

AS 1943 - S_7_

7
4

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION TO MR BUDDY HAWTON, CHIEF
EXECUTIVE OF SAFMARINE AND RENNIES HOLDINGS LIMITED

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

ULUNDI : 20TH JULY, 1993

Mr Hawton, it gives me great pleasure to talk to you on what is the IFP's position on negotiations and where we hope to take South Africa in the future. Although this meeting was requested by you I thought it was equally important for me to explain to you what the correct position is in relation to what is happening in South Africa just now.

It is always for me an honour and a pleasure to be able to talk to our country's businessmen, for I and my party, the Inkatha Freedom Party, see you as vital in our quest to secure a democratic and prosperous future for our country. It is our belief that while South Africa's politicians might do their best to secure a negotiated settlement which will ensure peace and democracy, it is only you who can give force to these goals through economic growth and prosperity.

It is in this very light that the IFP is perturbed by events taking place at the World Trade Centre. It is our view that if the job of laying the foundation for a prosperous future rests squarely on the shoulders of our negotiators and politicians, then they have shirked that responsibility. This is because it is obvious that the route that they are taking us will not lead to peace and democracy that we all yearn for, but instead conflict and chaos. It is a route which will make the creation of a climate for sustainable economic growth impossible.

Two weeks ago, the IFP walked out of talks in protest over the setting of an election date. This drastic action was not in reaction to the setting of an election date per se, but the setting of an election date before our negotiators have decided on a new constitution and before any decision was made on what the form of the future South African state will take. This was not the only reason for our decision. Behind our move was also our objection to the wording of a Negotiation Forum Resolution which wrongly and prematurely instructed the Technical Committee on Constitutional Matters to draw up a draft constitution for an interim period.

At the crux of our approach to the setting of an election date are two simple questions: How on earth can we set an election date before we know what we will be voting for? And how are we in South Africa to achieve peace, economic growth and justice if decision-making is made on the basis of sufficient consensus. The concept of sufficient consensus has no precedence and was adopted to ride over the objections of political foes. In this way it ensures that the ANC will get its way at negotiations. Our allies, the COSAG group, are not the only political force which objects to decision-making made on a sufficient consensus basis. The PAC, too, has opposed decision-making based on this criteria.

Our objection to decision-making based on sufficient consensus is simple. We ask the question: What are we negotiating for if the objections of major political players can be got around through a simple vote of all participants to the process? We are not talking about coming to an agreement to secure us a new just and democratic constitution but merely achieving oneâ\200\231s goals at all costs. Â£ decision-making is made on such a basis we can forget about achieving a constitution which will have the confidence of all of South Africaâ\200\231s people. In so doing we can forget about achieving long lasting peace and prosperity.

Yet it is the IFPâ\200\231s view that if the decision to set an election date before the form of state was decided was a temporary lapse of sanity then it might be forgiven. However, . It 'is far from that. Sadly, our entire negotiations process has been bedeviled with the winner-takes all mentality of the ANC - a mentality which might have been excusable in the o0ld South Africa, but which has no place in the forging of a new South Africa.

This is not all that the IFP and other parties who are anxious to achieve democracy are faced with. In their quest for power, the ANC has secured secret deals with their former arch-foes, the National Party, through such innocuously sounding agreements such as the Record of Understanding. Far from recoiling at the thought of sharing power with an organisation which they fought with for decades, these deals suit the National Party down to the ground, in that it gives them an opportunity to remain in government - albeit as a junior partner of the ANC.

.But where does this leave South Africa? Are we to endure another 45 years of authoritarian rule but this time under an ANC government? Worse still, are we to be condemned to further economic stagnation and poverty?

In objecting to the undemocratic ways of the ANC and highlighting the connivance between the ANC and the Government we have been severely criticised by the press. For our troubles we have been labelled as "afraid of democracy" and spoilers. But let me assure you that we have not taken our position because we are spoilers. Nor have we taken this position to upstage any of our negotiating partners. Rather it lis our sincere belief that the route down which the ANC is taking South Africa will not lead to the Jusk, democratic and prosperous country which we, and indeed which many other organisations, have fought so long and hard for. Instead it will condemn us to continued conflict and chaos.

The Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging stormed the World Trade Centre because they felt that their calls for the right to rule themselves were falling on deaf ears. The threat that this organisation poses will not simply disappear but can be expected to grow as we approach elections for a democracy. If we are to have peace in our country then we will need to accommodate these people and any others who demand the right to rule themselves.

That lis not to say that we should resort back to the dark days of apartheid and separate development. Rather, it is the IFPâ\200\231s belief that the needs and aspirations of the Afrikaner can be accommodated in a manner which is consistent with majority rule through federalism. Federalism, we believe, is the only form of government

which can fairly and democratically confront the anomalies and tensions within our pluralistic and divided society. It ' is.â\200\234 the only form of government which can accommodate the complexity of South African society and cater for the necessity of durability and stability in the future. These goals could never be achieved by following the Constituent Assembly route the ANC is demanding.

The ANCâ\200\231s call for a popularly elected Constituent Assembly, elected on a unitary basis could only mean that centralised power will be entrenched in a new constitution. It is the IFP belief, borne from experience, that the election of a central, unitary body while valid in a homogenous society, could never achieve sustainable peace and democracy in a plural society such as ours.

Our objection to a popularly elected Constituent Assembly is not of recent vintage but goes back a long way. The IFP rejected the ANCâ\200\231s Harare Declaration where it was decided that an elected constituent assembly would be set-up as South Africaâ\200\231s constitution-making body. It was at that time that the ANC was hell-bent on seizing power and was in no way prepared to share power. The Constituent Assembly therefore reflects the politics of confrontation of a by-gone era. It therefore cannot be seen as a credible alternative for the new South Africa.

This is not our only reason for rejecting this option. It â\200\230is+-our firm belief that such a body cannot come up with a constitution which will satisfy the fundamental needs of our diverse society and a constitution which will withstand the test of time. Rather we can expect the constitution which it will draw up will be flawed, inadequate and one which will reflect vulgar popularism of a liberation politics which desperately tries to appease the whims of the radical youth. Crucially, it is our firm belief that the constitution which will be agreed to by this body will not give force to the need for self determination amongst our plural and diverse society. Without this prerequisite we have a recipe for disaster. :

The pre-occupation with a constituent assembly is not the only objectionable aspect of the ANC constitutional proposals. Today, the ANC, along with . their new-found allies - the South African Government, are insisting that our transition to democracy take in a two-stage transitional process. This process has as its basic elements the setting of an election date, the establishment of Transitional Executive Councils and an agreement on the notion of an interim constitution which would act as an enabling mechanism to empower a Constituent Assembly after elections.

In terms of their constitutional proposals, the ANC and the National Party Government are prepared to go into elections before a final, complete and fully fledged constitution for South Africa is drafted. After the elections for a constituent assembly these two parties will share power for five years. The final constitution would then only be drafted after elections and the empowerment of a power-sharing cabinet.

Yet this would create a second stage of transition. The drafting of South Africaâ\200\231s final constitution would be left to a constitution-making body with no deadline to complete it. We could therefore be left in a situation where constitutional negotiations could be dragged on for years without end. What this will do for

our already violent and conflict-ridden society, I shudder to think. Certainly it can be said that the already endemic violence will worsen and destroy what little confidence we have left amongst our battered business community.

Unfortunately our businessmen, through no choice of their own, have had to endure first apartheid, then ANC-inspired sanctions, mass action and consumer boycotts. With the ANC/NP proposals they will therefore be subject to further uncertainty.

Yet the threat of violence would not only emanate from the economic hardship which will be imposed on our long-suffering people, it would almost certainly come from the heightened potential for political conflict which is inherent in the powersharing agreement between the Nationalists and the ANC. Both are organisations which share a deep distrust and hatred for each other. The conflict which is inevitable between these two organisations can be expected to cause a breakdown in rule and delay our transition to true democracy and prosperity.

In the interests of bringing about a speedy resolution to our constitutional dilemma and in the interests of uplifting our people, we in the IFP reject this two-stage transition process. We believe such a process will serve only to subject South Africans to needless suffering and hardship. If we are to bring our people up from the depths into which poverty and hunger has driven them, then we will need to speed up our political transformation.

We therefore believe that South Africa's complete constitution be written now. We see no need for a two stage process. We feel that there is no reason why a final constitution cannot be written by acceptable constitutional experts, endorsed by an all-inclusive Multi-Party Negotiating Forum and accepted by South Africa's people through a referendum by the constitutional deadline of September 1994 without resorting to any type of transitional or intermediate arrangements.

So you see, it is the IFP position far more than any other party's, which will see us achieve democracy in our country far sooner. However, this is not seen by the ANC-leaning press. For them we have succeeded in getting our own way and therefore our decision to withdraw from negotiations was shifting the goal posts.

Let us destroy this fabricated lie. For one thing, the press argue that we have wrung from the ANC our long-demanded concession that South Africa's constitution be written by a multi-party negotiating forum rather than by an elected constituent assembly. While they are ready to admit that a constituent assembly will come into force after elections in April, they argue that it will be so constrained by the comprehensive set of principles which are to be agreed to between now and then, that the constituent assembly will be able to do little more than improve on the grammar of the interim constitution.

We in the IFP reject this naive view. What will stop the Constituent Assembly from ignoring the interim constitution under the excuse that it was written by an unelected body and was therefore inconsistent with democracy. Also, - if the Stalinist tendencies within the ANC are anything to go by, this interim constitution which the Nationalist Party is so set on approving, will not be worth the paper it is written on.

We therefore see the ANC's call for a popularly elected constituent assembly as entrenching centralised power in South Africa's first non-discriminatory constitution. We believe that any election process controlled at central level is, by its very nature unitary. For us, therefore, the constituent assembly route totally excludes federalism, because there is no case on record where a sovereign parliament on a unitary basis has produced genuine federalism. Indeed, such a body has always claimed for itself sufficient powers which enable it to overrule the rights of regional or state legislators.

The press ignores this experience and have accepted whole heartedly the bona fides of the ANC. They say that one of the principles which has been thrashed out and agreed to is that pertaining to a federal state. They argue that the ANC has committed itself to a constitutional dispensation where regional government's exercise original powers. Therefore, by deduction, a federal system of government has been agreed to all but in name only.

Again we cannot agree with this deduction. At my meeting with Mr Nelson Mandela, he said that there was no chance of federalism being set up in South Africa. What are we to make of the assurances of the press that we have achieved a federal dispensation if the leader of the ANC says otherwise?

It is therefore our belief that if we were to accept this process then all South Africa will end up with is a glorified provincial set-up. We all know how our present set-up has allowed the National Party to rule with impunity and with a disregard to the wishes of South Africa's people. The question one should ask is: do you want the future South Africa to be a repeat of the Old? Do you want a repeat of authoritarian, centralised rule but this time by the ANC? Do you want the impoverishment of Natal/KwaZulu to continue? According to the Deloitte and Touche report, the Natal/Kwazulu region has been underfunded in the vital areas of health, education and roads to the tune of R1.2 bn.

With the launch later this month of a regional economic forum to co-ordinate the development of Natal/Kwazulu, organised business has made it known that they are seeking to get support for its bid to remedy the gross underfunding of the region. It is however our view that unless we can secure a federal constitution for South Africa, Natal/Kwazulu will always remain at the mercy of central government's generosity. In setting up a federal system of government we will be able to determine our own development. In so doing, we will be able to control our own destiny.

_____ B s

*5527