

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERED

A FEW REMARKS ON THE OCCASION OF A DINNER WITH SENIOR OFFICIALS OF
THE ITALIAN PARLIAMENT
BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF
INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE
SHERATON HOTEL, ROME. 28 MAY 1986

I believe in democracy and I believe that in South Africa it is
absolutely essential that we rely on the parliamentary process to

ensure that democracy actually works. I believe that in our
circumstances the parliamentary process will only survive in a
multi-Party political system. We do now have a parliamentary

process in the country and it is quite clear to every Black South
African and to the whole world that the parliamentary process on
its own is insufficient as a forum for democracy unless every
citizen has an equal opportunity of either participating in
Parliament or influencing it. Without a one-man-one-vote system of
government, the parliamentary process can be wielded as an
instrument of oppression.

What parliamentary form is associated with a one-man-one-vote
system of government is for me the only negotiable thing in South
African politics. My own cherished ideal is a one-man-one-vote
system in a unitary state. In our circumstances such a system must
place the highest possible premium on democratic principles. I
accept, however, that the unitary state is not ordained by God as
the only form of modern democracy which is tenable. A one-man-one-
vote system in federal systems work exceedingly well in some parts
of the world. A one-man-one-vote system of government works well
in the Swiss canton system. None of the systems which do work
detract from the quality of each independent vote. That is the
bottom line requirement.

The South African Government is now faced with failed apartheid and
the necessity of bringing about radical political change. It is on
the question of what form a one-man-one-vote system of government
should take that is the central burning issue in South Africa. The
South African Government still insists that there is no majority in

the country. It insists:- that 'B South: Africa ' is: a '200\230' country- ' of
minorities and that the parliamentary process should take
cognisance of this supposed fact of South Africa. Blacks reject
this notion entirely. I do not deny that there are minorities in

South Africa, but I deny emphatically that race, colour and creed
should be used as criteria with which to establish political
constituencies for a parliamentary process. The principles on
which the Government is presently insisting all South Africans must
accept are principles which are untenable both in theory and in
practice.

In practice, under the circumstances which the Government
envisages, the White minority will still be the final decision-
making group in 87 per cent of the country. The White minority

is conceived of as a legitimate minority despite the fact that it

is heterogeneous in ethnic origin but there is no overall cohesive Black population to balance this perception - only ten Black ethnic minorities. Each Black minority will only have a territorial lien in its final decision-making in a South Africa as it has now been partitioned to give Blacks so-called homeland areas. The State President insists that minority groups should recognise the distinction between "own affairs" and "general affairs." When one applies the territorial reality to this situation as envisaged by the State President it becomes clear that he envisages a situation in which the White minority has a lien on 87 per cent of the country. This makes the "own affairs" of Whites to include the economy itself, running the civil service, running the country's transportation system, control over the police and defence forces and in fact control over all the factors which determine domestic and foreign policy.

Violent confrontation in South Africa will escalate unless the State President concedes that a one-man-one-vote system of government will only be meaningful if it is accepted that there is in fact a democratic majority in the country. I reject the notion of South Africa being a country of minorities and there is no prospect whatsoever of me being drawn into final negotiations about the future of the country if I have to succumb to this demand. South Africa may well only have one last and final opportunity of bringing about radical change through the politics of negotiation. I do not believe that we have the time left within which to dabble experimentally with constitutional change. The introduction of the present constitution two years ago was a terrible political blunder on the part of White South Africa, and the only remedy for that blunder is now a final bold step forward into a truly democratic future.

The new constitution gives the country's only Parliament a permanent theoretical domain over 87 per cent of the country. It excludes four-fifths of the country's population who are Black from participating in Parliament. The new constitution endorses Blacks out of this Parliament both in principle and in practice. We must recognise that more than half of all Blacks who constitute 72 per cent of the South African population, live permanently in the domains of this Parliament. The magnitude of the National Party's democratic blunder can be seen.

The present constitution was formulated in the President's Council. Mr. P. W. Botha, then Prime Minister, attempted to legitimise the workings of the President's Council by attaching to it a Black Advisory Council. I would have nothing to do with it, and primarily because I would have nothing to do with it, he never in fact got it off the ground. He went ahead unilaterally and presented the constitution, drawn up by the President's Council, to the White electorate for their acceptance or rejection in a referendum. The Whites endorsed it and it was introduced in 1984.

I led a massive Black rejection of it and at the time, I warned the whole of South Africa that this constitution would precipitate

violent Black action, it would hasten the process of polarisation and radicalise Black politics. My predictions were accurate. The dramatic escalation of violence being used for political purposes now so evident in South Africa can be traced to this constitution.

After the State President had introduced the new constitution he again attempted to give it Black legitimacy. He established a Special Cabinet Committee which was charged with the responsibility of negotiating with Blacks about their political future. Again, I would have nothing to do with this attempt to legitimise the new constitution by getting Blacks to be involved in its workings. After two years of meaningless activity, the State President attempted yet again to legitimise the new constitution by augmenting the work of the Special Cabinet Committee with a Non-statutory Negotiation Forum. Again I refused to have anything to do with it and this Forum in fact never got off the ground.

The State President has now finally had to concede that the new constitution is not working and will not work and will never be made to work. He is now attempting to establish a National Council and for the first time in the history of South Africa a White head of State is attempting to establish a mechanism which will satisfy the aspirations of Blacks. The primary aim of the new National Council as contained in a Bill drafted as a discussion document is: "To provide for participation in the planning and preparation of a constitutional dispensation which provides for the participation of all South African citizens in the process of government..." These are the words which the whole world has been waiting to hear, but in the light of the history of the National Party and in the light of the deeply ingrained racism in White politics one will have to wait to see whether the new National Council will get off the ground and go on to be an instrument of radical change.

I am right now making a careful assessment of whether the new National Council could possibly succeed. I have not yet formulated my final view on it. I am a democrat and before I come to any final conclusion, I have to consult with my colleagues and I have to refer the matter to my constituency.

Inkatha is the largest Black political movement ever to have emerged in the history of South Africa. Inkatha has now over 1.3 million card-carrying paid-up members. No Black leader has ever gathered the constituency support in Black South Africa which I today enjoy. This massive membership of Inkatha is dominated numerically by peasants and workers. With the exception of the Eastern Cape, it has branches scattered across the length and breadth of the country and it is as representative of Blacks in urban areas as it is of Blacks in rural areas. It is as representative of the old as it is of the young. Inkatha's Youth Brigade is the largest youth organisation ever to have emerged in the history of the country. Its Women's Brigade is the largest women's brigade ever to have emerged in the history of the country.

Inkatha is intensely democratic. Its supreme authority is the Annual General Conference where policies are determined and where tactics and strategies are accepted and rejected. Inkatha's

leadership is elected by its ordinary members. At branch, regional and national levels Inkatha's representatives are chosen by the people, and its Annual General Conference is a conference of

representatives chosen to be there by the people. I never ever speak for myself on public issues. I reflect only that which Inkatha's membership has endorsed. The point I am making is that

when Black South Africans are given the freedom to choose and are given democratic machinery through which to exercise their choices,, and through which to determine tactics and strategies in the Black struggle for liberation, choices are made which make a mockery of the media representation of my leadership in South Africa.

I am not free to make my own decisions about the National Council. and I am not even prepared to seek a mandate from the people to become involved in it, if it is not made a Council in which all Black leaders who may want to participate in it can participate in it. The National Party for decades now has done everything it could to cripple Black democracy. Right now some political organisations remain banned and scores of Black leaders are incarcerated in jail for political reasons. I have already said publicly in South Africa that unless Dr. Nelson Mandela and Mr. Zeph Mothopeng of the PAC and other political prisoners are released I will not entertain the idea of entering the Council.

Right now the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group is attempting to table a formula which will lead to the reconciliation between Black and White, and they too have said that unless Dr. Mandela and others are released from jail, there are no prospects of a negotiated future in South Africa. They may have come to this conclusion for reasons different to my own, but that conclusion is a very widespread conclusion.

I do not link my participation in the National Council to the participation of Dr. Nelson Mandela or anybody else. They must make their own decisions. All I am saying is that my decision is already made. I will not participate if they cannot participate and if they do not participate, I will reassess my own position at that point in time. I will not be bound by their decisions, but I am bound by my commitment to ensure that the National Council is a democratic mechanism. It cannot be a democratic mechanism if South Africa's body politic remains shackled by Draconian laws and practices.

In a very real sense the parliamentary process in South Africa and democracy itself hangs in the balance. Whether or not the State President has conceived the National Council in such a way that democracy can be salvaged from the ravages of violence, remains to be seen.

_____ o R S Sy