

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION AT A MEETING BETWEEN THE INKATHA
FREEDOM PARTY DELEGATION, THE STATE PRESIDENT AND THE
SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT DELEGATION
BY MANGOSUTHU BUTHELEZI, PRESIDENT INKATHA FREEDOM PARTY

UNION BUILDINGS, PRETORIA. 2ND NOVEMBER 1990

Mr. President, policies, personalities, image and opportunity all intermingle for those who will be participants in negotiating a new South Africa. It will not always be easy or even possible to determine bottom line positions amongst Parties which are manoeuvring and manipulating their political environment to gain political advantage.

Inkatha Freedom Party believes that in the end the right: policies are going to count more than anything else. We have a history of being constant on very basic issues and before we talk today about establishing a Government/Inkatha Freedom Party Work Group to examine the impediments to negotiation and to tackle the issues which constitute risk to successful negotiation, I would like to spell out IFP's bottom line policy positions. We would like the IFP to be a known factor, a constant factor and a reliable factor in what will, I believe, become a very difficult political position which will become filled with obscurities as we get closer to getting negotiations off the ground.

Party political goals

Policies are for us instruments to achieve goals. The objectives we set ourselves in politics most frequently can be achieved in many different ways and there are many disputes about the best way of achieving them. We believe that it is vitally important for the country to know where each political Party thinks South Africa should go.

I believe the National Party will yet have to do more in detailing the goals it will be striving for. There was a time when Mr. P.W. Botha and others around him kept saying that the National Party would not pronounce on this or that because the this or that in question would have to be decided in consultation or in negotiations. There was a kind of leaning over backwards not to appear dictatorial by those in government who took a total authoritarian approach.

You, Mr. President, already have the credibility that those manoeuvrings attempted to establish. We feel that you need to adopt positions so that we know where the National Party wants South Africa to go. The positions of various Parties which will be participant in the politics of negotiation are far too amorphous. We need more known factors. It is in setting political direction and the policies, tactics and strategies which will achieve the goals stated that will be of primary importance in developing national consensus and the national will to establish a democracy and make it work.

| Inkatha Freedom Party's goals

We sum up by saying that the IFP wants to produce a modern, 'Western-type industrial, multi-Party democracy resting on an enterprise-driven economy. We want an independent judiciary and we want total equality for all before the law and the constitution. We want freedom of speech and freedom of political association and we want to create the circumstances in which governments do not have to usurp the rule of law for the sake of Party political expediency.

This means we want a one-man-one-vote system of government in one South Africa with one Parliament which is placed in position and which will be accountable to one sovereign nation. We also want to break up the kind of monolithic State apparatus that successive National Party governments have built around itself as the governing Party. I was actually heartened, Mr. President, to hear you say during your recent trip abroad that you are also against the idea of an all-powerful President even as is the case at present.

We want a political system in which success in the search for consensus determines who will govern and who will oppose. We want a balanced political system in which it is possible for the people to place and remove governments.

The majoritarian principle in politics is for us essential in any democracy. We of course see nothing wrong with a one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary State. That has in fact always been our cherished ideal but we are aware that the winner-takes-all principle involved in, for example, the Westminster model, will be divisive in South Africa. We are therefore prepared to look at alternatives if it is going to mean spreading reconciliation across our polarised society.

In the goals we set ourselves and in our ideals for South Africa, we are prepared to make compromises because we will be demanding that others compromise until it hurts. We say only that the principles of democracy must never be compromised.

A Statement of Intent

Inkatha Freedom Party has long argued the advantages of drawing up a Statement of Intent which will locate political Parties along various political continua. The general public need to know which Party will agree with the kind of political goals the IFP has set itself and hopes for South Africa. The general public need to know what the positions of other Parties on crucial issues are - not nitty gritty detail, but baseline positions.

For us to achieve consensus politics and for us to moderate the majoritarian principle in politics so that it threatens no group, we will need the evolution of alliances, both informal and formal. A Statement of Intent will spell out that which holds the Parties subscribing to it together.

The lack of clarity about goals and the freedom with which political Parties can lambaste other political parties because there is this lack of clarity, is for us a stumbling block. It is not good for the politics of negotiation and it is not good for reconciliation for the Conservative Party to be talking about the Government as it does talk about the Government. A Government Statement of Intent, or a National Party Statement of Intent, subscribed to by considerable forces in the political field, would tell Mr. and Mrs. Average that the Conservative Party is being viciously malicious.

The IFP has a deep-rooted need for a Statement of Intent to be drawn up. Our intentions are absolutely laudable and they would be highly acceptable to the vast majority of South Africans but we are so vilified by our political opposition and so disgraced by false press reports of us, that a great many people inside and outside South Africa forget about the noble intentions of the IFP.

The IFP has a need to nail its flag to a mast and I believe South Africa needs other Parties to do so alongside, around, above, to the left or to the right of the IFP position.

The documentation which I have received from you, Mr. President, and your Ministers, has shown the extent to which the IFP's position and the National Party's position converged so rapidly after you took office, Mr. President. I am quite sure others could say the same. Let all of us who can say the same now say it with the South African Government. Let there be evidence of growing consensus about what kind of a country we are going to produce.

Constitutional Goals

The IFP is going to strive for a South African constitution which will: i

s, a2

s be based on universal adult franchise;

25 enshrine the principles which assure the continued existence of a multi-Party democracy;

devolve power downwards to maximise the decision-making autonomy of first and second tier levels of government;

provide for minority group protection;

immunise South Africa from all possible abuses of minority group protection for the broader democracy as a whole and which will ensure that the majoritarian principle in politics is not destroyed by minority group protection;

provide for an entrenched Bill of Rights beyond Party political manipulation, even by the Party in power;

provide for a truly independent judiciary which will, amongst other things, be given the right to adjudicate in disputes between the people and the Parties and the Government SO that the sovereign right of the people to remove governments are protected;

structure the Houses of Parliament and give shape and form to second and third tier levels of government in such a way that the more contentious the issue is, the more difficult it will be to pilot it through a series of checks and balances before it is embodied in law;

only exclude criminals, the insane and those under age from full participation in the political system;

in idiom provide for the kind of consensus politics in which the majoritarian principle is softened and kept from becoming contemptuous of minority groups that do exist.

11. harmonise with the spirit of contract essential to an enterprise-driven economy.

Tactics and Strategies

If policies are the instruments to achieve goals, tactics and strategies are instruments to remove the obstacles in the implementation of policy. When it comes to tactics and strategies, the IFP is guided by the fact that democratic objectives can only be achieved through democratic means. Revolutions and liberation wars are waged to topple governments and to replace them with an authoritarian government formed by revolutionaries after victories. Revolutions and liberation wars are not fought to establish the right of others to form a government.

In contrast with this, the IFP sees itself as a Party amongst Parties and it strives to establish the circumstances in which it or any other Party could - in theory and in practice - form a government if sufficient people support them.

Inkatha Freedom Party has been committed to non-violent democratic opposition to apartheid from the time it was founded. It remains committed to non-violence in the production of the new South Africa. It is internally democratic and it is led by people who were elected to office by ordinary members. The IFP rejects the politics of coercion and it rejects those who claim to be leaders but who have no constituencies.

Democracy in opposition or democracy in the government of a country must be expressed in the behaviour of leaders elected to office by constituencies. Unless tactics and strategies are non-violent and democratic, no set of leaders has the right to claim that they represent people. If they do not represent people, they should not be in politics, they should not be in the politics of negotiation and they should certainly not be in government.

In this regard, the IFP has grave difficulties with those who employ tactics and strategies and who are ultimately backed by violence. Even threats to resort to backing up tactics and strategies by violence are for us totally unacceptable.

Tactics and strategies should be democratic means of implementing policies to achieve national goals. They should be formulated in putting the good of the State before the good of the Party, and they should not be instruments through which political parties seek competitive advantages over other political Parties, regardless of what is good for the State.

Democracy and mandates

It is constituencies which mandate leaders and give them the right to pursue the objectives and to employ the tactics and strategies that they pursue and employ. There are going to be heated disputes between negotiating Parties about what is best and who should have the right to pursue the best in the name of the people. Unless these disputes are taken to the people, there will be no democracy. Negotiations cannot succeed if it is not possible for leaders to seek mandates and to report back to constituencies to seek endorsement for what they are doing.

We need normalised relationships between political Parties and we need the recognition by all Parties that every Party should be afforded untrammelled opportunity to present its case to the people and to seek endorsement.

Inkatha Freedom Party has grave difficulties in conceiving of negotiations taking place in a situation in which free access to any area or any community anywhere is not possible.

I told previous Heads of State in this country that until they are free and able to contend with black political Parties in Black areas for endorsement, there will be no democracy. While Whites are represented by Whites because they are white, and Blacks are represented by Blacks because they are black, there will be no democracy. If Whites elect Whites because they want to elect Whites and if Blacks elect Blacks because they want to elect Blacks, then we could have a democracy.

We labour this point because what a minority group is and how we define its protection is going to be very problematic. As far as the IFP is concerned, there can be no statutory definitions of who belongs to what group. We like the kind of approach which the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba adopted to group definition. Groups must Dbe groups because people come together to form them.

The whole process of group formation, group definition and group interaction will be central to emerging democracy. We believe that the more reconciliatory politics becomes, the less rigid group definitions will be by practise. And the more leaders attempt and fail to get endorsements across colour lines, the more leaders of similar colour to their constituencies will be acceptable.

South African society is not homogenous. Group dimensions do exist and at times group dimensions have territorial imperatives. We say let the people decide the group composition of South Africa and let the territorial imperatives emerge from ordinary people in day-to-day politics.

There will be no democracy without mandates and there will be no mandates without constituencies. And there will be no natural constituencies in South Africa unless we make the difficult transition from defining groups as apartheid did by race and skin colour, to group definition by the people. This will facilitate consensus politics and the formation of constituencies the people endorse for the purposes of defining constituencies.

South Africa today

There are raging battles for minds going on in South Africa and to put names to things towards the right of centre-stage politics, the Conservative Party is waging a relentless war against the National Party in its search for Afrikaner political endorsement. To the left of centre-stage politics, the ANC is waging a relentless war against Inkatha Freedom Party in its search for Black political endorsement. [This is true however much the ANC claims to be colour blind in its search for support.] We see the Conservative

Party desperately trying to hasten its challenge to the National Party to force another Whites-only election on the National Party and to so confuse White thinking that the Conservative Party maximises its prospects of doing well in an election to be held not later than 1994. The ANC on the other hand is likely to consume time to delay negotiations.

We have therefore the anomaly of successes on the ANC side being grist to Conservative Party political mills. This is true not only on the time side. The more successful the ANC is in becoming perceived as the dominating political force capable of seizing power if necessary, the more the backlash to it will favour the Conservative Party.

Right-wing politics does not augur well for negotiations and the ANC's politics pursuing its Harare Declaration blue-print both exacerbates right-wing problems and presents its own left-wing

problems. These dominantly run around the theme of establishing the ANC as a powerful, centralised, authoritarian structure in government. The ANC does not want a true democracy in which it is

a Party amongst Parties, having to fight for its right to exist and having to work within a system which gives people not only the right but the ability to marginalise it if they so choose.

The ANC will want to ride the crest of the euphoria wave that it has been on since you, Mr. President, made your February 2nd parliamentary speech and followed it up with action. They will want to ride on to be the moving force which establishes a Constituent Assembly and they want to go down in history being sufficiently powerful to coerce the South African Government into accepting the Constituent Assembly notion and to hand over power to

K 18

~

The ANC sees itself as an equivalent to Frelimo and the MPLA which came home as governments returned from exile. It might well be that even before negotiations really get off the ground, there will have to be some kind of test of who the ANC is and whether it does have the mass support that it itself assumes to be the case in formulating its aims and objectives and its tactics and strategies.

Sharply defined political issues lie behind the obscurities we are referring to. The Conservative Party is claiming that it is being mandated to remove the National Party from power and is adopting tactics and strategies based on the assumption that the National Party does not have the mandates it is acting on. The ANC is claiming that it has a mandate to negotiate for its own objectives as defined in the Harare Declaration and has the mandate to resort to seizing power if necessary. Both the Conservative Party and the ANC are ready to move in the direction of coercive politics to force show-downs.

We must shed these dimensions of South African politics if negotiations capable of finally eliminating apartheid and establishing a democratic constitution, have a chance of success. How one eliminates these dimensions without risking everything in a premature referendum before the public have been properly informed in circumstances which make it possible for political Parties to seek mandates, is of course a problem.

There are no political roads leading over sure ground for any of us. The acceptance and management of risk is before all of us and what should be done, and how it should be done, to manage the risk factor, will itself be problematic.

Inkatha Freedom Party would very much prefer there to be tests of the who's who in politics prior to negotiations. If the National Party is due to be endorsed out of existence by the White electorate, then that is something we ought to know about sooner rather than later. If the ANC is capable of establishing itself in a one-Party, Socialist State, the sooner we begin opposing it for what it is, the better. Too much soft-footing, too much hesitancy, too great a fear of risk and regarding the politics of negotiation as too tender, are all dangerous. South Africa is either ready to negotiate, or it is not. The readiness of the people for negotiations is, in IFP's opinion, undoubted. The people must be given the negotiations they want or they will get a government they do not want.