

FOURTH SESSION OF THE FIFTH KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

C O N T I N U A T I O N O F
P O L I C Y S P E E C H
BY THE CHIEF MINISTER
MARCH 1992

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, I said:

"The first thing to say, of course, is that change in South Africa really is now irreversible and I would like to dwell on this fact because much of what some other Parties are doing, is being justified by the fear that the ruling National Party and the South African Government will renege on its now public national and international undertakings to bring about an open democracy.

There are still governments in the world which have not lifted sanctions because, they say, the intention to change South Africa which Mr FW de Klerk has signalled are insufficient and they are waiting for the final confirmation of change in the birth of a new democracy before they will lift all punitive measures against South Africa.

Inside South Africa there are still some who justify the retention of liberation armies and reserve rights to use the forcefulness of mass action politics instead of becoming totally immersed in constituency politics because change really is irreversible and there will be a new democracy.

Inkatha Freedom Party sees South Africa being driven by what amounts to an institutionalised demand for change. There is no 'real politik' outside the politics which is preparing South Africa for negotiations and heading the country towards a new, multi-Party democracy. Programmes of mass action requiring intimidation to make them work - as inevitably all mass action programmes do - are just not necessary and will not be tolerated for over long."

When overseas I found that it was necessary to be positive and optimistic and I had to tell the South African story as it actually is. The ANC tries to pass gloomy doom where ever it goes, because it wants the world to back it - the ANC - in preparing for the worst. Of course the ANC does not tell the world that it will be the ANC confrontationalism in politics, the retention of their private army and their commitment to mass action programmes rather than to constituency politics which will bring about the destruction of the negotiation process, if that ever takes place.

I am positive, and I told the Business International Conference:

"We thus have a situation in which the South African Government has committed itself to change and political Parties have committed themselves to work peacefully to make that change possible."

The world is still given to understand that the negotiation process may still not get off the ground. I told the Business Internatltnal Conference that this is not so and that:

"The real political issues now revolve around who should be in the driving seat of change and it is here that the IFP takes a different stance to the African National Congress and its allies."

I spoke with confidence because I know that there is no alternative negotiation. I said:

"The South African Government can now do nothing unilaterally. The political base on which its past monolithic powers rested, has already been destroyed. Institutionalised South Africa will not tolerate action by the South African Government, particularly if that unilateral action is retrogressive. The failure of the South African Government to bring about change through constructive moves forward, would also spell doom for it in the white electorate."

If we allowed the negotiation process now to gather momentum, and if all political parties began preparing to become just political parties amongst other political parties, putting a multi-party democracy into position - I would have no problem with my work in multi-party endeavours. We need the momentum. I agreed that there were right-wing backlashes, but it is progress that will defuse right-wing backlashes. I said:

"On the other hand, powerful moves forward in which all the major Parties co-operate will defuse right-wing fear and give evidence that Whites are wrong in believing there can be no dealing with black political forces in an open democracy."

Of course, whenever I am overseas I have to argue the need to look at economics as much as we are looking at politics to bring about a fair and just society. I constantly have to argue that politics and economics are two sides of one coin. I told the Business International Conference:

"The IFP also perceives the need for a future democracy to rest on a market-driven economy. We believe that a future government should be rigorous in ensuring that its interventionist action is goal-orientated and that the intervention will cease when goals are reached. There will have to be one or another degree of mix. The question is what that mix in the economy is going to be."

I also have to deal with the consequences of irresponsible ANC talk about economic matters. The world just does not know what to think of the ANC. It breathes hot and cold and says one thing one day and another thing the next day, about a free enterprise system for South Africa, about the redistribution of wealth, about the honouring of foreign debts and about the extent of government intervention in the economy which they favour.

I have to make the outside world understand that unless we make political victories meaningful to people in terms of increased standards of living for them, no democracy will last however well-founded we make it to begin with. I said:

"If we do not redistribute wealth, no government will stand for any length of time. Spreading mass poverty always is the mortal enemy of democracy. We already have common cause that this is the case. What one does about it, of course, gives rise to contentious issues.

Any political Party in government after apartheid and all political Parties in a coalition government or better still, a government of national unity, will face the political reality that there is just not enough wealth in the country to take from the haves and to give to the have-nots to make them satisfied. You cannot buy the satisfaction of the have-nots with all the wealth that there is amongst the haves.

There is also, I believe, very substantial agreement that the redistribution of wealth must not lead to the destruction of the productive capacity of the economy. We are very, very fortunate that our day of liberation is coming at a time in which there is international recognition that State ownership of all the means of production spells out disaster.

There is no major player in South Africa that is any longer talking about a State-controlled economy in a Socialist system. Market forces will have to operate and free enterprise will have to be the dominant driver in economic progress."

There is another matter which I find I have constantly to correct. The world often looks at South Africa and asks whether the ANC is doing what is right for the country, because they believe that that is what the ANC is attempting to do. They see some noble struggle taking place in which the ANC is trying to produce a South Africa which the world wants. They do not see the ANC, and indeed the government, playing power stake games in the midst of negotiations which they both know are inescapable.

I told the Businessmen at the Frankfurt Conference:

"The real threat to the whole negotiation process is to be found in the desire for political power. The IFP sees the ideal as being one in which the majority that does form a government after apartheid, is a multi-Party majority. We do not use the term 'government of national unity' because that implies some kind of arrangement by political Parties."

It would have been an easy option to retire gracefully at the end of a very illustrious political career. It would have been easy to be sung out of office. You chose the hard road to walk. You went there ahead alone where only you could go and with an epoch-making gesture of faith in your countrymen, you admitted electoral defeat and wished your successor well. That is the Kenneth Kaunda we know - a man and human being before being a politician.

These things I say to my friends and more, and I now say to you that we cannot experience the awesome aloneness of the decisions you took and the turn of events in the recent election. However you rose to meet the historic challenge of permitting an election in which somebody else would obtain a mandate to form a government, you must have hurt and hurt and hurt again deep inside where nobody can see.

It is my fervent hope that when you have had the time you need for yourself that you will come forth out of where you went to be in Africa with us and to take up the cause of Africa as a senior Statesman of very rare distinction.

Africa needs you. South Africa certainly needs you in Africa. You could stand up for democracy and decency in politics as few others, if any, could. Your integrity, your humility, your deep Christian convictions and your penetrating insight into the ways of man and society simply cannot be lost to us.

Far be it for me to make even one suggestion about what you ought to do. All I know is that we need you and ask you to give us of yourself. When I look at the future of South Africa I am afraid for what may happen. I am at once confident that South Africa's final victory over racism and white minority government will be a victory for the whole of Southern Africa and at the same time I fear for the future. I fear because not many countries in Africa have been able to continue the struggle after political victories over racism and colonialism and to grapple with the real issues of destiny - poverty, ignorance and disease and what to do about them.

How do we make South Africa's victory over apartheid and finally over violence and revolution and war, a victory for people so that they may know that politics does fill empty bellies? How do we so manage our victory over apartheid in this country that what happens here is epoch-making for the whole of Southern Africa and Central Africa beyond?

How do we go about fulfilling my life-long dream of living to see the vast economic backbone running down from Zaire through Zambian mineral deposits, through Zimbabwe and Botswana, and through South African mineral deposits right down to Cape Town? How can we make this economic backbone the reality which millions upon millions need it to be?

How do the countries of Southern and Central Africa get together in one huge sub-continental onslaught against the things that make the ordinary peasant and worker and the ordinary man and woman lead lives of misery and pain?

How do we make the whole of Southern Africa and Central Africa flourish as one vast region to do more than what Japan did after the war, more than what Taiwan did and more than what South Korea did after the Korean war? How do we raise up sons and daughters of Africa to go forth into the new world into which you have launched Zambia with the election that you permitted?

This letter is a letter of love and appreciation and I only ask the questions I ask because of whom else can I ask them? When there is a new government after apartheid I will see to it that you are honoured in South Africa for what you have been, what you are and what you will still become. Right now I can only say what I have said and mean every word of it.

May God really guide you and may He really keep you and may He uphold you in this time of the greatest ever testing of your strength.

With my deepest respect and affection,

MANGOSUTHU G BUTHELEZI

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, I think it would be appropriate if this House could pass a resolution expressing appreciation for Dr Kaunda's contribution to the development of Africa. I have seen him regularly down through the decades, and I look forward to him making his own unique contribution to the development of democracy in South Africa. Only two weeks ago, I addressed a Conference organised by the Institute for Multi-Party Democracy in Johannesburg, and I had the privilege of again meeting Dr Kaunda who had accepted an invitation to address the same Conference.

I believe, Mr Speaker, Honourable Members should know what I said to Dr. Kaunda. There is an ongoing development of South Africa's image and I believe that KwaZulu will now be able to come into its own as a contributor to a better understanding of South Africa. We must send missions into Africa and we must realise that the day for South African involvement in the OAU cannot now be very far off.

When I met Dr Kaunda this is the message I conveyed to him:

"Dr Kaunda, I would first like to express my great joy that you have come to South Africa to participate in deliberations here regarding a future democracy. The vastness of your experience, and the integrity of your political acumen will, I am sure, be beneficial to all those who are putting their heads together to talk about the new South Africa.

It is part of the excitement of today that world leaders like you who are so implacably opposed to apartheid, and who so staunchly supported opposition to apartheid here in this country, can now come to South Africa to participate in discussions such as those we are having here at this Conference.

You, Dr Kaunda, will go down in history as having made one of the bold moves in Africa to prepare for the twenty-first century. I believe your decision to introduce multi-partyism to Zambia, and your subsequent acceptance of the election outcome, will yet be recognised as the prophetic act that it was. We are honoured, Sir, that you have come to share your experience with us.

Our circumstances are very difficult and our ideals which are very high, are under threat. To have an elder statesman of Africa, such as yourself, showing the interest that you show in our struggle to establish democracy is gratifying indeed.

In looking at South Africa with you, Sir, I want to start off by making the statement that there is a need to see that the final achievement of democracy is the important thing and not its achievement by any one particular route. I say this because there is, right now, the danger that unrealistic expectations that negotiations will succeed and that we will have a transitionary situation in nine months leading to a fully fledged democracy soon after, will confound matters.

There is always a danger when drawing parallels. I remark, however, that final Zambian independence only came after a failed Central African Federation and that the Lancaster House Conference which set up the independence of Zimbabwe was long in the making through a number of failed attempts.

Tragically, there is the need for this warning. I say tragically because it is not pre-ordained that negotiations leading to an open multi-party race-free democracy will have to run a tortuous course. There is an astonishing upwelling of South African goodwill across all race groups, wanting South African political parties to get on with establishing the democracy in this country that the whole world is waiting for.

There is even, I believe, world wide consensus that we should have a multi-party democracy resting on the free enterprise system with only really necessary government intervention. There is agreement that we should have a small efficient government at the national level with massive devolved power downwards towards second and third tier levels of government.

There is very substantial agreement across all race groups and across all shades of political opinion that we need an entrenched Bill of Rights in the Constitution. There is agreement that a universal adult franchise system of voting should incorporate the principles of proportionality when it comes to deciding who will govern and who will form the executive of the government.

We are, in short, poised as a country to service the land of our birth under the guidance of a government of national unity. The political field is open to negotiations aimed at maximising constitutional and political stability so that we can get on with the process of the kind of economic reform that will make political victories meaningful to ordinary people in terms of increased standards of living for them.

With all this going for us, and against the additional fact that South Africa is the most industrialised country in Africa, with well founded economic infra-structures, well developed road, rail and harbour systems, well developed electricity and water supply systems and an efficient communications system, it is tragic that one still has to caution that the road to constitutional democracy may yet prove very difficult.

Ever since Mr de Klerk made his now famous February 2 address to Parliament, I have been arguing very strongly that we must reconcile South Africa's race groups during the process of negotiating a new democracy into being if we want to succeed. We must develop a national will to establish democracy and make it work.

I therefore argued strongly against winner takes all politics. South Africa is a divided society, and it is a plural society. We will not be able to get rid of the divisions that separate us from democratic success until we recognise the plurality of South African society. I do not repeat National Party propaganda that South Africa is a country of minorities. I do, however, argue that South African minorities are real and they will have to find a way of producing a democracy that will work. Winner takes all politics in all-or-nothing political battles will not help us find the way.

We must negotiate a new South Africa into existence. Force majeure politics by vast majorities will not succeed. The very first thing I say we must do, is to ensure that all the country's minority parties are joint participants in the political process and the negotiation process through which we are going to establish a new democratic order.

CODESA has risen out of the South African climate of opinion wanting, Sir, the democracy for this country that you and other international statesmen want for us. CODESA followed on the national peace moves which originated in the State President's Conference on Violence and Intimidation last year and culminated in the signing of the National Peace Accord on the 14th September, 1991.

CODESA is therefore legitimised as an outcome of important South African moves to make society amenable to the negotiation process which will establish a new democracy. I do not question CODESA's legitimacy. The IFP was fully involved in setting it up and is now fully involved in its workings. We are, however, compelled by our commitment to make CODESA work to caution against some things about which we have misgivings.

CODESA will survive or fall on the extent to which it remains rooted in consensus politics. I make a second statement. The outcome of work in CODESA will hinge on the extent to which its findings and recommendations find common acceptance across virtually the total South African political spectrum. Right now CODESA is insufficiently representative of South African political opinion to justify the pace it is setting for itself in thinking about real negotiations.

I pause, Dr Kaunda, to emphasise that we must get the change process and constitution making right the first time. We are living in a golden moment of history and astonishingly we, as South Africans, are capable of crossing party lines and colour lines to come together to take advantage of this golden moment.

If negotiations went wrong and established a government in a democratic dispensation which could not stand, I shudder to think of the consequences. Below the South African willingness to reach compromise solutions and to meet across party political differences, there are harsh realities which are there as consequences of nearly a century of racist rule following two centuries of colonialism. There are the harsh realities which are the consequence of the draconian measures which successive National Party governments employed to smash democracy. There are also the harsh realities which are there as the consequences of revolutionary thinking and practice.

Everywhere in black South Africa there is a sub-strata of intolerance and anger. Black South African society has been ripped apart by black on black violence. The cult of intolerance which now prevails in so many areas is a reality which we have to face.

If we do not get our Constitution making right the first time our failing will unleash very ugly consequences and I do not know how long it will take for us to sufficiently recover from failure before we can think of coming together again in circumstances which are as conducive as we now have.

I make these observations to stress the real importance of my statement that we must not allow CODESA to fail. It will fail if we rush headlong into the future without pausing to put right that which is wrong in CODESA. I met with Dr Treurnicht and some of his Conservative Party colleagues. My colleagues have met with other political leaders from the left and from the right political domains now excluded from the work of CODESA. We have argued with them that there is no political future for them and their followers outside of a future which can only be established by multi-party co-operation.

On the other hand I warned CODESA that it cannot succeed if it proceeds without the Conservative Party and the AWB from the right, or if it proceeds without the PAC and AZAPO from the left.

I have also warned that the levels of violence in South African society continue to be excessively high - prohibitively high in fact. The whole negotiation process is being held to ransom by the violence which is disrupting politics. We do not have the minimum degree of stability and political normality necessary for the negotiation process to succeed.

There is also not the acting out of normal practice between political parties necessary for them to be joint participants in a common negotiation process. The IFP and the ANC have not

met again since January 1991 when we met to sign the agreements and accords that we did come to. Those agreements and accords still remain disrupted by the action of the ANC following its Open Letter to the State President and the consequences of that Letter.

The ANC adamantly refused to meet with us right through the Peace process which culminated in the signing of the National Peace Accord on the 14th September last year. We went into the Preparatory Committee which set up CODESA not having yet met. We participated in CODESA not having yet met. The ANC has accepted in principle that we need to meet again in the same way as we met on the 29th of January 1991, when the President of the ANC led his National Executive and when I led members of the Central Committee of the IFP.

Quite clearly, the ground must be level for all political players if multi-party democratic discussions are going to become fruitful. Violence by one party against another party must cease. We are not going to see any real progress in negotiations in this country unless all political parties really do put violence aside. You cannot put violence aside and maintain a private political army. That is what the ANC is doing in refusing to disband Umkhonto weSizwe as its military wing. Nor can we hope to proceed with any degree of success if political parties like the CP, and more particularly like the AWB, continue to encourage the evolution of an Afrikaaner revolutionary idiom in what they are doing.

The ANC's accusation that the IFP is surviving only because it has army and police trained assassination squads and military and para-military units is vile. Those accusations are totally unfounded. At no stage has the IFP ever turned to military or violent actions. In spreading mass violence members of all political parties are drawn into violence. But we have never as an organisation and at leadership level made a decision to set up assassination squads or military wings.

We cannot do as the ANC is doing - maintain a private army, continue training military personnel, continue holding caches of arms and ammunition scattered around the length and breadth of the country and blame the IFP as surviving on military action and at the same time pretend to want to normalise relationships and work in concert in CODESA.

It is good, I think, that we will now see who leads who in white society. The pause by Mr FW de Klerk to hold a Referendum to see whether he has a mandate to do what he is doing from the people who elected him into office could yet well prove to be constructive.

We need more pausing to settle more issues which threaten the CODESA process.

We have already talked about the need to make CODESA more representative and the need to normalise politics to make a representative CODESA work. I know that I cannot touch on all the important issues we face in South African politics but, Dr Kaunda, I must go on to argue for the need to pause and take stock of what is happening in CODESA.

We went to the Preparatory Committee at the end of November to attend a Multi-Party Conference to talk about how to structure negotiations and about the negotiation structures we would need to succeed. The Preparatory Conference was so astonishing in the extent to which political parties found it possible to talk to each other that the whole process was unduly hastened up.

The Preparatory Conference actually turned itself into CODESA and CODESA immediately turned it into a Constitutional Negotiation Forum. In a matter of two days CODESA rushed into endorsing a Declaration of Intent and Terms of Reference for five Work Groups and then setting up the structures to carry on.

We had the courage of our convictions to question this headlong rush into the future. We questioned the Declaration of Intent and some of the Terms of Reference and we are now questioning the mission that CODESA sees itself as having. We argue that the negotiation process must be one in which parties go to the negotiating table to negotiate and debate within the terms of mandates with which they went and then to frequently return to the constituencies from whom they got the mandates to seek confirmation that what they were doing was acceptable.

Here I want to pause and say that this is not possible right now, and this alone could cause us to slow down the CODESA process. There is just too much violence for CODESA to continue at its present rate of development.

Politically, and more importantly, we face the danger in CODESA that because some parties which have a black constituency agree with some parties which have a white constituency, people believe that there is black/white agreement on important issues. That is to ignore that a Constitution has, by its nature, to be all inclusive. There is failure to appreciate the need for universality as the main feature of a Constitution.

This is particularly dangerous when the whole world sees ANC/SAG-NP agreement being of paramount importance because the world assumes the government and the ANC talk for blacks and whites. Each political party, I argue, needs to sell its political thinking to every race group in this country. Mr de Klerk cannot even put his foot in black society to argue the merits of what he is doing.

Whereas the ANC can put its foot in white society, it is most certainly not in the position to gather white constituency support to any significant degree.

I look at the harsh reality that in membership terms, viewed against the total South African population, both the National Party and the ANC are insufficiently representative.

Even a major party in a settled democracy only on very rare occasions actually speaks for the majority of the people. The distinction between a dominant membership based party, and the

majority of the people of a country, needs to be made in the circumstances we face.

There is too much party politics, and there is too little constituency politics for us to be reaping the benefits that we should be able to reap from the existence of South African goodwill. There are no prospects whatsoever of South Africa slipping back to apartheid society. The whole country would go up in smoke before that could happen. Resistance would be prohibitively strong. There is only one way to go and that is forward - towards a multi-party democracy.

We urgently need confidence and success so that we can make a start on economic recovery and in parallel endeavours to reconstitute South African society. We cannot afford for CODESA to rush ahead beyond the mandate of its participating parties. We cannot afford for CODESA to fail. The best way to hasten the negotiation process is for us to pause now to put CODESA on track.

-----O-----

Of course, Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, when I wrote to Dr Kaunda after his election defeat, I also wrote to Mr Chiluba congratulating him on his victory. The following are excerpts of my letter to Mr. Chiluba, dated 7th November 1991:

"I write to congratulate you on your historic victory in the recent election in Zambia. Zambia is very important in Africa and it most certainly is very important to South Africa.

I am quite convinced that Zambia and South Africa are going to form a formidable team to put the whole of Southern Africa on the international economic map."

And:

"Right through my political career, I have been deeply aware that the balkanisation of Southern Africa by colonial forces has continued to have a terribly detrimental effect on the quality of life for many millions of people in Southern and Central Africa because there has been apartheid, and we could not put Southern Africa together.

Now that our day of liberation is in sight and now that we can be quite sure that apartheid is going to be eradicated and a multi-party democracy is going to be established in South Africa, we must turn our minds to what we here can do for and with the whole of Southern and Central Africa.

Together I am quite sure that the States of Southern and Central Africa can combine to do a lot more could be summed up in the total of what they would all do separately. There are preferential trade pacts to arrange; there are currency deals to be put together. There is international financing to be arranged and to be facilitated by the strength of the whole of Southern Africa acting as one economic block. There is the spread of technology and deeply symbiotic relationships between Southern and Central African States to establish."

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, I return to what I said abroad about South Africa. I am presenting the details of what I said, Mr Speaker, because it is vital that Members of the House have the opportunity of making an input into the kind of things I say. I do not go overseas to advance my own image and I often stress how important it is that I do not have the luxury of expressing personal opinions.

What I say abroad I say on behalf of Black South Africa and on behalf of KwaZulu. I tell the world what Black South Africa wants and I tell the world what KwaZulu wants. I convey Black perspectives to the world. Being a democrat I have to come back to check with those who support me at home, to make quite sure that they approve of what I did while I was abroad.

In November I undertook a trip to Switzerland, Belgium and Germany. In Switzerland I addressed a Conference at St. Gallen in Zurich on the theme "The Road Ahead for South Africa and the Role of Political Parties and the Influence of Economics".

In my opening statement I said that:

"When I look at the issues we face in South Africa in the context of South Africa in Africa, I am immediately aware that a third partner in anything that we do must be the EEC. There can be no real developments in South and Southern Africa which can take place quite outside European influences and in-puts."

I pointed out that there would be no solution for South Africa if we regarded ourselves as living in an island sufficient unto itself. I pointed out that:

"No country in the whole of Southern and Central Africa has completed its liberation course because there was a balkanisation of Southern Africa and colonial strangleholds put over what should have been sub-continental wide drifts of events and circumstances.

The struggle for liberation finally means a struggle against poverty, ignorance or disease once you have achieved political independence. A people cannot be free if they have a sovereign government that cannot govern for the benefit of the people because that sovereign government is hamstrung by its continental or sub-continental location and disadvantages. The final sovereign freedom of governments is only achieved in international contexts."

As always, I link economic development to the prospects of political stability and progress. I told the Conference at the University:

"I look at Africa and I see the political atrocities that have occurred, and I say to myself that no one can lay blame where

spreading mass poverty emerged as the mortal enemy of democracy and good intentioned governments never had a chance of success because they did not have the means to govern for the benefit of the people.

Spreading mass poverty will destroy the very best that we can possibly do in introducing a new constitution and establishing a democracy in South Africa. For me economics and politics are but two sides of a single coin."

When I am abroad I always try to put the political clashes which I have with the ANC in perspective. In Zurich, during this trip, I said:

"The political clashes which I have with the ANC on the one hand and the South African Government on the other hand, relate to the basic positions that I have been pointing to in what I have thus far said. The ANC wants to establish a strong, simple majoritarian government which it will lead. It seeks to entrench winner-takes-all politics in South African politics. It wants to fight all-or-nothing political battles so that it can finally hope to emerge as a government returned from exile. Dr Mandela does indeed talk about the ANC as a government-in-waiting."

We also these days, Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, must be very aware of the need that there is to make the world understand that unfettered majoritarianism in politics in plural societies does not work and ultimately can only be maintained by coercion in government action.

I am constantly astounded that the whole world cannot see the truth of this statement in the events of what used to be the USSR and East Europe. No more powerful attempt could have been made than to force total conformity on diverse populations than was the case in the Soviet Union and East Europe. The awesome power which lay behind the Soviet State was just not enough to secure long term success.

We face the difficult task of having to make the world understand that we must somehow combine South African diversity in the new democracy we are going to establish, but we just cannot do so by establishing a powerful central government which will be expected to deal with South African diversity as it sees fit.

There will be no prospects of lasting peace and the development of democracy to relieve dealing with minorities and ethnicity until after a new government is in position. We must build the necessary safeguards for minority rights into the new constitution.

In Switzerland I said:

"We dare not make the blunder of discounting the ethnic factor in the South African political situation. I am totally

opposed to racism and I will have nothing to do with any constitution which uses race as a guiding principle or which rests on racial cornerstones or uses racial building blocks.

I would have nothing to do with the Tricameral Parliament because it was racist in nature. I vehemently campaigned against the homeland policy because it was racist. Nothing short of total equality before the law and the constitution will suffice. South Africa's voters' rolls of the future must be completely race free. There must indeed, I say, not even be a legal and constitutional definition of race. The law and the courts must know no such thing as a black man, a white man, an Indian man or a Coloured man.

Cultures do exist, however. Idioms and ways of doing this and different world views giving rise to different slants of perception, do exist in different cultures. Regionalism is there as a reality. The idiom of democracy in South Africa must be an idiom tolerant of differences and the utilisation of differences to make power out of heterogeneity."

The theme of the Conference demanded that I emphasise the role of business in changing South Africa. I said that it was absolutely vital for the democratic future of the country for us to get the South African economy of the country working and productive. I said:

"Unquestionably this means doing two things - bringing in investment capital with the technology and the management skills that come with it, and increasing productivity and general efficiency in the management of economic matters, going in for beneficent developments and gaining access to international markets."

I outlined the general principles under which the IFP will shape its economic policy. I said:

"The general principles under which the IFP will shape its economic policy will be:

1. private ownership of property and the means of production;
2. allowing market forces freedom in the economy;
3. minimum intervention in the economy by the State;
4. the State's role in the economy to be facilitative and regulatory;
5. the promotion of competition in the economy;
6. the recognition of interdependence in all decision-making;
7. just distributions of income and wealth;
8. equal opportunity for all participants in the economy;
9. pragmatism in dealing with inequalities and imbalances;

10. the elimination of race and gender discrimination in the economy;
11. the development of the human potential of all South Africans."

And I added, in talking about increasing economic productivity and generating benefits for the masses in South Africa, that:

"At all costs, the IFP believes that we must avoid theoretical rarification in economic policy. We must be flexible and highly pragmatic. We must start off with existing productive sectors of the economy and we must bring about greater interim economic stability by conducting information campaigns designed to reduce unrealistic expectations, introduce mass subsistence income job creation schemes, give material attention to the more desperate areas of basic need, urgently commence with large-scale education and skills training programmes necessary to sustain growth and finally, establish an economic planning body to plan for the next stages of each implementation strategy."

Always, I find myself having to argue that there is danger in some tendencies towards socialism amongst some South African political parties. I said:

"We do not believe that this kind of economic policy will flow from any one-party State. It is the kind of economic policy which will only naturally go hand in hand with what one can perhaps call Western-style multi-party democracies."

From Switzerland I went to Brussels where I addressed journalists, audiences of businessmen and opinion makers, the Chamber of Commerce, a former Vice-First Minister and Minister of Justice of the Liberal Party.

Belgium has always been part of Scandinavia which has solidly backed the ANC and which has been most stringent in their support of the punitive isolation of South Africa. On this trip I found an altogether changed attitude towards South Africa in Belgium. I believe that KwaZulu can gain a great deal by developing as many links as possible with Belgium and particularly with big business in Belgium.

Wherever I went I found real interest and I was fortunate in meeting businessmen at the home of Mr Verbeke, who is an industrialist of considerable stature, who has made investments in KwaZulu. We must not under-estimate the importance of linking up with industrialists abroad who have got business connections with KwaZulu.

I was very fortunate on this Belgium trip to have had Dr. Marius Spies go ahead of me and prepare the way for discussions with

businessmen and investors. KFC has been superb in its performance in selling KwaZulu as a place where there are viable investment opportunities.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, most of us in this House have been in opposition politics a long time. We have been here in order to oppose apartheid. We have been here to destroy the South African Government's homeland policy. We have been here to keep a resistance base intact.

The very best that the ANC did, with the massive backing from Russia and its allies which they had, did not clear one square meter of South African territory of SADF and SAP control. There was not one liberated zone in the country. The ANC had no bases from which to operate inside South Africa.

Frelimo would never have won had they not had liberated areas inside Mocambique. NPLA and UNITA would not have won had they not had liberated zones from which to operate. There would not have been victories in Mocambique and Angola if adjoining territories had not provided Frelimo, NPLA and UNITA with military bases which could be used as springboards to open up liberated zones and then to service the activity which was then conducted from them. Robert Mugabe would not have won if he had not had adjacent Zambian bases from which to operate.

We in this House, Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, opened up a base of resistance for the only kind of fight which could have won and which in the end did win - the fight against apartheid and racism here on-the-ground in South Africa, using multi-strategy approaches in which each political organisation and other resistance organisations played complimentary roles to what you were playing.

It was KwaZulu and finally KwaZulu alone, which actually broke up the South African Government's homeland policy and made it impossible for Mr Voster and then Mr Botha to achieve the objective of establishing a Confederation of Southern African States.

Had KwaZulu opted to join Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Transkei by accepting Pretoria's offer of so-called independence, so-called independence would have become real independence and our joining the scheme of things would have made the pursuit of a Confederation of Southern African States a real politic. (check)politik?

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, had we and had the Zulu people not been principled and had we not retained our deep conviction that what we were doing was right and that we would win in the end, we would have dumped the ANC and gone for independence and achieved a very dominant role in a Confederation of Southern African States.

I have never said that before, but that is the reality of it. It was our refusal to betray the struggle for liberation which laid the foundations for the victory which is now being won. Dr Mandela knows this, and Mr de Klerk knows this. What Mr de Klerk is now doing, became possible because we prepared the way for the politics of negotiation.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, a rage starts to rise in me when I think of what we did for just on two decades to bring about today's politics and now, in the hour of South Africa's glory which we helped to establish, KwaZulu is spurned and His Majesty is spurned and we are not even permitted entry into the negotiating chambers.

A rage rises in me when I think that during the last two years, the ANC continues its attempts to lord it over us and to treat us as small boys in politics.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, I was utterly outraged in October last year when the ANC effectively blocked my presence in the proceedings of the meetings of the Commonwealth in Harare. The ANC and PAC were invited to address the Commonwealth. They went and they did so but the ANC blocked me from doing so.

This has been going on ever since Inkatha was formed in 1975. Everywhere in the world, the ANC did whatever they could do to stop me visiting Heads of State and travelling freely abroad. For years, everywhere I went, the ANC would go ahead and organise anti-apartheid groups to demonstrate against me and to say the most despicable things about me, about the IFP and particularly about KwaZulu.

"Homeland politics" was dragged through the middens, spat upon, and I take the unprecedented step of using words like 'shat upon' because that is actually what took place. It did, of course, mostly not succeed. Every year during my political life I have been abroad, and seen the most powerful Heads of State in the world. Every year my senior lieutenants have been abroad and they too have seen powerful leaders in many, many countries.

With nothing, with no resources, with no offices to represent us and with no roving ambassadors, we maintained a presence in Africa, Europe, North America and the Far East. The worst that the ANC did to block us actually failed. The worst they did marred what we were trying to do.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, despite the worst that the ANC did, I received invitations from Heads of State in Europe, North America and Africa. I was even invited to Moscow but the ANC managed to block the trip to Russia.

Despite the worst that was done by the ANC, Inkatha became known and every editor in every population in every country knew who we

were and what we were doing. Inkatha's name and my name became a household name in the countries of the world. But the damage was done.

When Dr Mandela was released from jail and the ANC was unbanned, I (check) anamiously thought that these things would then end. I wrote to Dr Mandela, congratulating him on his release, and even held a mass Prayer Rally in Durban giving thanks to the Almighty for Dr Mandela's release. In a Rally which he held in Durban, Dr Mandela paid tribute to what I had done to gain his release. In the meeting between the ANC Executive and IFP Central Committee, he explicitly stated to everybody there that he appreciated what I had done to gain his release, and he appreciated what we had done to oppose apartheid and the Homeland policy.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, then of course there was the trampling under foot of what we agreed to in Durban when we met with the ANC in April, when the ANC published its Open Letter to the State President smashing any bond which could have been in the process of being developed. The hideous physiological war against the IFP was again declared and then there was the stepping up of the killing of IFP office bearers.

It was in this resurgence of hate for the IFP and the resurgence of violent action against the IFP, that I was told that the ANC had blocked me from attending the Harare Commonwealth meeting. Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, this House must know what the ANC has done to denigrate me and to call everyone of you here lackies and sellouts and traitors to the cause of the struggle.

I have friends in important places, and I always hear what goes on. I know that I was blocked. When I heard that I had been blocked, I wrote to General Ibrahim B. Babangida who would be presiding over the Commonwealth Meeting in Harare, and I also wrote to Mr John Major, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and to Dr Kenneth Kaunda, then President of Zambia.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, these are the letters that I wrote:

General Ibrahim B Babangida
President
Commander-in-Chief
Armed Forces of Nigeria
State House
Lagos
Nigeria

10th October 1991

Ref : 4409

Mr President,

Mr President, I am writing to you as a matter of some urgency about the Commonwealth invitation to the Presidents of the ANC and PAC to address members of the Commonwealth in Harare next week.

My discussions with General Olusegun Obasanjo and more recently with General Mahommed have encouraged me to take this step of writing to you. Nigeria is powerful in Africa and in the Commonwealth and the interest that you, Mr President, are displaying to assist in the process of normalising relationships between anti-apartheid political Parties and organisations in South Africa, is very welcome. It is my hope that this interest of yours, Mr President, will lead you to intervene successfully in the matter I am writing about. It really is vitally important for internal political reasons that the ANC and the PAC are not selectively endorsed by the Commonwealth to the exclusion of Inkatha Freedom Party.

I only heard about the invitation yesterday and it is therefore with some haste that I have to act. I do not even know whether this letter will reach you before you leave for Harare. I will in any event send a copy of this letter to your diplomatic mission in Harare.

The exclusion of Inkatha Freedom Party from the Commonwealth endorsement amounts to its participation in South African Party politics. For the years that the ANC and PAC were in exile and were given observer status by the United Nations and the OAU, I made no objections to their privileged position.

The situation is, however, now very different. They are not in exile. Their organisations are not banned. The foundations of apartheid have been broken up and we are busy dismantling the last of it and throwing its pieces away. The continued selective endorsement of the ANC and PAC is now quite inappropriate.

Dr Nelson Mandela, Mr FW de Klerk and myself are, by widespread agreement, the three major actors in the unfolding South African drama of burying apartheid and raising up a new democratic South Africa. The PAC is historically and sentimentally important and they must have a role to play in the creation of a new South Africa, but to include the PAC in a Commonwealth endorsement and to exclude the IFP is very wrong. The PAC is a small Party and has not even been a participant in the peace process and did not sign the National Peace Accord.

There is in South Africa no Party suing for peace, there are no victors and there are no vanquished. There should only be leaders and Parties who are putting the interests of the country first and who are seeking to establish a multi-Party democracy in such a way that reconciliation comes during the transitional process. If we cannot become reconciled sufficiently to normalise political relationships between South African political Parties, we will not get very far down the road towards a multi-Party democracy.

We need a multi-Party democracy in which every Party is assured of freedom to campaign for support and to fight elections if the warring factions in South African society are to be brought together in peace. We will also need mechanisms of reconciliation between race groups if we are going to succeed in establishing a multi-Party democracy. If the Commonwealth endorses one political alliance in South Africa

it will add to the many difficulties which have already mounted up to produce problems of considerable magnitude.

The ANC has a democratic right to pursue policies and to adopt tactics and strategies of its choice but the IFP has the same right. The selective invitation to Dr Mandela and Mr Makwetu to address members of the Commonwealth is in fact unfair on Commonwealth countries. Commonwealth countries need to hear IFP perspectives as much as they need to hear ANC and PAC perspectives.

I have also written letters in similar vein to President Kenneth Kaunda and to Mr John Major in the hope that a lobby could be set up to ensure that I am invited to the Commonwealth meeting. If it is too late now to do so, it would be my sincere hope that you, Mr President, could assist by raising the matter at a suitable point on the agenda.

I feel particularly strongly about this issue, Mr President, because South Africa should be at the Commonwealth meeting. I experienced great anger when Dr Verwoerd removed South Africa from the Commonwealth. It would, I believe, be the right thing in this interim phase of South Africa's development, for members of the Commonwealth to hear Inkatha Freedom Party's views on South African politics and the role that we believe South Africa should play in Africa and in the Commonwealth.

We will need the power of Nigeria in Southern Africa after we have eradicated apartheid and we are re-constituting economic and political ties in the sub-continent. I wish you well in your deliberations, Mr President, and I look forward to the outcome of your inputs to the Commonwealth meeting.

I have the honour to remain, Mr President,

Yours sincerely,

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI
President Inkatha Freedom Party

The Hon John Major
Prime Minister of Great Britain
10 Downing Street
London
SW1
United Kingdom

10th October 1991

Ref : 4408

Mr Prime Minister,

Mr Prime Minister, I am making an urgent and direct appeal to yourself to intervene and correct the imbalance which the selective invitations to the the Presidents of the ANC and the PAC to address members of the Commonwealth has created.

I only heard about the invitation yesterday and it is therefore with some haste that I have to act. I do not even know whether this letter will reach you before you leave for Harare. I will in any event send a copy of this letter to you through your High Commissioner in Harare, Mr Prime Minister.

The exclusion of Inkatha Freedom Party from this endorsement amounts to Commonwealth participation in South African Party politics. For the years that the ANC and PAC were in exile and were given observer status by the United Nations and the OAU, I made no objections to their privileged position.

The situation is, however, now very different. They are not in exile. Their organisations are not banned. The foundations of apartheid have been broken up and we are busy dismantling the last of it and throwing its pieces away. The continued selective endorsement of the ANC and PAC is now quite inappropriate.

Dr Nelson Mandela, Mr FW de Klerk and myself are, by widespread agreement, the three major actors in the unfolding South African drama of burying apartheid and raising up a new democratic South Africa. The PAC is historically and sentimentally important and they must have a role to play in the creation of a new South Africa, but to include the PAC in a Commonwealth endorsement and to exclude the IFP is very wrong. The PAC is a small Party and has not even been a participant in the peace process and did not sign the National Peace Accord.

There is in South Africa no Party suing for peace, there are no victors and there are no vanquished. There should only be leaders and Parties who are putting the interests of the country first and who are seeking to establish a multi-Party democracy in such a way that reconciliation comes during the transitionary process. If we cannot become reconciled sufficiently to normalise political relationships between South African political Parties, we will not get very far down the road towards a multi-Party democracy.

We need a multi-Party democracy in which every Party is assured of freedom to campaign for support and to fight elections if the warring factions in South African society are to be brought together in peace. We will also need mechanisms of reconciliation between race groups if we are going to succeed in establishing a multi-Party democracy. If the Commonwealth endorses one political alliance in South Africa it will add to the many difficulties which have already mounted up to produce problems of considerable magnitude.

The ANC has a democratic right to pursue policies and to adopt tactics and strategies of its choice but the IFP has the same right. The selective invitation to Dr Mandela and Mr Makwetu to address members of the Commonwealth is in fact unfair on Commonwealth countries. Commonwealth countries need to hear IFP perspectives as much as they need to hear ANC and PAC perspectives.

Mr Prime Minister, I have stated on a number of occasions to your predecessor, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, and to British Cabinet Ministers, that I am convinced Britain has a particularly important role to play in the establishment of democracy in South Africa. It is more than Britain being an honest broker of some considerable importance. It was Britain that locked South Africa into a north/south economic and

diplomatic axis and the best that there is in South Africa is there because Britain left it behind. It is in this context that I am appealing to you.

I have also written letters in similar vein to President Kenneth Kaunda and to General Ibrahim Babangida in the hope that a lobby could be set up to ensure that I am invited to the Commonwealth meeting. If it is too late now to do so, it would be my sincere hope that you, Mr Prime Minister, could assist by raising the matter at a suitable point on the agenda.

I feel particularly strongly about this issue, Mr Prime Minister, because South Africa should be at the Commonwealth meeting. I experienced great anger when Dr Verwoerd removed South Africa from the Commonwealth. It would, I believe, be the right thing in this interim phase of South Africa's development, for members of the Commonwealth to hear Inkatha Freedom Party's views on South African politics and the role that we believe South Africa should play in Africa and in the Commonwealth.

I wish you a good Commonwealth meeting, Mr Prime Minister. There are troubled times ahead for South Africa and what happens in South Africa will have implications for the whole of Southern Africa and Africa beyond. The inputs that you are going to make are going to be needed.

I remain, Mr Prime Minister, sincerely yours,

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI
President Inkatha Freedom Party

and:

H.E. Dr Kenneth Kaunda
President of the Republic of Zambia
State House
Lusaka
Republic of Zambia

10th October 1991

Ref : 4407

Your Excellency,

I have only now come to learn that the President of the PAC and the ANC have been invited to address members of the Commonwealth who will be gathering next week in Harare. I am writing to you, Mr President, as a highly respected elder Statesman in Africa to appeal to you to explain to your Commonwealth colleagues how inappropriate this selective endorsement of ANC and PAC political positions in South Africa is.

The exclusion of Inkatha Freedom Party from this endorsement amounts to Commonwealth participation in South African Party politics. For the years that the ANC and PAC were in exile and were given observer status by the United Nations and the OAU, I made no objections to their privileged position.

The situation is, however, now very different. They are not in exile. Their organisations are not banned. The

foundations of apartheid have been broken up and we are busy dismantling the last of it and throwing its pieces away. The continued selective endorsement of the ANC and PAC is now quite inappropriate.

Dr Nelson Mandela, Mr FW de Klerk and myself are, by widespread agreement, the three major actors in the unfolding South African drama of burying apartheid and raising up a new democratic South Africa. The PAC is historically and sentimentally important and they must have a role to play in the creation of a new South Africa, but to include the PAC in a Commonwealth endorsement and to exclude the IFP is very wrong. The PAC is a small Party and has not even been a participant in the peace process and did not sign the National Peace Accord.

There is in South Africa no Party suing for peace, there are no victors and there are no vanquished. There should only be leaders and Parties who are putting the interests of the country first and who are seeking to establish a multi-Party democracy in such a way that reconciliation comes during the transitionary process. If we cannot become reconciled sufficiently to normalise political relationships between South African political Parties, we will not get very far down the road towards a multi-Party democracy.

We need a multi-Party democracy in which every Party is assured of freedom to campaign for support and to fight elections if the warring factions in South African society are to be brought together in peace. We will also need mechanisms of reconciliation between race groups if we are going to succeed in establishing a multi-Party democracy. If the Commonwealth endorses one political alliance in South Africa it will add to the many difficulties which have already mounted up to produce problems of considerable magnitude.

The ANC has a democratic right to pursue policies and to adopt tactics and strategies of its choice but the IFP has the same right. The selective invitation to Dr Mandela and Mr Makwetu to address members of the Commonwealth is in fact unfair on Commonwealth countries. Commonwealth countries need to hear IFP perspectives as much as they need to hear ANC and PAC perspectives.

Mr President, you have always had a particular insight into South African politics and a balanced understanding for what can and should be done in South Africa. I appeal to you, Mr President, to seek agreement from your colleagues that I too should be asked to go to Harare to present the IFP's views and perspectives of the South African situation.

In thinking about how to approach this issue, I decided that the best approach would have been for me to seek your advice about how best to proceed. Unfortunately, Mr President, as I have said, I have just come to hear about the invitations to the PAC and ANC and I am aware that Heads of State will be travelling to Harare over this coming week-end and there is no time for the ideal course of consulting you first and then acting.

Not being able to do this, Mr President, I have instead also written to General Ibrahim Babangida and Mr John Major. It is my earnest plea that even if you, Mr President, and they, cannot get agreement that I should be invited to address the Commonwealth meeting before it convenes, that you raise the matter at a suitable point in the proceedings so that at least the world will know that there are some in the Commonwealth who would disagree with the selective endorsement of the ANC and PAC.

Not knowing of your own travel plans, Mr President, and not knowing when this letter will actually reach Lusaka, I have taken the liberty of sending it both to you there and to your care of the British High Commissioner in Harare.

Thank you for being the kind of statesman, Mr President, to whom one can address a communication such as this. I wish you well, Mr President, in your strivings in this Commonwealth meeting for a better world. It will not be long now before South Africa can take up its rightful place in the Commonwealth from which it was removed by Dr Verwoerd.

I remain fraternally yours, Mr President, and ask you to please find it possible to convey your response to my request through the British Ambassador in Pretoria if necessary.

Yours most sincerely, Mr President,

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI
President Inkatha Freedom Party

I learnt through informal sources that finally it was consultation with the ANC which led to the failure of this effort to gain entry to the Commonwealth in order to present an IFP and a KwaZulu point of view. Members of this House, Mr Speaker, ought to know about these things and these things ought to be written into the record so that those who follow us will see that whatever happens in South Africa, we left no stone unturned to bring about national unity based on the acceptance of the need to have unity and diversity by putting South Africa first.

KwaZulu is not going to disappear. We will be party to what ever happens in South Africa. We have never sought ethnic politics. We have never sought racism. If you look at the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba constitutional proposals which we in this House accepted in principle, you will see that there is no racism in them. I stated publicly, and I state again, that these kind of constitutional principles and the wisdom in the Buthelezi Commission reports, will provide our points of departure for our involvement in the negotiation process.

Whatever else happens, regionalism will be entrenched as important in the new South Africa. KwaZulu will remain a regional force. however boundaries of regional government are written, and however the vertical separation of the three tiers of government are affected. Finally, the ANC will see that all they achieved in their long, very bitter and very violent attack against KwaZulu was a closing of KwaZulu ranks against attacks from without.

Mr Speaker, Honourable Members, there will be elections in the not too long distant future. I cannot see how there can be another Whites only election or even a Whites only referenddum. The country is moving towards deadlines which are prescribed by the constitution itself, and we only have been now and 1994 to prepare for one or another form of new government.

A Referendum will in all likelihood come before then. Every member of this house must be aware of the fact that Zulu honour will be at stake. We must prepare for elections, we must tell the people what is going on and wherever there is a Zulu, he or she must be made aware that the final expression of Zulu respect for our very long line of illustrious Kings and Zulu respect for my own leadership and my own line of descent, must be expressed in Zulu national pride in the way people vote in elections and referendums.

If we fail in making the people aware of what has taken place in the past and what is happening now the ANC will finally succeed in smashing Zulu identity and shaming Zulu pride in who we are and where we came from.

----- CONTINUATION TO FOLLOW -----

4600.7