

PRAYER RALLY FOR PEACE AND PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

ADDRESS BY MANGOSUTHU G BUTHELEZI

CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU

UMLAZI, 15TH DECEMBER 1991

Members of the Zulu Nation, I called us together in this*â\200\234 Prayer Rally because I believe that you have got the right to know what is going on in the country, the land of your birth, as we set about negotiating a new constitution for the new South Africa. :

on the 20th and 21st of this month every political party and organisation which wants to participate in negotiations will be welcome to attend a Congress for a Democratic South Africa which will be held in Johannesburg. Thus so far it looks as if 20 parties will be there. The parties that will not beâ\200\231 there are the PAC and AZAPO and on the right the Conservative Party, the HNP and the AWB.

The IFP will be there together with the ANC and the National Party and other political parties. There will also be a number of governments represented at the CODESA meeting. The South African Government will be there and we all agree that they should be there. The South African Government is the de facto government of the day. It is also the de jure government. "What is more since Mr de Klerk's February 2 1990 address we have seen the South African Government actively move to scrap apartheid laws and help mount negotiations for a new race free democracy for South Africa. For me this means that the South African Government is not only the de facto and de jure government but it is the legitimate government involving itself in the legitimate scrapping of apartheid and working with other political parties for a new South Africa. It must be in CODESA.

The South African Government is not the only government that is going to be represented. The Transkeian Government is going to be there. The Bophuthatswana Government is going to be there. Ciskei and Venda will be there.

They are going to be there as governments because in places like Transkei and Venda they are ruled by military juntas and do not "have political parties which can represent the people. I did not oppose their presence in CODESA as governments because somebody had to represent the people in these TBVC countries. When you are disposing of boundaries and rewriting the Provinces and Provincial boundaries and perhaps dividing South Africa up into a number of states for a federal or another kind of constitutional structuring the people whose boundaries are being altered must be party to the discussion.

We live in this part of South Africa - in KwaZulu and Natal - should also be there because our boundaries are also going to be affected. The question of who should represent KwaZulu is, of course, a crucial question.

I am hearing innane remarks and I read very superficial and even sometimes mischievous newspaper reports of His Majesty being there at the CODESA meeting. People are saying that I am drawing His Majesty into politics and some newspapers are even saying that it may even be illegal for His Majesty to attend the meeting.

His Majesty has a place reserved for him in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. He is free to speak if he so chooses to and indeed on certain occasions he delivers lofty addresses to the Assembly and to visitors. He never indulges in party politics on these occasions. His Majesty will not be drawn into party political wrangling in CODESA. He will be there to be consulted and perhaps to advise where necessary, when it comes to dealing with the future of KwaZulu.

His position there will not be more than that of an observer status, on the same basis to that on which the South African government will be there. King Cetshwayo suffered in defence of his Kingdom. King Dinuzulu was charged with and convicted for treason. He was twice banished from his Kingdom and died in exile. The future of the KwaZulu Kingdom will be decided at these negotiations, and it is only right that His Majesty the King be present on the basis I have outlined.

The King was present at the Peace Convention on the 14th of September 1991, and the Heavens did not cave in as a result of it.

He went up to the Reef to talk to his subjects at the height of the violence, and no one complained about it. He and Paramount-Chief Nyangilizwe Ndamase went up together to see the President and to address their subjects. Paramount-Chief Nyangilizwe Ndamase as President of Transkei is also above politics as is our King.

I have argued that the IFP as one of the country's major political parties must of course be at CODESA - and it will be there. I have also argued that the KwaZulu Government must be there. Everyone of you here knows that KwaZulu was not created by apartheid. It was not created by any White South African Government. We, the Zulu people of South Africa, rallied behind our great founding King, King Shaka ka Senzangakhona. We also rallied around other illustrious kings who walked in his footsteps after him. The IFP has never claimed to represent the Zulu Nation nor is it a Zulu organisation.

I have seen the danger emerging in South African politics that there are those political leaders who think that the parties negotiating have a clean slate on which to write anything they want to write upon it. There are those who dream of setting up a powerful government and wish now already to begin eliminating opposition before we even get near the first open and free elections.

I warned all of South Africa that the ANC / COSATU / SACP Alliance was making a grievous error when they declared last year that KwaZulu shall be dismantled. I warned of the terrible consequences of what would happen if the more than seven million people came together as Zulus and said a final no to what was being done to them.

I warned again and again that KwaZulu was not a construct of apartheid which could be crossed out of political existence by pens of administrators and negotiators. We are a people who rose out of Mother Africa itself before colonial wars and conquests gave Whites any dominion over the territory of the Zulu empire.

Long before there was racist government, KwaZulu was there. KwaZulu was even there long before modern South Africa was formed. The great exploits of King Shaka ka Senzangakhona established the Zulu Kingdom as a powerful sovereign Kingdom with influences which reached down to the Caledon river in the Cape Province and far north into what is now Mocambique and also into the Transvaal.

The Zulu people were the only people, apart from Afrikaners, to fight a fully fledged war against a colonial power and to tackle the full might of the British Army. The Anglo Zulu war which was fought in 1879 was the only war of its kind fought in the whole of South Africa. The Zulu armies were so powerful and they fought with such valour, in countless acts of bravery which made epic history, that they actually defeated the British Army at the Battle of Isandlwana. - They were, of course, as history records, subsequently finally beaten at the Battle of Ulundi.

Only then was it possible for the British Government under Queen Victoria to attempt to forever crush the might of the Zulu nation.

After the Battle of Ulundi the Kingdom was divided into thirteen districts which were given to Amakhosi whom the British chose. They were expected to rule over this divided land and Kingdom in order to divide the people. That proved impossible and nothing the full might of the British Crown, exercising power through its Natal governors, could do was able to break the spirit of the Zulu people.

KwaZulu's armies were beaten in war. The victorious armies conquered KwaZulu and the British banished that very great and illustrious son of Africa, King Cetshwayo ka Mpande, to Cape Town.

King Cetshwayo went to Britain to see Her Majesty Queen Victoria and was forced to negotiate with the Secretary for Colonies, Lord Kimberley, who forced the King to return to his Kingdom under impossible conditions. A portion of his Kingdom was set aside for Zulus who no longer wanted to pay homage to the King. These were dirty imperialist designs under which King Cetshwayo was forced to return to his Kingdom. Part of his Kingdom was taken away from him. King Cetshwayo's son, King Dinuzulu, suffered a worse fate than his father. For the battle against the Mandlakazi, he was exiled to St Helena as a young man. When he returned to KwaZulu in 1897, he was again forced to accept the annexation of his Kingdom to what was called Natal.

When the Zulu people revolted against the Poll Tax in 1906, and started what became known as the Bhambatha Rebellion, King Dinuzulu 'was again implicated. This was merely because he gave refuge to Inkosi Bhambatha Zondi's wife, Siyekiwe, and to his daughter, Kholekile. He was charged and convicted of high treason and given a sentence of life imprisonment. He was jailed in Newcastle.

When the Convention was held between the Boers and the British to form the Union of South Africa in 1908, the Zulu nation and black people in general were not represented at all. When General Louis Botha was elected the first Prime Minister of South Africa in 1910, he remembered that his friend King Dinuzulu was in jail in Newcastle. He had him released and sent to "Uitkyk" farm in Middleburg, where he lived in exile until 1913 when he passed away.

It was King Dinuzulu's son-in-law, Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme, who founded the ANC with his fellow African leaders in 1912.

When we were dragged into the Union willy-nilly, we accepted that history had made us South Africans. We are a Kingdom like Swaziland and Lesotho but we were not tempted to accept the so-called independence à la Pretoria in spite of this. We could not be lured by the South African Government to accept being re-set up under their grandiose apartheid plan.

All this happened because the powers of invading armies with their modern war technology was too much for our brave warriors with their spears and their bare hands. All this happened and more but the Zulu people were not crushed in spirit. Zulu brother reached out to Zulu brother. Zulu sister joined with Zulu sister and Zulu clan allied itself to Zulu clan.

My brothers and sisters, I do not have the time today to tell you the great story of the Zulu people from the inception of the reign of King -Shaka right down to the reign of the present King of the Zulus, His Majesty King Goodwill Zwelithini ka Bhekuzulu. I am only recounting some sketchy details in support of the statement that KwaZulu was not created by apartheid and cannot be dismantled by apartheid.

My brothers and sisters, I have been careful in many ways over a long time to make sure that the South African Government and everybody else became aware that KwaZulu was not created by apartheid and would therefore not be dismantled at the will of anybody.

At the fifth conference of political executives, chaired by the State President on the 30th November 1990, I proclaimed to the State President before all that "there was a Zulu Kingdom - a sovereign Kingdom, powerful in the ranking of the nations of Africa in its days. We survived the colonial onslaught longer than any other. We were the only nation to be brought into a full scale war with Britain. We were actually defeated militarily.

We were dragged into the Act of Union without any consultation at all. We must not repeat that historic error in negotiations about the future of South Africa which we are- now envisaging. The Inkatha Freedom Party is one thing; there is also the Zulu nation." Earlier that month on the 11st of November again in a meeting chaired by the State President, this time between himself and the IFP to establish an IFP / South African Government work group, I said: "The IFP views Zulu governmental structures as an expression of the historically authenticated existence of KwaZulu. It is not a construct of apartheid; it is part of the South African reality and will have to be afforded the full status of a negotiating partner."

There were many other occasions when I spelt out very clearly that KwaZulu would be at the negotiating table as KwaZulu. I have said so in many public speeches and I continued to say these things this year to the Government and to the State President. In January this year, in talking to Mr J de Villiers Minister of Agriculture and Development, I said that "KwaZulu is going to be at the negotiating table as KwaZulu. It is unlike any other regional authorities where structures were not created long before there was any White control. Kwa Zulu was an independent sovereign State. It has a Zulu psyche and a collective Zulu mind which could be enormously constructive in negotiating a new South Africa."

The government heard what I was saying. In a letter addressed to me by the Hon Dr G van N Viljoen dated 17 September 1990, Dr Viljoen said "Furthermore, I can give you the assurance that in the Government's view KwaZulu should be represented at the negotiations in its own right and not 'as a member of a team of leaders of self-governing states'. I also concur with your view that KwaZulu has a distinctive existence rooted in history and, in fact, is not something 'created by apartheid'".

As recently as the 5th of November this year, that is only a matter of weeks ago, in another meeting with the State President and other political leaders of this country, I prompted Dr BS Ngubane to state very clearly before everybody present that KwaZulu was not a construct of apartheid and that it would be represented as well as the Zulu King when the talks start.

We have struggled for the liberation of South Africa in the IFP. Parallel to this IFP struggle there have been many other struggles and one of the great struggles that paralleled the IFP struggle, has been the KwaZulu struggle.

It was KwaZulu which broke the back of the South African Government's homeland policy. Had KwaZulu accepted so-called independence and joined the TBVC states and the South African Government there would have been a confederation of South African states. Then there would have been an entirely different South Africa than the one in which politics and negotiations are dominating today.

There will never be a new South Africa which we have not helped to emerge out of the history of this country. There will not be a new constitution which KwaZulu has not helped shape. We will never ever live under a new constitution that others have shaped for us. No power in South Africa and no combination of political parties in South Africa could change this reality.

Yet now that negotiations are getting under way I am told that KwaZulu cannot be a full negotiating partner and I am told that His Majesty the King of the Zulus can have no part in the negotiating process. I am told that certain representatives of smaller ethnic groups and smaller political parties ganged up to deny the King of the Zulu Nation and the Zulu Nation this sovereign right to be represented in their own right at CODESA. This is in spite of the fact that Transkei and Venda who have no political parties will be represented at CODESA, as well as Ciskei and Bophuthatswana. I have no objection to their representation at all. But I am just pointing out the oddness of excluding the Zulu King and the Amakhosi from the talks, as well as the Zulu Nation.

KwaZulu of all the self-governing territories is the only one which was not created as an entity by the homelands policy. I have on other occasions in the presence of representatives of all self-governing states, and President de Klerk and his Cabinet Ministers, stated that KwaZulu is unique because it is the only Kingdom in South Africa with this unique history. No one has ever questioned me when I said it but now at the Preparatory Committee meeting, new voices from amongst the same people I have made this point to, were heard strongly objecting to the representation of KwaZulu Amakhosi and the Zulu Nation.

We in the IFP have never claimed to represent the entire Zulu Nation, nor was Inkatha from the very beginning a Zulu members-only organisation. We now have nearly two million members, many of whom are people of all race groups in South Africa. Zulus are more than seven million and how can the IFP accept falling into the trap laid so openly by our political enemies. I cannot accept being put in a position which will be interpreted as my having endorsed the elbowing out of the Zulu King and the Zulu Nation from participating in shaping a new South Africa. ;

We seem to have latter-day imperialists who are denying the Zulu King and the Zulu Nation their birthright to participate in determining their future destiny. There is no doubt that a delegation of the IFP should perhaps attend talks and maybe without me being present. I want your advice and wisdom on what I find to be a very complex issue.

The South African government failed to dragoon us into the so-called 'independence' with all the might of the State that it is wielding. We want to tell all and sundry that there will be no political organisation, or political party, or a combination of political parties and/or military Regimes that will succeed in forcing their will on the Zulu Nation. We are a resilient people who have for generations demonstrated that we can stand up for what we believe in, and even die for it, if necessary. :

It was, in fact, a Committee of the KwaZulu government with members of the South African government that paved -the way for what President de Klerk did in February 1990. It i's: ironic. that - the Zulu Nation as an entity, is now being elbowed out of negotiations, which is something we have battled for long before any other people or organisation in South Africa ever dreamt of it. President de Klerk himself, in his February 1990 speech, told the whole world that I had begged him to get to where he now is.

You have heard that we are going to hold a conference of all willing political parties so that we may set in motion a machinery of change to finally bury apartheid and establish a new democracy. The parties will meet in the Convention for a Democratic South Africa on the 20th and 21st of this month to undertake this work.

Preparations were made and a Preparatory Committee Meeting was held on the 29th and 30th of November. KwaZulu was not invited to this Preparatory Committee and His Majesty the King of the Zulus was not invited to send delegates to it. When the IFP delegates who were there objected, they were told that this was not possible and the Zulu people would not be represented at negotiations by KwaZulu delegates. They in fact suggested something quite preposterous - that the King and the Zulu Nation should be included in the IFP delegation.

The matter was debated but was not finalised and was referred to the first meeting of the Steering Committee of the Preparatory Committee. That meeting took place on Wednesday the 4th of December. Again there was no acceptance of the need for KwaZulu representation and again the matter was deferred - this time to a meeting of the Steering Committee to be held on the 10th of December. The matter was tabled at this Steering Committee meeting but again the matter was deferred to another Steering Committee meeting which will now be held on 17 December 1991.

Thus, my fellow Zulus, I must record my objection and say that we must now gather together and serve notice on South Africa that every man, women and child must help us in this matter lest a great disaster befall us all. We must negotiate a new South Africa. It is imperative that we do so. It is urgent that we do so. We must allow nothing to stop us, not this thing or anything else.

When I said no to the armed struggle, there was no armed struggle worthy of the name. When I said no to turning the armed struggle into a people's war, there was no people's war. When I said no to the Government's homeland policy there was no homeland policy. There will be no new South Africa without us as Zulus playing our very important Zulu role to make the new South Africa a glorious

democracy which we can help to make it.

You have heard my arguments about why we should be at the negotiating table as KwaZulu and I ask you to tell me whether my protest is right and just or not. Speak that I may hear and, my brothers and sisters, speak with a loud voice so all the world can hear what you say. How say you?

We in Inkatha Freedom Party have always called for this day when we can come together in a gathering of all political parties in the country to decide among ourselves how we will be governed in the future. We must so make decisions that the majority of people in every race group and in every cultural group will be willing to be governed the way they are going to be governed in the new South Africa.

Members of the IFP are adamant that each political party must have its own proper say in the writing of the new constitution and in fashioning a new dispensation. Many of us have grown old never knowing the great freedoms of democracy. Many of us have never had the opportunity of making our own contribution to the shaping of the government of the day and the institutions of the country.

All of us have been witness to the hideous consequences of one

political party arrogating unto itself the right to tell everybody, and every other political party, what they shall have, how they shall live and what rights they may or may not have. We have all seen how the power of the state in South Africa has been used to crush political parties and to devastate the indigenous people of

this country.

Those of us that are old enough have watched racism develop in the aftermaths of colonial conquests, through racial domination

through the old Act of Union and through the beginnings of and the

development of apartheid. We watched racism develop as apartheid grew in strength and became monstrously bad. We watched all this and we suffered very grievously and we struggled because we watched and we grieved and we rejected what we saw and what we experienced.

Those of us who are members of the IFP say that we will never, ever allow any political party or any ugly alliance between two political parties to rise up to again become a power in the land. We will not allow a government to be formed by that party or those two parties which could again build around them the Draconian powers that apartheid used to make the good of the State synonymous with the good of the ruling National Party.

Tyranny always comes from a powerful tyrant or a powerful government which no democratic opposition can stop in its tracks. Tyranny and oppression always comes from having too much power in

too few hands.

Members of the IFP have said right from the beginning of our life as a political force that there must be a multi-party democracy in this country. We trust no one party, nor a combination of any two parties, which can deal with each other .and become one party in practice. We can only trust a political party if it has to woo support from the electorate in fair and open competition with other political parties.

We say that there must be as great gathering of all the forces in this country necessary to make the multi-party democracy that we aspire to a reality in this land. None shall be left out. All shall be involved.

In this great task that faces us of building a new South Africa we must be quite sure to harness all the forces that it is necessary to harness if we are going to succeed. Think, my brothers and sisters, think very hard and hear what I say. We must never ever make the mistakes that were made in countries like Mocambique and Angola. Great new democracies were thought to be proclaimed only to be torn apart by civil war because the democracies did not embrace a sufficient number of people, a sufficient number of political parties and a sufficient number of vreligions, language and cultural groupings. .

We saw how those who felt aggrieved could gather together in an organisation like Renamo to tear Mocambique apart. We saw how those who felt aggrieved came together in Unita to tear Angola apart. We saw how civil war laid the land bare and made it impossible for there to be progress and for there to be good government.

We say that none shall be left aggrieved in South Africa lest what happens in this country emerges as so terrible and so destructive that the civil wars of Unita and Renamo are child's play by comparison.

When leaders are not wise and do not understand that there are great groupings of men and women who should not be left out of negotiations and out of the framing of new constitutions, and who should not be left out of setting up new governments and making it possible for the people to choose a government in the land, there can only be awesome problems. ,

I am today officially presenting Inkatha's constitutional thinking to you so that you may know what kind of a negotiating stance the IFP â\200\234has taken up and those who negotiate with me on your behalf have drawn up this draft constitution because this is what we have heard you the people of South Africa saying you want.

I am presenting it to you today for close studying. I will not go to the negotiating table, nor will KwaZulu, which will go to the negotiating table despite all opposition, without being quite clear in my mind that I am going there with a valid mandate from the people.

There will be a meeting that I mentioned when the Convention for Democratic South Africa (CODESA) is held on the 20th and 21st of this month and there will be ongoing work in which the new constitution is-going to be fashioned. Now is the time for you, - the people of South Africa, to consider what kind of constitution you want and to tell your leaders what to struggle for on your behalf.

I do not want to do more than launch the draft constitution for a new South Africa. You must take copies of the constitution home with you. You must study the constitution and say what you think of it. You must instruct your representatives at the IFP Central Committee meeting which will be held on 14th of this month how to respond to its provisions.

I have championed the cause of non-violence and the politics of negotiation for the whole of my political life. Since the 1970's I have been <calling for a negotiated settlement of South Africa's problems and I have argued strongly that South Africans were quite capable of ending apartheid themselves and establishing a fair and just democracy.

I rejected the armed struggle as unnecessary and I rejected the punitive isolation of South Africa because I knew that Black opposition to apartheid here on the ground would in the end. succeed. I rejected the notion that only violence could end apartheid. .

I called for the holding of a National Convention in which all the parties of the country would get together to author a new constitution under which the majority of people in all race groups would be prepared to be governed the way they wished to be governed under it.

The draft constitution below is presented as a working document for study and debate. The document speaks for itself and in this preface I want to draw attention to the need for continuity in a gathering of momentum in the process of change.

I have always argued against expecting South Africans to unite in making constitutional leaps into the dark. I have always argued that negotiations about a new constitution should proceed until consensus is reached about the kind of constitution we need. I have also argued that once there was consensus about the constitution we need it should be made a reality by an Act of the South African Parliament.

It is only in this way that Black and White could be brought together to act in unity. We will need this unity if threats which are always present in times of radical change are not going to become disruptive.

I established the IFP as a membership based organisation, COMMITTED to constituency politics and committed to bringing about change through negotiations. In the 1970's, after June 1976 and its aftermath, the IFP became intensely aware of the need for national consensus on fundamental constitutional principles.

In 1978 I began exploring the need for a Commission of Inquiry to look at alternatives to apartheid. In 1979 we brought the Buthelezi Commission into being. " The Commission drew its Commissioners from all walks of life and all race groups and was open to all political parties which wanted to participate in it.

The Commission sat in serious work for nearly two years and produced a set of recommendations which the IFP and the KwaZulu Government accepted in principle. The hard work that went into the Commission, and the recommendations arrived at, will not be lost because the IFP and the KwaZulu Government will take cognizance of the work of the Buthelezi Commission in its own approach to negotiations about the new South Africa into which we are now entering. ' ;

The IFP and the KwaZulu Government will also take serious note of the constitutional proposals of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. The recommendations of the Commission and the Indaba will be used as a base line from which the IFP involvement in negotiations will proceed.

The IFP is also very aware that the progression into the Buthelezi Commission and from it into the KwaZulu / Natal Indaba is a progression which must continue into the future. It was along this progression that negotiations for a Joint Executive Authority took place. The JEA is the first leg of an unfinished journey into the future. It was established with a view to going on to establish a Joint Legislative Authority.

This brings me to the second point that I want to make after having said that there is a need to maximise continuity in the process of change. It is that it would be extremely difficult to over-emphasise the importance of regionalism in South African constitutional development. -

If we want peace in this country and if we want negotiations for a new multi-party, non-racial democratic South Africa to proceed at the maximum pace and with the greatest certainty, we will have to accept the need for a massive devolution of power downwards from the Central Government to Regional Governments. '

Majoritarian principles will have to hold sway in whatever constitutional arrangement we arrive at. The people must rule and majorities must forever be important. The IFP, however, has taken serious note of what has happened in the USSR, East Germany and the Baltic States as country after country and region after region gave evidence that no amount of powerful centrist political power could overcome the inherent difficulties in an ethnically heterogeneous population.

The IFP's and the KwaZulu Government's credentials, as far as racism is concerned, have been clearly established by the Buthelezi Commission and the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba constitutional proposals which we accepted in principle.

We believe that cultural factors, economic factors, democratic factors and political factors should all play a very important part in determining future State or provincial boundaries for the constituent parts of the new South Africa. We now see a situation where talks regarding possible alterations to the KwaZulu/Natal boundaries are going to be discussed behind the backs of members of the Zulu Nation.

In this regard we accept the nine development regions as worthy of study and geographic amendment to determine areas of jurisdiction for second tier level governments of the future. This matter can only be finalised by negotiations and agreement between all the people of South Africa, including the people directly affected - that is the Zulu Nation.

The IFP sees a great need to bring government closer to the people. It can only do this by establishing consensus as a vital principle in the country's future political system. We believe that there should be cross-cutting checks and balances built into a future constitutional arrangement which would make a central government dependent upon approval of regional governments for its political programmes.

We believe that a strong downward devolution of power should be associated with a constitutionally entrenched Bill of Rights and with a set of proposals for minority group protection. We believe that regional governmental authorities and their tax bases should similarly be entrenched. ;

Entrenched clauses, like the rest of the constitution, should be put under the jurisdiction of the country's courts. These courts should be put outside party political control by making the constitution and action by the executive arm of Government subject to Supreme Court intervention.

The IFP proposals in the draft constitution for South Africa which follows are made to enrich the debate about the new South Africa and are not made as all-or-nothing proposals. Debate must be vigorous, honest and progressive and no political party should adopt constitutional non-negotiables which are put beyond the give and take politics in which the spirit of compromise should prevail.

E o ne i T sdadeeeeane Om=m=m=====

*Y4517