous in itself, and operates as a sort of built-in check and balance in the traditional structures and powers of traditional authorities. There are different models of societal organisation, including the different types of black traditional communities, the rural Afrikaner communities, the Westernised municipal realities and the urbanised cosmopolitan areas. There is also a huge body of unwritten law which operates on a different level from the country's Roman Dutch law, which includes several autonomous indigenous legal systems governing the majority of South Africans as well as the powers of traditional leaders and the organisation of traditional structures.

I am saying all this to stress that the notion of pluralism is very well known to any African person, even if he or she may not be acquainted with the word. It is the very way in which life in Africa has been organised and experienced by our people. On the other hand, in the past 30 years the notion of pluralism has emerged throughout the Western world as the natural development of democratic societies.

In a South African context this notion of pluralism is especially fit to accommodate the wants and aspirations of the non-Africans amongst us. For instance, there are in our country economic groups which are provided with significant levels of virtual autonomy as well as many claims for self-determination and self rule, among which, as I indicated earlier, are those of the Afrikaners. More importantly, there is also a countrywide phenomenon which has led to the mushroom-like germination of fora in community based organisations which have claimed the right to regulate, or promote the regulation of their own interests within their own autonomy.

All this is what one as an observer from the sky would notice looking at South Africa below: an endless number of social, economic and cultural formations with different degrees of organisation, awareness and political aptitudes. But all of them are ready to revindicate the right of their existence and the role they intend to play in the unfolding of politics and society.

Beyond federalism: pluralism

Many Parties in South Africa have advocated federal ideas of one type or another. However, only the IFP has formulated and advocated a very broad and comprehensive notion of pluralism during recent years. Our notion of pluralism is inclusive of our culture of federalism, but is much broader because it includes the notions of the pre-eminence of civil society and the protection of the autonomy of economic, social and cultural formations.

As we go beyond federalism and we make explicit a broader political vision of which federalism is one of the components, our new commitment shall settle once and for all the preposterous claim that our federalistic stand was motivated by a desire to protect a kind of fiefdom. This will also put the correct perspective on our commitment to defend the rights of the Zulu Nation, and of other formations including civil society, for pluralism is a unified dimension in which the defence of the liberty of one is the protection of the liberty for all. Because of our vision of pluralism, we are committed to defend the rights of other minorities or groups with the same vigour we have employed in the past to defend the rights of the Zulu Nation. We have been attacked for daring to do so and others have used it as propaganda against the IFP as if we are only interested in the interests of the Zulu Nation. For me as the leader of the IFP, I could not help but fight for everyone in this arena by fighting for those in my immediate situation in the belief that this is a battle we are fighting for all the people of South Africa. We have said over and over again that what is good for KwaZulu Natal is good for the rest of South Africa.

Pluralism versus organicism

When we look at the great plurality of economic, social and cultural formations in our country two approaches may emerge: our pluralistic approach or the ANC organicistic approach which has clearly revealed itself in the past months. Simply put, on the one hand the pluralistic approach recognises that an area of protected autonomy must be given to economic, social and cultural formations. They must be entitled to regulate their interests and existence as they best see fit. This approach goes across the board encompassing cultural autonomy, as well as free market enterprise and privatisation in one unified vision.

On the other hand the organicistic approach will attempt to transform social, cultural and economic formations which exist in society into "organs" of a unified and co-ordinated broader and all-comprehensive structure centred around the government of the State and its political power. Organicist approaches have been experimented within Communist countries and also in many countries of western democracy and throughout Africa, and in all cases they have proven to reduce the freedoms and liberties of the people. We have seen the dark ages of the organicistic approach when universities, arts, culture, family organisation, professional associations and trade unions were required to serve the greater interest of the State or of the "people."

South Africa is now set on the same organicistic path, as the ANC wants to transform traditional leaders into organs of the State, register and take control of trade unions, retain institutes of tertiary education under the control of the Ministry of Education, determine all educational curricula, discriminate between NGOs which serve government policies such as the RDP and those who do not, and hand down government policies to the business community by means of a corporative institution such as NEDLAC which in itself is organicism in the extreme.

The dichotomy between pluralism and organicism may be seen as underlying many of the existing and future political debates in our country. For instance, the entire RDP implementation may be cast either in pluralistic terms recognising an independent role for Provinces as well as for

economic, cultural and social formations, or alternatively it can be cast in organicistic terms where central government directs the action of all the other players who are called upon to implement the RDP, something we can correctly describe as shades of central planning.

Moreover, the entire phenomenon of fora and community based organisations which are likely to become the driving political development in our country, may be met with either a pluralistic or with an organicistic type of response. These fora may either be given powers which they may exercise autonomously within determined parameters, or they may become components, or organs, of a broader complex organisation at political or institutional level. There is no doubt that if offered the opportunity, these fora will opt for the first option, as there is no doubt that the ANC has not and will not offer them such an option.

It also does not take a great deal of clairvoyance to understand that this is the issue which will underline the future political tensions of South Africa. It must be realised that it will not be long before ethnicity will re-emerge as a driving consideration in political behaviour as we have seen in the former USSR and other parts of Eastern Europe. Cultural structures or ethnic formations will claim the right to preserve their autonomy. Ethnic groups such as the Coloureds in the Western Cape are likely to find a common political identity, whether we like it or not. The various peoples of South Africa who shared a common political identity and organisation by virtue of the now dismantled structures, such as the former TBVC states and self-governing territories, are sooner or later bound to find common cause on some political issues, which will be voiced by them as a group, as is already happening in the territory of the former Bophuthatswana and Transkei, and the ANC will not be able to stop this from happening for much longer, just as the leaders of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were unable to do.

Unless accommodated within a pluralistic vision, the tensions of our plural society are also bound to tear apart the institutional fibre on which South Africa is built. When these tensions emerge, it will be seen that we were probably the only realistic political party which had a vision of what was in the offing. I have said many things over the years which some have described as weird when I said them, but about which I have been proven to be correct in voicing them as my gut feeling.

The real politics of the future

The pluralistic vision which I submit is not a minority party concept. It is a broad concept which expresses the terms of our political action if we become the majority party. The notion of pluralism can very effectively bring together and harmonise the many levels of political commitment in the IFP. In fact, as I indicated earlier, pluralism caters for the protection of autonomy of cultural groups, as well as for the advocacy of a Bill of Rights. Human rights, whether in their individual, collective or group form, can very well be reduced to an area of protected constitutional autonomy in which the people, either as individuals or as members of social and cultural formations, enjoy an area of inviolable freedom in which they are kings.

It is the notion of pluralism which will bring and hold together the many aspects, organisations and substructures through which the IFP must operate in order to meet the political challenges of the future. The word *pluralism* can in itself adequately summarise the political commitment of the IFP in the new South Africa.

We are committed to a type of democracy which can deliver to all the people of South Africa true and advanced freedoms and liberties. We will not allow a new authoritarian and oppressive system to be substituted for the old one. It would be naive to think that today the battle for freedom is any different from what it has been for the past two thousand years. The battle for freedom is still the battle to limit and control government, and to ensure that political power is abridged through government structures.

It is our vision that the new South Africa shall be organised as a pluralistic society. Therefore, we are committed to promoting individual and collective guarantees as well as a model of economic and social development which will successfully redress the great social and economic imbalances of our society and bring about substantive social justice for all.

Pluralism is a unified approach which can be divided into four primary segments:

- (1) Political Pluralism,
- (2) Social Pluralism,
- (3) Cultural Pluralism, and
- (4) Economic Pluralism.

Political pluralism

Federalism

The IFP believes that South Africa shall be organised in a federation of Provinces. Provinces shall operate as the primary government of the people, and only those powers which cannot be adequately and properly exercised at provincial level should be devolved upwards to the federal government, for federalism promotes political pluralism allowing different parties to be in power at the same time in different regions and levels of government.

Protection of political minorities

Moreover, our diverse society requires that political minorities be especially protected and be given special opportunities in the process of political representation to make their voices heard.

Parliamentary law

This includes special provisions in parliamentary law, which defines the rights of Members of Parliament and the relationship between executive and parliament, to be entrenched in the Constitution rather than being left to the whim of the majority which adopts the standing rules of Parliament. Minorities shall be entitled to submit and carry to full discussion minority bills and to actively participate both in the legislative process as well as parliamentary activities aimed at controlling the activity of the executive and of the public administration.

Referenda and direct political action

The national and provincial constitutions shall make provision for referenda which will allow committed and proactive minorities to raise an issue on the merits of any existing piece of legislation. Minorities and qualified segments of civil society (*i.e.* with a legitimate qualifying interest) shall also have direct access to government, including the right to petition the Executive,

the right to initiate legislation by submitting draft Bills to Parliament, and the right to raise issues of constitutionality before the constitutional court.

Parliamentarianism

Our diverse society calls for the establishment of a parliamentary rather than a presidential or executive system of government. The primary responsibility of policy formulation shall rest with Parliament, and the Executive shall serve at the pleasure of Parliament on the basis of a revocable fiduciary relationship. The exercise of the vote of no confidence shall not be hindered by the duty to dissolve Parliament.

Parliament shall retain policy guidance and control over the Executive and over public administration including, but not limited to, the power to hold parliamentary hearings and investigations, to request reports and information and to question Ministers for written or oral replies. Furthermore, Parliament shall not be a rubber-stamp and shall have all the necessary powers to develop legislation and policies and to monitor their implementation.

Local autonomies and local government

The third tier of government shall be fully representative and shall exercise autonomous powers. Provinces shall delegate to the third tier of government as much as possible of their powers on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity. Local government shall operate through substructures which should germinate out of political representation at community level. Such substructures shall respect the different models of societal organisation, such as traditional communities, and existing cultural or ethnic diversities, while the over-arching structures shall ensure that economic and social development is distributed where most needed.

True political representation

All levels of government and all governmental functions shall be inspired by the principle of true political representation. *Inter alia*, this means that the affected interest must be heard and shall participate in any relevant decision-making process both at executive and legislative levels. It also means that the African consensus-driven decision-making process shall receive the same respect and appreciation as the Westernised concept of political representation.

Administrative procedures and rule-making (regulations) must solicit the participation of, and consider, affected interests, and the African notion of consultation and reporting shall receive adequate consideration. Moreover, parliament should also operate through extended select committees which involve non members, while schools should be administered with the input of parents and teachers, and local planning shall be performed in consultation with the affected community. The principle of participatory democracy shall be constitutionally entrenched.

We should consider the advisability of substituting some government departments with independent regulatory agencies which express the relevant segment of civil society, expanding on the precedents of the National Housing Forum and the Independent Broadcast Authority, so as to promote the self regulation of such segments of society along with the affected interests.

More importantly, government work shall not be the exclusive prerogative of government. Voluntarism and NGO activities shall be valorized.

Accountability of political representatives

Political representatives must be politically accountable for their actions. *Inter alia*, this means that they must be chosen by identifiable constituencies to which they are politically accountable. Therefore, the electoral system must be changed to a mixed proportional and constituency system. In order to protect political minorities, the constituency system must be mixed with a system of proportional representation, so that proportional lists may correct any departure from the rule of pure proportionality caused by the application of the constituency system. The possibility of petitioning for the recall of political representatives, especially at local government level, must also be considered.

Public administration

Public administration must be shaped around the notions of good government, efficiency and accountability. Civil society shall have direct inputs into the Civil Service Commission so as to promote the re-organisation of, and to monitor, public offices to prevent government waste and disfunction and to guarantee constant maximum efficiency. Civil society shall also express a Regulatory Relief Commission with the power to counteract the unnecessary growth of government and to request the repealing or amendment of burdensome, unnecessary or inadequate regulations and permit requirements, this to be coupled with a constitutional provision ensuring against unreasonable or unnecessary licensing and permit requirements.

Furthermore a system of administrative justice must be developed to strike down administrative actions which are a violation of law or arbitrary or capricious or the result of improper use of discretionary powers. Civil servants must be held liable for their gross negligence and malice.

The affected interests shall participate in the operation of a special independent administration which is to promote small business and assist the informal business sector, where possible.

An international perspective

The constitution shall recognise the position of South Africa as part of a pluralistic international community.

The use of armed forces abroad for offensive purposes shall be prohibited. Limitations of South African sovereignty for purposes of international organisation or international integration shall be permitted. The South African legal system shall automatically adjust to international norms and standards which do not contravene the pluralistic principles of the new constitution.

Social pluralism

All government originating with the people shall be founded only upon their will and shall be instituted only for the good of the people. This notion has been spelt out in constitutions ranging

from North America, Europe and the Pacific. This notion shall mean that the purpose of government is to serve civil society and not vice versa.

Society shall preserve a role of pre-eminence with respect to any of the activities of government. Conversely, government shall respect the integrity of civil society without attempting to take over, or exercise its influence with respect to the natural organisation of civil society.

Social and cultural formations shall be recognised as an area of protected constitutional autonomy which shall not be encroached or infringed upon unless a compelling reason of public interest justifies an encroaching action on the side of the government. People shall be free to organise and regulate their interests in autonomy at all levels of society and outside any government intervention which is not justified by compelling public interests.

Autonomy means the power to live by rules adopted to organise and administer one's own interests. *Inter alia*, this shall apply to universities and other institutes of tertiary education which shall be organised and administered on the basis and the principle of self-governance, as well as to chambers of commerce, sport and recreational institutions, scientific research and development, professional associations, trade unions and other institutions of civil society which shall organise and conduct themselves autonomously.

Social pluralism shall also protect traditional communities and related structures and lead to the recognition of the right of self-determination of the people in all personal, social and cultural matters and segments of organised life. Forms of societal organisations centred around indigenous and customary law shall be recognised and protected, along with the recognition of the right of the people to choose what they best prefer in all matters which can be legitimately left to their autonomy. This shall include, but not be limited to, family law, inheritance, communal property matters and any chosen form of societal organisation such as those centred around traditional leaders.

Cultural pluralism

Cultural pluralism and social pluralism fall together as two faces of the same coin in promoting and supporting the right of self-determination of people. However, cultural pluralism extends its protection to some of the most sensitive matters in the lives of people. Cultural pluralism requires full freedom of religion and culture, and full personal autonomy on any matter which falls within the personal sphere of individuals. State and Church must be separate to ensure that no religion is favoured or hindered.

It shall not be the business of government to favour or hinder to any extent any particular code of moral conduct or the right of the people to choose how to conduct their lives. The rural way of life shall be protected along with traditional structures as well as the rights of minorities or single individuals who choose specific rules of conduct which affect exclusively their personal lives.

The principle of the respect of cultural diversity shall be entrenched in the constitution. Linguistic policies shall protect the equal dignity of all languages spoken in the country as well as the right of people to be educated and to relate to all governmental structures in their respective mother tongues.

Government shall have no role in directly managing and promoting any given form of art and culture. Arts and culture shall remain the prerogative of civil society and the role of government shall be limited to the assistance of the free development of arts and culture as it emerges from the natural dynamics of civil society. Within the parameters of the protection of social and cultural pluralism, and consistently with accepted international standards of advanced human rights protection, the IFP recognises and commits itself to defend the rights of ethnicity, which are the rights of the Tswanas as Tswanas, of Swazis as Swazis, of Afrikaners as Afrikaners, of Jews as Jews, of Zulus as Zulus, of Coloureds as Coloureds, of Portuguese as Portuguese, of Vendas as Vendas, of Indians as Indians, of Sothos as Sothos, of Shangaans as Shangaans, of Ndebeles as Ndebeles, of the English as the English, of Xhosas as Xhosas, and of all the other individuals of South Africa regarded as members of the peoples, nations, and social and cultural formations to which the belong.

In order to be adequately protected, social and cultural formations shall be entitled to resort to the Constitutional Court to complain against the unjustified encroachment of their constitutional autonomy.

Economic pluralism

The final liberation of all the underprivileged people of our country will rest on the long-term economic and social development of South Africa. We support legislation which will redistribute economic opportunities but we do not believe in the long-term viability of pure redistribution of wealth, for too often it soon becomes redistribution of poverty.

The viability of any economic plan must rely on the liberalisation of the South African stagnant and overburdened economic system. True economic pluralism shall be established in South Africa for the first time.

Privatisation

The huge South African parastatal shall be privatised to reduce its disastrous inefficiency. A privatisation commission shall be established to ensure that the privatisation effort is economically sound and corruption free.

The constitution must require that the government shall provide no service or product, nor shall it conduct any other economic activity, unless so authorised by a law demonstrating a public need and an inadequacy of the private sector to satisfy such need with comparable efficiency and reliability.

Free market enterprise

The constitution shall entrench the free market enterprise system promoting assistance to small businesses and equal access to all economic opportunities.

Private property rights shall be protected including the right to own, freely choose and organise the means of the production. Any expropriation shall be compensated on the basis of the prompt payment of the free market value of the property concerned.

Property rights in the land shall be restored without compensation where the land was wrongfully taken in pursuance of racially discriminatory programmes and the land returned which was taken away by colonialism.

Public property shall be limited to that strictly necessary for the exercise of public functions.

Communal property shall be fully recognised and guaranteed as a fundamental building block of our economic system.

South Africa's economic system must be brought up to the standards of Europe and North America, including the prohibition of monopolies, cartels as well as practice and agreements in restraint of trade, commerce and free market competition.

A South African economy

There should be no economic dirigisme or command economy on the side of the government. This approach must exclude the power of government to make decisions which will be a financial burden for many generations to come, and, therefore, a balanced budget policy must be constitutionally mandated.

Special emphasis must be put on small businesses, and no hinderance being placed on the informal business sector, as well as professional training.

South African economy must have a continental dimension and must rely on special economic ties with the rest of the continent. A super-national entity, modelled after the European Community of Coal and Steel, and managing all environmental and natural resources in the sub-Saharan region should be established as the springboard to greater economic integration.

It is also essential that the African nature of our dual economy be recognised and protected and that we valorize the great contribution which is given by the informal sector of the economy, which should not be unnecessarily restricted.

A unified approach

All forms of pluralism require that the role and scope of government be severely limited with respect to its intervention in the social, economic and cultural fields. It must be stressed that this does not mean that the capability of government to formulate and implement social policies is undermined. It is the prerogative of government to establish any legitimate policy, but this does not imply that government itself should carry out that policy.

Government shall become like a general contractor which determines priorities to be carried out by civil society. For instance, there is no reason why correctional services ought to be run by government only, rather than by private corporations under the control of government. Similarly the capability of government to develop educational policies for the public educational system would not be undermined if all schools of the public system are privately owned and operated on a contractual basis.

The Government's role will, however, be limited with respect to the role which is recognised to the institutions of civil society. In this case legislation will need to be adopted to ensure that

institutions of civil society which administer or impact on broad segments of public interest operate on the basis of representation and direct participation of the affected interests. This means that the affected interests will not need to go to government to seek their representation and protection but would go directly to the concerned institutions of civil society on the basis of participatory procedures established by such institution or by an Act of Parliament. For example, under this approach a self-governing university would need to broaden all its decision-making processes to solicit and receive the participation of all affected interests.

The proposals and policy positions which I have expressed thus far illustrate the type of truly modern and yet truly African State which we could achieve in our country, and which are fully consistent with all the positions adopted by the IFP in past years, even if they transcend them in a unified vision. Specifically, the vision set out in this document was embodied in the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal, the IFP constitutional proposals for a Federal Republic of South Africa submitted to the Multiparty Negotiation Process on 18 June 1993, and in the Yellow Paper of the Freedom Alliance dated 19 December 1993. The thematic of this document were also spelled out in my Policy Speeches delivered at the openings of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly in 1993 and 1994 and in other public speeches.

PART IV THE WAY FORWARD

What is good for the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal is good for the country

What is good for KwaZulu Natal is now more than ever good for the rest of South Africa. In fact, if true autonomy can be asserted at least in one Province in our country this will have a very healthy effect capable of balancing central Government policies in almost each and every relevant respect. Indeed, it would be quite difficult for central Government to embark on socialist and communist adventures if KwaZulu Natal has the power to go in the opposite direction. Similarly, as long as this Province can develop its own health, education, welfare, housing, land and labour relation policies, there will be healthy dynamics which will clearly show the country what works and what does not work. We must empower this Province to deliver to its citizens so that we can empower all the people of South Africa with a system of government which in the end will succeed in satisfying their needs.

Meeting the challenges ahead of us, peacefully and democratically

Our Special General Conference held in March this year considered many of the issues which I have expressed thus far, especially with respect to the breach of the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace, and resolved that our political response to the ANC arrogance and prevarication should come through the political, legislative and constitutional initiatives of the Government of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal. On that occasion the Conference called upon the Government of KwaZulu Natal to establish policies and adopt legislation which could counteract the policies and the legislation of the central Government so as to show South Africa what the IFP governance is all about and to break the ANC's grip on power. Moreover, the Special General Conference resolved that a Constitution for the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal should be finalised by this month of July. Alternatively it was resolved that it should be reported to this Annual

General Conference that substantial progress has been achieved in securing this Constitution for the Province.

This mandate has been taken very seriously by our constituencies, for I feel that the people on the ground have an instinctive but very clear understanding of a fundamental truth: we are left with less than one year to ensure for ourselves and future generations a future worth living, otherwise we will go down the slippery slope to autocracy and a one-party State. In the past months I have spoken throughout the Kingdom to respond to the demands of the people for bold political leadership and to support the courageous and bold activities of the Government of KwaZulu Natal. When I addressed an enormous rally at the Umlazi Stadium on April 23 and a similar gathering in Empangeni on May 27, I stated :

Never, never, ever will the IFP be intimidated. Violence and intimidation only makes us grow stronger in our resolve to fight for that which is right and to oppose with determination and unwavering commitment that which is wrong.

We must mobilise political activities on the ground which show our desire to reject intimidation and to resist any form of violence against our communities. [...] the time has come for the IFP community across the country to rise and resist the arrogance and prevarication of the central government and of those who have tried to impose on South Africa an autocratic, centralistic and authoritarian form of government. We shall rise and resist peacefully any strong-armed methods that are used to intimidate us and will do so armed with our courage and determination, and with our strength and commitment to non-violence. We shall rise and resist in the awareness that we shall prevail because in South Africa, as in the rest of the world, violence and intimidation fails and is crushed on the anvil of the righteous claims and demands for self-determination, pluralism, freedom and democracy. We reject the tactics which are meant to spell out that "might is right." We refuse to be "crushed" when all we do is to stand for truth, righteousness, justice and democracy.

When I say we shall rise and resist, we shall do so by overcoming the arrogance of power with passive resistance and if need be with civil, peaceful and disciplined disobedience in the democratic tradition of Mahatma Gandhi.

With you the people is the final empowerment. With you rests our own possibility of final victory. In your hands is the precious gift of freedom and democracy. Through your action and mobilisation alone it will be possible to resuscitate those wholesome promises for freedom which sprung out of the April 27, 1994 elections and which were so disgracefully extinguished by the arrogance and prevarication of the central government. Let the voice of our people be heard and let freedom, democracy and pluralism for the whole of South Africa come from the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal. Let our cry for freedom be heard loud and clear along with the warning that we shall not rest or yield to any type of pressure, intimidation or violence until South Africa becomes a free, federal and plural Republic.

[...] Let the new struggle for freedom begin. Let our voice resound to all corners of South Africa. Let our friends and foes be warned that our great march to freedom has begun. Long live the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal!

My call to rise and resist peacefully and democratically has received an overwhelming response of excitement throughout the Kingdom, for I called the people of this region to rise and resist with peaceful and democratic means to support the action of the provincial government of KwaZulu Natal and to show to the ANC that they cannot take the place of the democratically elected government of this Province with respect to matters of provincial competence. There was a deliberate distortion of what I meant both here and abroad. These distortions were disseminated even when I explained over and over again what I meant.

We must break the deadlock and cut the Gordian knot

The hard facts of reality are that the ANC is exercising political power in this Province with respect to all matters which ought to be a provincial competence. The other hard fact is that in the past 14 months the Parliament of KwaZulu Natal has not adopted any piece of legislation which fosters our policies, with the exception of the House of Traditional Leaders Act. The only legislation which has been adopted is structural legislation which has been promoted and often drafted within the parameters of the Intergovernmental Forum and can be regarded as technical legislation. This includes the Exchequer Act, the Tender Board Act, the Public Protectors Act, the Provincial Civil Service Commission Act and other similar legislation.

The legislation proposed in the IFP 20 point strategy document has been considered by IFP structures and yet no bill has been cleared through the Cabinet of the Government of Provincial Unity. Please do understand that when I mention these things that I am not by any means apportioning any blame to the Government of KwaZulu Natal or to the Premier. This is no more than just stating the facts of the matter. We have been astounded by the fuss that was made when the Premier decided to change the heading on his stationery to the Government of the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal. At Skukuza on the 8th of April 1994, the ANC in a document they submitted to the King recognised that this Region is a Kingdom, as distinct from any other. The Premier's letterhead therefore merely reflects a *de facto* situation.

Over the same period of time the national Parliament has adopted extensive legislation in spite of the fact that parliamentary time is reduced because of the constitution-making process. I want to be clear and say that one could be satisfied with what the provincial Government of KwaZulu Natal has accomplished thus far if we were in an ordinary situation. However, if we consider the fact that in less than 12 months our legislative powers may be taken away, we might not be pleased with the fact that all this Parliament was able to achieve in the small window of opportunity in which it had some degree of legislative autonomy, was to establish preliminary structural legislation. I wish to stress that I am not being judgmental when I speak as I do. I am just expressing concern at the prospect of us being overtaken by events beyond our control.

We are committed to delivering a Constitution for this Province and substantial progress in this respect should have been achieved by now. However, as I understand it, no agreement has been finalised with the other parties whose support is necessary to reach the required two-thirds majority with respect to any of the fundamental characteristics of the provincial constitution, including the form of government of the Province which we want to be a constitutional monarchy, or the issue of Ulundi as the capital, or those sunrise provisions which will empower the Province to exercise greater and more autonomous powers and functions in accordance with IFP proposals once the limiting national framework is changed, thereby expressing the aspirations of this Province, or the sunrise provision to give this Province judicial powers in all areas in which the Province exercises legislative powers, including a court of last resort, or a fully fledged provincial bill of rights, or the assumption of exclusive powers in all Schedule 6 functions, including local government, police, provincial civil service, and financial and auditing functions with related transfer of assets, or the elimination of the government of provincial unity or, finally, special guarantees to ensure that the Province may protect its own constitution.

While no agreement has been reached on any of these points, no deadlock has clearly been shown, which gives the impression that negotiations are proceeding, but in reality reduces the possibility to manoeuvre politically and to resort to alternative strategies. The fact is that if our counterparts wished to support us we would be much further ahead in securing this necessary Constitution.

We consider this to be a major impasse and we have discussed the matter during several meetings of the IFP National Council and we even held a joint meeting of the IFP parliamentary Caucuses. I must stress that I firmly believe that this unsatisfactory situation is not a consequence of anybody's negligence, inefficiency or incompetence. Our Premier Dr FT Mdlalose especially has done as much as is humanly possible under the circumstances. It appears, however, that the circumstances are such that more can not be achieved. I have been advised that because of the thin majority held by the IFP in the provincial Parliament, we are at the mercy of the minority parties. I have also been advised that this thin majority which we hold is the measure of the present difficulties which we are experiencing in the Province. We are also faced with a situation that Cabinet proceedings are constantly slowed down by lengthy discussions and procedures due to the ANC resistance to IFP policy formulation.

You all no doubt saw what Mr Jacob Zuma said in a speech that was recently read on his behalf in Chatsworth. He literally repeated President Mandela's accusation that what he called my "activities" in KwaZulu Natal were responsible for the violence in this Province. He went on to say that the IFP must now be dealt with by the ANC once and for all. He stated that the ANC will show that the government of KwaZulu Natal has failed to govern and that the ANC is going to demand an election. He accused me of what he called my "individualism", whatever that may mean in Mr Zuma's mind. I was pleased to read this, for Mr Zuma as a well trained protégé of the KGB Intelligence has managed to bluff a lot of people with his feigned affability. I am glad that he is now baring his claws. In the latest 'Tribute' magazine, he describes himself as a friend of our National Chairman. All I can say is that with friends like this, who needs enemies! The ANC leader in this Province who is also National Chairperson of the ANC, was throwing down a gauntlet to us. It is for you to tell me whether we should pick it up and when we should do so.

This is a very hard fact for me to consider because I know very well that the support for the IFP in this Province goes far beyond the 50.3% which was granted to us by the Independent Electoral Commission. I know that our electoral support did not come across properly during the 1994 elections for many reasons, not least of which is the fact that we campaigned only for four days and that many of our people in rural areas had no identification documents. It is also a fact that many of our votes were not counted. In spite of all this we have to face constant ANC arrogance, which is even echoed in the international press such as 'The Economist', suggesting that a deal was struck in the Independent Electoral Commission to increase the support that we received in KwaZulu Natal to give us a majority which we had not reached by our own doing. In a recent news report Mr Jacob Zuma dared to state that he hopes that we go to early provincial elections so that the people of our Province can remove the IFP from power.

This is the time for bold determination and brave decisions

The ANC rounds on the IFP and holds us responsible for the violence in KwaZulu Natal. They smart under the electoral defeat they suffered in the 1994 elections in KwaZulu Natal. They smart under the reality that millions of South Africans here and elsewhere in South Africa support the IFP, and the ANC finds that its claim to exclusive eminence is unfounded in all reality. The ANC can not conceive of a KwaZulu Natal which wants federalism, wants pluralism, wants power for Provinces and which rejects the centralism of the ANC. They smart under the reality that it is I and Inkatha which are showing the way forward to other Provinces which are increasingly realising the ANC's centrist stronghold over provincial decision making.

I want to state as clearly and as simply as I can that I and Inkatha will never accept centrist domination over provincial affairs. This Province will not tolerate it. We will not thrust South Africa into a future in which the love for power and its evil seductiveness prey upon political Parties and the population.

If we fail in our duty to halt the ANC in its headlong rush to concentrate centrist power around itself so that the interests of the ANC as a Party become for them synonymous with the interests of the State, all we as South Africans will have done is to exchange an apartheid centrist monster for an ANC centrist monster.

No price will be too big for me to pay in my opposition to the destruction of the self-determination ideals of the Kingdom of KwaZulu, the Province of KwaZulu Natal and of millions of South Africans elsewhere in the country.

The IFP is the only Party in the country which has deep insights into the dangers of amassing power at the centre and leaving a ruling political Party to wield that power in its own favour. For me democracy is all about hemming in political authorities and making it impossible for them to confuse the interests of the State with their own interests. The world over, and right down the centuries, the struggle for democracy has been the struggle against political parties amassing power around themselves. As we reconsider our options in this historic 20th year of our existence, we must examine what those options are.

We struggled against centralism at CODESA and at the World Trade Centre. We waged a fierce fight for ideals which are regarded as ordinary and normal in democracies around the world. After three years of negotiation struggle we ended up reducing our constitutional demands to the barest minimum. The IFP Yellow Paper of December 1993 records these minimal demands. For us the draft constitution that was pushed through Parliament in 1993 was fatally flawed and we refused to enter an election under it, and we have lived to see just how right we were in having those misgivings in 1993. After our massive concessions on constitutional issues, and after reducing our demands to a minimum, and after having these demands rejected, and after having agreed to enter elections under a flawed constitution, provided our minimum demands were subjected to scrutiny in international mediation, the ANC holds us in contempt.

They are not prepared to look at our minimum demands. They are not prepared to subject differences about them to international mediation. They know what they want in the final Constitution for our country and they will employ the tyranny of their majority power in Parliament to get what they want. Before elections my hand of friendship was spurned by the ANC, as it was way back then, as I have indicated in this address, when we thought that our very reason to exist was to provide an internal power base which would work with an exiled ANC. We have been subjected to brutal and violent attack and our members have been brutally slain. We were reviled before the whole of South Africa and the rest of the world. And there is nothing in politics today, and there is nothing in what Mr Mandela is doing and saying, and there is nothing in what the ANC is doing and saying, to give us any hope that reconciliation between the IFP and the ANC is possible. The issue is whether we want to continue to be ruled by the ANC, or whether the time has come to seek our self-determination, challenging the ANC's grip on power through a democratic system, turning the next elections into a real referendum to choose between autocracy, centralism and authoritarianism on the one hand and freedom, federalism and pluralism on the other.

The harsh reality is that the ANC is playing the numbers game in Parliament, and the harsh reality is that the National Party and the Democratic Party, and indeed the Freedom Front, are playing the numbers game with the ANC, to give the ANC the voting power it needs to draft a Constitution which it wants, while all its actions are already shaping a new autocratic and centralised State.

I can not advise Conference that there is a way forward for us if the ANC continues to trample rough-shod over all our constitutional aspirations and refuses to honour its solemn promise and commitments. I say this with total conviction. There is no future for the IFP in continuing what we have been doing politically over the last twelve months. I would die rather than subject the IFP to the fate of the Democratic Party and to the fate of the Progressive Party talking big, and wonderfully, and morally and convincingly, but remaining politically impotent as a declining opposition Party while our forefathers' dreams vanish before our own eyes.

I am not in the business of politics to play democratic opposition roles which legitimise the growth of authoritarianism in government. Nor - which I say with great emphasis - will we move out of parliamentary politics because the ruling Party forces us to adopt extra-parliamentary tactics and strategies to secure lasting democracy for South Africa. The ANC has yet to learn many things about being a ruling Party. The first is that the purity of parliamentary opposition politics depends entirely on the extent to which opposition parties accept the constitutional framework within which they operate. Democracy is not secured by ruling Parties forcing an unwanted Constitution on Opposition Parties and then expecting them to play according to the rules of ruling Parties' games.

The IFP will never accept centralised power which dictates provincial affairs. Other Provinces may well take cues from what the IFP is doing in KwaZulu Natal. In opposing centrist dictation the IFP is reading the signs of the times. We are being forerunners for other Provinces. We are showing the way forward.

We will secure the Kingdom of KwaZulu Natal. We will secure the meagre provincial powers that we managed to wring out of the ANC in negotiation politics. We will not let the ANC off the International Mediation hook. We will pursue land issues and the labour issues we have raised in Parliament and we will pursue the issues around which difficulties in the Government of National Unity revolve. We will hound the ANC in Parliament on these issues and we will make our presence felt in doing so. We will not abandon any of the things we have started, but we will not stop there. We will also go on to mobilise opposition outside Parliament.

There is only one political arena and we must conceive of provincial politics as nothing more than one corner of that arena. The IFP is one Party and we will move together across a wide range of issues. The impression being created that it is I, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, who upsets the KwaZulu Natal's applecart must be dispelled. Quite clearly if election politics is the name of the game, the IFP is heading for disaster if we go on in the future doing what we have done during the last 12 months. All Parties face the need to take stock of where they stand and what they are doing. Other Parties will do so and so must we. I will not stand by while the IFP heads for the kind of parliamentary impotence that Opposition Parties under National Party rule suffered from. The IFP has this last opportunity to deliver on the promises that it is a centre-stage Party and if we are to achieve our goals, we have to develop into an election winning Party.

I am saying nothing new, for these issues have been raised in the National Council, where discussion has taken place on the insufficient coherence between our national and provincial Members of Parliament, and on whether we are really driving forward as a Party moved by a unity of purposes and spirit which is expressed by a unified leadership. If the Party is failing then it is the business of this Conference to put these matters right, for there is no use in shying away from problems. Let us state them, debate them, and come up with answers and action programmes and we will grow stronger and more determined out of this exercise.

It might be that we are left with no option but to go back to the people for a fresh mandate and to increase our majority in KwaZulu Natal so that we can secure a Constitution for this Province, or lose the entire stake in this gamble. This is the time of final and bold decisions. The die is cast. It is for us to get on with the next segment of this drama.

-----ooOoo-----

#7545