

**SPECIAL MEETING OF SOME MEMBERS OF THREE-A-SIDE DELEGATIONS
OF THE ANC AND THE IFP**

**MR KGALEMA MOTLANTE,
SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE ANC**

**REVEREND C J MTETWA,
THE REVEREND MUSA ZONDI**

AND

MR SMUTS NGONYAMA, ANC PRESIDENCY

LED RESPECTIVELY BY

**HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT THABO MBEKI, MP
PRESIDENT OF THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS**

**AND PRINCE MANGOSUTHU BUTHELEZI
PRESIDENT OF THE INKATHA FREEDOM PARTY**

MEMORANDUM FOR DISCUSSION

BY

MANGOSUTHU BUTHELEZI, MP

**PRESIDENT OF THE INKATHA FREEDOM PARTY
SHERATON HOTEL : PRETORIA: DECEMBER 3, 2002**

The IFP welcomes the opportunity of this meeting with the African National Congress and expresses its appreciation to His Excellency President Mbeki for having been available for it. A meeting between the IFP and the ANC has been long overdue. The relationship between the IFP and the ANC has deteriorated over the past years. Many of the issues raised by the IFP aimed at addressing and possibly remedying this deterioration could not effectively be dealt with in the structures which the IFP and the ANC had established to deal with our inter-party relations and difficulties. Neither the three-a-side nor the fifteen-a-side committees were able to make progress and they requested that a meeting be held to include the leaders of the IFP and the ANC. Since February, this meeting has been in the making. It has been scheduled on several occasions for certain dates which were then changed and postponed at the ANC's instance.

I myself have requested the opportunity of this meeting on several occasions. In particular, when the crossing of the floor constitutional amendment was tabled in Cabinet Committee, I requested a postponement in the processing of such Bill until our two parties could meet. My request was ignored. I reiterated and strongly motivated the same request when the Bill was discussed in Cabinet, but my Colleagues in the ANC were unwilling to delay the processing of the Bill to allow a political discussion on its merits and implications between the two major parties which bear the responsibility of governing South Africa. My insistence was so great that in the end Cabinet resolved to recommend that the President and I should meet to discuss the matter, in spite of my pointing out that such meeting was becoming devoid of significance since the Bill was going to be tabled in Parliament. However, even this meeting did not materialise.

This impasse was at the end of a long process in which our attempts to have a meeting were frustrated, often with not much courtesy. A member of the Committee of 3 on the side of the IFP, Reverend Celani Mtetwa went to Johannesburg where he had been told by Mr Ngonyama that an appointment had been set up for him with the President of the ANC, our President. When he was in Johannesburg Rev. Mtetwa was told that he

should come down to Cape Town. He was then told that an appointment had been set up for him with the President on the 30th of May. He duly came to Cape Town. He was supposed to meet with the Deputy President on the eve of the 30th of May.

This was a follow up of the fiasco of the 15-A-Side process. The Deputy President was not able to see the Rev. Mtetwa. On the 30th May Rev. Mtetwa sat in my office the whole day waiting to be called by the President. I even sent him up to the President's Office with my Private Secretary where my Secretary was told that there was an appointment for Rev Mtetwa with the President although no specific time for it was mentioned. He was then told that the President was at the Caucus meeting and knew about the appointment and would be seeing him. That never happened and Rev Mtetwa had to fly back to KwaZulu Natal. Needless to say, it was not surprising that on the 31st May the leadership of the ANC in KwaZulu Natal in collusion with other parties dishonoured the standing agreement and made Pietermaritzburg the sole seat of the Legislature together with other parties, as I will discuss later.

On the 9th of October 2002, we held Cabinet at the Union Buildings, and during a break the Deputy President of the ANC approached me telling me that he had spoken to the Rev Celani Mtetwa to inform him that our meeting with the President was scheduled for 18h00 of that very evening. This was meant to be the meeting recommended by both sides of the of 3-A-Side Committee to both the President of the ANC and the President of the IFP. They recommended that it takes place in the presence of the Committee of 3-A-Side. As I had not been told about the meeting until then, and the Committee of 3-A-Side itself felt it should meet prior to the meeting of the two Presidents, the meeting could not take place that Wednesday. We also felt that for any substantial discussion to take place we needed more time than just an evening for discussion, as an evening could not be enough if we were serious about such a discussion.

We understand that the ANC has now requested this meeting giving us less than six hours notice to discuss the present situation in KwaZulu Natal. However,. We believe that such situation cannot be considered in isolation. It is the consequence of a long process. Something went wrong in our relationship and if we are to understand how and when it happened, we need to consider the broader context of our relationship. For this reason, we feel it is important that during this meeting we be allowed to put forward our perspective. I am sure that the ANC has its own perspective on the relevant events and we do not have the presumption to hold the absolute truth in this respect. However, our perspective is true in that it reflects the way we, our National Council and our constituency feel about the many issues which define the broader context in which the November 29 decision by Premier Mtshali to reshuffle his Cabinet was made.

These issues have been discussed at great length at all levels of our constituency. At the outset, one must regret that we did not have the opportunity to inform the ANC leadership of this impending decision. However, we did not wish to have that discussion in isolation from the broader context of the various issues which define our relationship, and the fact that the meeting could not be held became the cause of our difficulty in conveying this information to the ANC leadership within its adequate and necessary context. However, one must also appreciate the untenable situation in KwaZulu Natal which has precipitated events. The Premier of KwaZulu Natal has constantly been attacked by what should be his loyal Cabinet Colleagues, with Mr S'bu Ndebele stating again and again that he was about to replace him in the premiership of KwaZulu Natal.

Two days before the reshuffle, Dumisane Makhaye, a Minister in the Premier's own Cabinet compared KwaZulu Natal to the Devil because of the IFP leadership, while in the same debate the Premier was being compared to Adolf Hitler by an ANC Cabinet colleague. In politics this may be straws, but given the context which I will explain later, they are those which broke the camel's back.

As far as we are concerned, it is necessary for all of us to understand that what happened in KwaZulu Natal is to a great extent the product of the political dynamics and government relations which developed in that Province. I will not interfere in those dynamics or dictate its outcome. It must also be appreciated that the Premier acted on the strength of a full and unanimous mandate of our National Council. I am not without hope that the relationship between the IFP and the ANC can be remedied, but I recognise that such process is going to be difficult. I have tried to call attention to this deteriorating relationship a number of times, but to no avail. I wrote to the President of the ANC, to the Deputy President and to the Secretary General, but none of my correspondence was even acknowledged in spite of several reminders. I even wrote to former President Nelson Mandela. What I and my constituency find extremely hurtful is that while we were incessantly demanding an opportunity to meet with the ANC, pointing out the gravity and the urgency of the situation and tabling extensive documentation to support our request, the ANC did not have the time to meet with us, but found the time to hold a lengthy bosberaad with former State President FW de Klerk and the New National Party.

As a black man I find it very hurtful that after having served loyally and diligently for eight years in an ANC led and controlled Government, my partners in Government could not find the time to meet with me but found the time to meet with Mr de Klerk. However, in spite of these difficulties I am always an optimist and I believe that if we are serious about undertaking the hard political work necessary to remedy the situation, things could be improved. But this requires understanding and appreciation of where we come from.

From our viewpoint, one of the main concerns is that in our relationship with the ANC whenever we met to solve and resolve crises what was decided was never implemented. In 1979 we left the meeting with the ANC mission in exile with the agreement that Mr Oliver Tambo would get back to us. But that never happened. In January 1991 we met with ANC President Nelson Mandela and we agreed with him that we would hold joint meetings in violence torn areas to pacify our people, but as I will discuss later in detail, that never happened. In April 1994 we signed the Agreement for Reconciliation and Peace which, *inter alia*, called for international mediation to settle the many outstanding constitutional issues, including that of the monarchy of KwaZulu Natal and that of traditional leadership.

Such issues remain outstanding. Similarly, in 1999 President Mbeki and I committed to carry forward the joint effort which we began in Thokoza to pacify our people and rectify the record of history from the many distortions from which it suffered because of the campaign of vilification waged against me. However, as I will discuss later, that process stopped at its very commencement. Similarly, for the past 12 months, I have received indications that the law suit I had to bring to rectify the preposterous findings of the TRC would be settled, in recognition that the TRC had become a receptacle of discredited lies and propaganda, part of the campaign of vilification waged against me and the IFP.

Just today I was informed that once again the deadline for such settlement decided by the Chief State Law Adviser and by the circumstances of the case has been rolled over

by another three weeks which may make the settlement an impossibility forcing us into a litigation which is going to be devastating for the country and our Government, as it will show the superficiality of the entire TRC process. Irrespective of the merits, this is another example of things which have been the subject of a continuous string of promises made by the ANC which were not fulfilled. Therefore, primarily we must ask ourselves the question whether anything which is said, discussed and agreed in this venue will in fact be implemented.

The relationship between the IFP and the ANC has experienced a large number of problems and difficulties and after many other stages, methods and venues have been employed to try to address these problems and difficulties. Therefore, the IFP feels that this meeting is almost a last resort which must neither be missed nor under-utilised. For this reason, the IFP intends to table in this meeting the full list of difficulties and problems it sees and has experienced in its relationship with the ANC. The IFP does so not to recriminate or to accuse but to heal and move forward.

We see this occasion as the one in which the ANC and the IFP must wash each other's wounds and make substantial progress in their healing. Therefore, it is necessary that we deal with the relevant issues in depth and exhaustively. No real progress can be made unless solutions to the issues are found, and no solution can be found unless the truth and the details of each relevant issue are fully recognised and addressed. Skirting around the issues cannot be the basis for progress. This exercise must also go to the root of some of the issues.

The issues that the IFP intends to table during this meeting are not new and their not being new, compounds their problematic nature. In fact, the IFP has tabled them with the ANC on many prior occasions and they have not been addressed. Therefore, this meeting must now both address such issues as well as the separate problem of why they have not been addressed in spite of their having been on the table for so long.

The IFP is very concerned by the lack of responses it received to its many prior attempts to engage the ANC in serious discussions on the relevant outstanding issues. For instance, my January 8, 2002 letter to the ANC's Secretary-General was not even acknowledged or replied to in spite of it calling for a reply and it having been sent on two separate occasions in case it went astray. This letter was sent because similar correspondence to the President of the ANC on sensitive issues went unacknowledged and unanswered.

For the past eight years the IFP has seen its co-operation with the ANC as the most important route to ensuring the reconciliation of those who were at war with one another during the low intensity civil war which developed between our two parties during the 80's and 90's and claimed the lives of about 20,000 of our people, imposing untold suffering on hundreds of thousands more. We left no stone unturned nor spared any effort to promote co-operation and to project an image of reconciliation. It was in 1991 that I proposed joint rallies in violence-torn areas and in 1996 began an incessant campaign calling for unity and the launching of a revolution of goodwill.

For more than eight years the IFP has acted under the theory that if we project a sound and credible image of our respective party leadership working together to rebuild and develop our country, our people on the ground would take heed of the cordial

relationship between their leaders and could find in their hearts the strength not only to stop seeing their political opponents as enemies, but also to begin realising that it is time to look upon them as friends and brothers and sisters in the national effort of reconstruction and development. The perception that the relationship between IFP and ANC leaders has deteriorated beyond repair, places all the progress made in jeopardy. One does not suggest that cordial relations must last forever and that the IFP and the ANC will never part ways. However, it is important that if now is the time for us to part ways, we do so acknowledging the outstanding issues and committing ourselves to continue the path of reconciliation even on bases different from those of cooperation in Government. It is important that we recognise that reconciliation is work that we must be jointly committed to continue for the next decades.

We must not give up that work because if reconciliation is not fully achieved and consolidated, everything which we tried to achieve for our reconciliation is in jeopardy. The entire prospect of an African Renaissance and indeed NEPAD itself will sink if we do not continue to pursue reconciliation at all costs. The most important aspect of reconciliation is that of remaining polite and respectful of one another. It is also essential that we leave no stone unturned to ensure that whatever happens between our two organisations at the political level, there is no opportunity for a resurgence of violence. As I will indicate later, violence against the IFP has never stopped. In this respect, I must place on record clearly and bluntly that I do not think the ANC has done enough to stop violence. In all my recent addresses to my constituency, including those I make in our General Conferences I have stressed that no IFP person is allowed to resort to violence, even if he or she is provoked. I have condemned violence among my own supporters time and again. However, I have not seen the same statements being reciprocated by the ANC. It is essential that the proactive effort is made to prevent violence from erupting. Perceptions become reality and the perception that the ANC is involved in violence against the IFP, condoned by the highest ANC leadership, is part and parcel of the political discourse of KwaZulu Natal. This situation was compounded by the way in which the trial of the killers of the Mayor of Nongoma was handled and the involvement in the controversy of the highest level of the ANC's KwaZulu Natal provincial leadership. Therefore, it is essential for us that this meeting, irrespective of its outcome, produces a pledge to continue on the path of reconciliation.

However, if this is to happen it is essential that the outstanding issues be solved and that a framework of mutual respect be maintained so as to avoid jeopardizing the gains made in the pursuit of reconciliation. Unfortunately, the existing signs point in the opposite direction and the perception exists that issues have not been solved and that the framework of mutual respect which the IFP struggled to construct, has either never been in place, or has cracked. It must be stressed that this is not a matter of only claiming the respect which is rightly owed to me as the Leader of the IFP, but it is a matter of respecting my followers.

Removing the root causes

The problem and its solution

The most lethal wound to the IFP-ANC relationship came from the low intensity civil war between our respective supporters and the ANC propaganda and campaign of vilification employed as part of its strategy. I as the Leader of the IFP was portrayed as a collaborator of *apartheid* and my role in the liberation movement was obfuscated and ignored. Instead of rightly recognising me as one of South Africa's leaders in the

liberation movement, lies were employed to undermine my role and contribution. This issue is of paramount importance and relevance not as a personal issue which affects me as Mangosuthu Buthelezi alone, but as an issue which affects the existence of the millions of people who followed me in my struggle, many of whom paid the ultimate price with their lives, or bore untold human suffering because of it. It is their contribution which is being obliterated and negated and they are the final recipient of the insults contained in the lies to discredit me, including those perpetuated by the TRC. It is for them that the truth must be re-established and the ANC must distance itself and gainsay the lies employed in the past.

The IFP recognises that the ANC has made certain attempts to walk down this road, but the steps taken have been timid, limited and insufficient, even though they are acknowledged and much appreciated. Unfortunately, the record of these efforts shows many lost opportunities and no real commitment. The first great opportunity was that of the ANC's leader, then President Mandela, and myself as the IFP leader, holding joint rallies to address their people in violence-torn areas. In spite of President Mandela having agreed to them, these rallies were never held and the only one which was organised in Taylor's Hall was cancelled when President Mandela received inordinate pressures from ANC cadres to cancel it.

Similarly, several years went into the organisation of a joint rally in Thokoza, one of the worst theatres of the low-intensity civil war to be addressed by President Mbeki and myself. After many postponements it was understood that this occasion would offer the opportunity for the ANC to rectify the record of history recognising the role played by me as the IFP leader and by Inkatha in the liberation struggle. However, President Mbeki's written speech contained nothing significant in this respect and the remarks he added off the cuff touched on the issue without providing the full measure of acknowledgment which was required and widely expected.

My aforesaid letter to the ANC's Secretary-General pointed out that another opportunity was lost during the ANC's 90th Anniversary celebrations in which the only statement relating to Inkatha made within the context of the history of the liberation movement was that I grew up in the ANC Youth League, without acknowledging the three decades of liberation struggle which I conducted. Moreover, former President Mandela's recent ludicrous statements that the IFP was financed by apartheid and that I co-operated with it, compounded the problem and created a real climate of suspicion, because it is a matter of record that neither ever happened, which former President Mandela could not repeatedly gainsay if he is in good faith.

The ANC never distanced itself from the lies used to defame the IFP leader and Inkatha, ranging from former President Mandela's statement at the UN Security Council in June 1992 that Inkatha was a surrogate of apartheid, to the failure to take distance from the libellous and totally false book *Gatsha Buthelezi - A chief with a double agenda*, written by Mzala Nobleman Nxumalo, who was then an ANC researcher, at the ANC's instance.

In prior discussions between the IFP and the ANC it was agreed that there is a need to reconstruct a fair and objective record of Inkatha's contribution to the liberation struggle and the role that the IFP leader played in it. It was agreed that Professor Herbert Vilakazi would conduct this task, receiving inputs from both Parties, as a scholar who enjoys both Parties' confidence and respect. However, this agreement was never

implemented. It is now necessary to implement it within a rigid time-frame and to ensure that the outcome of this process is firmly tied to a specific event or opportunity. The IFP wishes to make progress in this respect and in order to do so wishes to place before the ANC the concrete proposal that once approved by both Parties, Prof Vilakazi's contribution be placed before a formal venue to be established to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of our liberation on April 27, 2004. This venue should be independent and established under the auspices of the State and should receive Prof. Vilakazi's report as a joint contribution from the IFP and the ANC, which would not preclude each Party from making additional and separate inputs. This action would go a long way in promoting reconciliation, irrespective of the outcome of this meeting.

On many occasions the IFP has made inputs to try to identify the main flaws in the present record of history, corrupted as it is by the vilification of the past. My aforesaid letter to the ANC's Secretary-General contains a long list of facts and circumstances which must be taken into account. More will need to be supplied and possibly jointly researched or disclosed from the ANC's archives, especially as they relate to the violence against the IFP, the killing of its leaders and the assassination attempts against the IFP President and his colleagues.

Some highlights

The list of historical circumstances distorted by the campaign of vilification is too long to mention. Some are listed in my correspondence to former President Mandela and the ANC Secretary-General. However, it must be stressed how the lies of the past are carrying into and polluting present-day politics.

The pejorative of "Bantustan" in reference to Ulundi is often hurled at us by no lesser person than the leader of the ANC in KwaZulu Natal, Mr S'bu Ndebele. Even recently in a not-so oblique reference to the Premier, Mr Ndebele stated that he cannot be told anything by "political johnny-come-latelys" who were modelled by Bantustan politics. May be there is no bigger insult than the lie that KwaZulu was ever a "Bantustan" so-called. President de Klerk stated at the TRC that they abandoned their grandiose apartheid scheme because of Prince Mangosuthu Buthelezi's rejection of independence a'la Pretoria. Moreover it was no lesser a person than Dr Oliver Tambo and Inkosi Albert Lutuli and other ANC leaders who persuaded our leader not to turn down the leadership of the Zulu Territorial Authority if he was elected in 1970 by amaKhosi and the people of KwaZulu. Indeed proof of this fact is that President OR Tambo worked with me right through until after the London meeting in October 1979, which some of us here attended, between the ANC leadership and the Inkatha leadership.

At that meeting Dr Tambo stated that Inkosi Mangosuthu Buthelezi was not "a traitor" as had been said by Dr Ntatho Motlana after I, as our Leader, had told a meeting at Langa in Cape Town about his contact with Dr Tambo. In fact Dr Tambo said that there were others who could be called traitors, for instance Ikumkani Kaizer Matanzima. When this utterance was made by Mr Tambo, the present President of the ANC and now of South Africa, was also present so that when Mr Ndebele hangs the label of a Bantustan on us, he insults not only the Premier who was a member of my Cabinet, but he insults me and millions of my followers. Recently the print media also quoted Mr Ndebele in reference to the Premier's stance on Nevirapine, as having referred to the Premier as a salesman for pharmaceutical companies and that people could not be bluffed by a salesman in whatever shape or form.

There were some of us who were also present at the unveiling of the tombstone of the President of the ANC mission in exile, Dr O.R. Tambo, in Benoni when Mr Cleopas Nsibandé testified to the fact that Inkosi Lutuli and Dr Tambo together sent a message to me through Princess Morgina to the effect that he should accept a leadership position of the Government of KwaZulu Territorial Authority if the people of KwaZulu elected him. Against this background it should be clear that these kind of insults which the very leader of the ANC in KwaZulu Natal, Mr Sbu Ndebele, is churning out almost weekly, will cause the flames of violence once again to be reignited.

The Coalition in KwaZulu Natal

For a long time, the ANC's behaviour in the coalition government of KwaZulu Natal has been extremely problematic. Certain examples are indicative of the type of destructive, confrontational and undermining conduct which has characterised its participation in the coalition since August 1999. Very often ANC provincial leader Mr S'bu Ndebele attacks and undermines his Premier. He even went so far as to display such unbecoming conduct during the opening of the provincial Parliament this year and in front of His Majesty the King, the Deputy President, the Minister of Justice, Dr PM Maduna, me, as the IFP leader, and other national leaders. Notwithstanding appeals by the Speaker, Mr Ndebele persisted, aided and abetted by Mr Bheki Cele, Ms Blose and others. This contemptuous behaviour is becoming very obvious and well-known to people on the ground and this undermines to its very foundation the process of reconciliation. If people see their leaders insulting one another and lacking respect for one another, they may act in an even worse manner in respect of their political opponents on the ground which may give rise to a resurgence of violence. In fact, the message which Mr S'bu Ndebele with this type of behaviour sends to people on the ground may be read as an incitement to violence. To the extent that for the very first time after the official opening of Parliament, there is vitriolic and insulting graffiti in the toilets in Ulundi. This is an incitement to violence.

At the national level, the IFP has never insulted the President. No IFP leader has ever lacked respect for ANC leaders nor has ever brought personal attacks against them. Since 1994 the IFP has at times disagreed with the ANC but has never been disagreeable with ANC leaders nor projected an image of animosity, confrontation or virulence. The IFP has maintained this behaviour in the national Parliament and in all its Committees.

Conversely, the ANC in KwaZulu Natal has maintained a constant course of confrontation and destructive behaviour in all its activities, including its positions in portfolio committees and in respect of legislation which was approved by the Cabinet in which it sits. It went so far as to threaten to refuse to approve the Government's budget. The conduct of Mr Bheki Cele, MPP, Mr S'bu Ndebele, MPP and Mr Mtholephi Mthimkulu towards the IFP, has been characterised by a constant string of personal attacks on the IFP, with expressions which would be unbecoming of any civilised democracy and in our context could easily be regarded as an incitement to violence and political hatred. Nothing similar can be pointed out in the way IFP leaders have behaved towards ANC leaders. People on the ground misinterpret our behaviour as confirming that we are lap-dogs of the ANC.

In many respects it is clear that the KwaZulu Natal coalition government has not been working for a long time. For instance, months after the IFP Premier had announced the fundamental provincial policy that anti-retroviral drugs would be distributed in all public health care facilities to prevent mother-to-child HIV transmission, the MEC for health had instructed his lawyers to appear before a judge arguing that KwaZulu Natal was not ready, willing and able to do just that. This forced the Premier to intervene in that litigation and place all the relevant facts before the judge. On that occasion, the judge was forced to rule that in terms of the Constitution, all executive authority vests in the Premier who could, therefore, correctly intervene in that litigation; a point which Mr S'bu Ndebele had constantly challenged for the past two years, claiming that he should be a quasi deputy Premier. Throughout his participation in the KwaZulu Cabinet as Minister of Economic Affairs and Tourism, Deputy President Zuma never ever conducted himself as Mr Ndebele conducts himself.

Another aspect showing the non-functioning of the KZN Coalition is centred around the drafting of a constitution for the province. It is unconscionable for the ANC to ascribe to the IFP the intention of not wanting to draft a constitution for the province. The very notion of having constitutions for provinces was introduced in the constitutional negotiations of the early 90's by the IFP and was advocated by it alone. It is particularly rich for the ANC to make such an accusation when the province had adopted a Constitution in 1996 which was an extremely watered down version of what the IFP wanted or had ever conceived to agree to. This Constitution was adopted unanimously because of the enormous amount of concessions made by the IFP and in spite of that, the ANC opposed its certification before the Constitutional Court.

The IFP has indicated its willingness to resume working on the constitution but requested this to be a serious effort which must address all the relevant issues which a constitution is expected to cover, including the monarchy, the amaKhosi, the House of Traditional Leaders and other matters which are high on the political agenda of the province. The constitution must be the opportunity to find a fundamental compact amongst all provincial political forces. It is the opportunity to force all those concerned to seek consensus and work together. It cannot be a purely perfunctory exercise with the sole scope and purpose of increasing the number of Cabinet Ministers in the province.

For this reason, in his State of the Province address, the Premier outlined a serious and substantive process leading to the expedited drafting and adoption of a provincial constitution. This process requires the IFP and the ANC to work together on the relevant issues at the highest level of their respective leadership to reach an agreement in principle on the actual list of items to be covered in the constitution and the general parameters of how they should be regulated. This is a serious way of going about achieving real progress in this matter. It is important that the ANC agrees to it, and that high-level meetings dealing with the constitution are scheduled. This will also enable the constitution-making process to be lifted from the confrontational climate of KwaZulu Natal politics and to avoid a repeat performance that whatever is agreed to in the provincial Legislature is then opposed by the ANC nationally during the certification process. The IFP has every reason to be wary in dealing with the ANC after experiencing the dishonouring of the Agreement on International Mediation by the former President of the ANC, President Mandela, and after what the ANC did in

accepting with all other parties the Constitution of KwaZulu Natal in 1996, and then taking it to the Constitutional Court immediately thereafter to oppose its certification.

The Capital of KwaZulu Natal

The issue of the capital of KwaZulu Natal is perhaps what the IFP feels is one of the most blatant betrayals by the ANC, and what undermined the process of mutual trust and respect. Effectively the coalition of KwaZulu Natal was disintegrated by this act of betrayal. For many years the issue of the legislative and/or administrative capitals was debated in the Province. Prior to the ANC's betrayal, the status of the matter was defined by a decision adopted by a commission of enquiry headed by Mr Radcliffe Cadman, a former Administrator of Natal, and appointed by former Premier, Dr FT Mdlalose, which, after long deliberations and an extensive process in which all relevant stakeholders and role-players in the province were canvassed, decided that the *status quo* should be maintained until a referendum is held on the matter. The *status quo* consisted of both Ulundi and Pietermaritzburg being administrative capitals, with administrative and ministerial offices located in both places, while the legislative capital alternated between Ulundi and Pietermaritzburg in respect of each term.

During the discussion on the Premier's State of the Province address this year, ANC Provincial Leader Mr S'bu Ndebele tabled a substantive motion for the House to resolve right there and then that henceforth Pietermaritzburg shall be the administrative and legislative capital of the province. This motion piggy-backed on one tabled by DA provincial leader, Roger Burrows, requesting the same thing. However, as he clarified in his address, Mr Burrows recognised that his motion was a "*pro forma* one" and he did not actually intend it to be passed. He has tabled such motion every prior year to state his Party's position. However, the situation created by the ANC riding on his motion would have forced a decision by the House having to be made, suddenly and unexpectedly.

Accordingly, Mr Burrows withdrew his motion and a compromise was struck for the development of a process with the following characteristics:

1. The only issue on the table would be that of the location of the legislative capital, to the exclusion of the issue of the administrative capital;
2. A decision on the legislative capital will be made by May 31, 2002;
3. An *ad hoc* committee is to be established to look into the issue and report back by May 31, 2002; and
4. The first meeting of the *ad hoc* committee should take place no later than 7th March.

Furthermore, for two years various political parties had committed themselves to drafting a constitution for the province and during his State of the Province Address the Premier announced a process to expedite its formulation. The issue of the capital had been a political football for too long and should have adequately been settled in a constitution where it would no longer be at the mercy of shifting parliamentary majorities and would be entrenched.

However, when May 31 came, the ANC joined with the DA and declared Pietermaritzburg as the sole primary seat of the Provincial Legislature. This hasty decision forced the IFP to declare Ulundi as the only seat in which Cabinet will be meeting, effectively turning Ulundi into the Province's administrative capital. This was a

very sensitive issue with very important political and historical undertones. The IFP believed that no decision on the location of the legislative capital should have been adopted until the next elections in 2004.

This issue should not have been dealt with on the basis of compromises which do not reflect a long-term vision of governance for the province. Establishing the legislative capital in one place while maintaining the administrative capital in another in respect of all or only some provincial departments, could be highly inefficient and problematic. We must have a vision which accommodates the provincial government in a coherent plan which takes into account the hard facts of administration as well as the sentiments of our people.

Ulundi was the last capital of the Zulu Kingdom and its fall under the conquering British army symbolises the subjugation of the Zulu people. Moving the capital out of Ulundi would be perceived by many as a second burning of Ulundi. Moreover, it is significant that in the Battle of Ulundi of July 4, 1879, a large number of "native" soldiers were used who were Zulu people mainly drawn from the Pietermaritzburg area. This fact carries heavy symbolic significance to this day.

Ulundi was built where only bushes existed. Within a quarter of a century it became a city which provided the only hub of development for that region, supplying job opportunities and services to people who had none. If Ulundi were to cease to be the capital, it would soon be transformed into a ghost city which would stand for eternity as a monument to the failure of liberation. The debate on the capital cannot be separated from the need to develop Ulundi and maintain its economic viability, even if it were no longer the capital. On many occasions the IFP has put forward proposals for a comprehensive plan for the economic development of Ulundi which found little or no interest from its ANC colleagues. This has effectively immensely frustrated the IFP's governance of the Province.

The IFP concedes that by itself a capital does not mean large scale development. Nonetheless, there is a significant degree of development which comes with the establishment of a capital. It would be unconscionable to move this benefit into an affluent area such as Pietermaritzburg and away from the poorest of the poor. It would also counter the ends of redistributive justice because the developmental benefits of the capital would be captured in Pietermaritzburg by segments of the population who are already affluent and are not previously historically disadvantaged. The IFP cannot reconcile our shared commitment towards black empowerment, if the ANC, colluding with white elitist interests, places the capital in Pietermaritzburg where black people would have little opportunity for empowerment and development. It will also confirm that the spatial inequalities of apartheid are maintained and that areas which were by-passed by the colonialist-driven development continue to be marginalised in the new South Africa because of petty political gains.

It has sent a terrible message to our people north of the Thukela if Pietermaritzburg were to be forced on them as the provincial capital by the opportunistic collusion of the ANC and DA. Their sense of alienation would deepen and so would their anger. People north of the Thukela were less exposed to the conflicts of the ANC-IFP war, and the related horrors and sufferings. Accordingly, they have nurtured a lesser desire for reconciliation and maintained a more militant attitude. They would feel a strong sense

of despair and a deep seated anger if the capital were moved south of the Thukela.

Pietermaritzburg was the colonial capital and maintains a colonial image in the eyes of the majority of the people of KwaZulu Natal. It also has insufficient accommodation for Members of Parliament and an inadequate legislative building. It is common cause that Ulundi has better infrastructures to accommodate the provincial Legislature, its members, its staff and its infrastructure, including overnight accommodation.

World experience shows that capitals should not necessarily be placed in the bigger cities but that their location may reflect developmental needs and considerations. In the Eastern Cape, Bisho was preferred over Port Elizabeth, East London and other bigger cities. Similarly, the capitals of Mpumalanga, the North West Province, the Northern Cape and other provinces have not been placed in the largest or most developed cities but rather in places where the developmental value of their location could be highlighted. Abroad, cities like Brasilia have been erected as capitals while, in the United States it is almost common practice that the capital be located in a smaller and often remote city.

The IFP is shocked that the ANC KwaZulu Natal provincial leaders would call Ulundi a "bantustan capital" to undermine its potential to be the capital of a province when KwaZulu was never a bantustan because of Inkatha's refusal to take independence and when the ANC chose artificial cities such as Bisho and Mmabatho which were created exclusively for the purpose of the nominally independent TBVC states as capitals in the provinces which the ANC controls. The IFP is also shocked by the statement that Pietermaritzburg would be a safer area for a capital when in fact the overwhelming number of victims in the ANC-IFP conflict have died in that area.

Finally, a decision on the capital outside the parameters of a constitution-making process of the province has made a mockery of the commitment jointly expressed by the IFP and the ANC to draft a new constitution for the province. It must be pointed out that the drafting of such constitution has been an echoing demand on the ANC's side for the past two years.

The issue of the King

History will not fail to record in the history of the monarchy of the Zulu Kingdom that after 1994 the ANC tried to turn His Majesty the King of the Zulu Nation into a political football. ANC provincial leader Mr S'bu Ndebele has admitted to certain people that the ANC had a strategy to woo His Majesty into its political campaign in order to increase its political support. He went so far as to state that his credit card had been overused to please His Majesty and to gain influence over him. This manipulation has been very destructive not only within the IFP-ANC relationship, but also for the institutional future of the Zulu monarchy. History has proven that wooing the King has no political value as the electoral results did not reflect the ANC's hopes. Nonetheless, His Majesty continues to be used as a pawn in ANC political games, as was recently shown by ANC provincial leader Mr S'bu Ndebele using the King as a pretext to move his aforesaid motion about Pietermaritzburg becoming the capital of the province.

Therefore, it is essential that henceforth the issue of the King is no longer dealt with as a political matter. It needs to be lifted on to a different level where it can be dealt with as an institutional matter. Only the drafting of a provincial constitution can offer this venue. In this respect, it is essential that the ANC abandons the notion of utilising the provincial

constitution as a tool to provide benefits to, and ways to, entice His Majesty. Constitutions limit the powers of monarchs rather than expanding them, and regularise their positions rather than creating new institutions around them which are not the product of history and traditions. The IFP says this because it is mindful of the ANC's proposals on the monarchy in 1996, such as a royal council and the king's power to appoint amaKhosi, which are contrary to our traditions.

The ANC must also remove any hindrance to the process of reconciliation and normalisation in the Zulu Nation and its Kingdom. This involves the mutual recognition of the roles that the king, the traditional Prime Minister and amaKhosi have to play in the structures of our Kingdom. This is a matter to be dealt with by the Zulu nation which could have been dealt with serenely and effectively had it not been for the manipulation of the ANC provincial leadership. For instance, one may mention the litigation brought by the ANC leadership against the legislative recognition of the traditional Prime Minister, which the ANC later decided to withdraw.

The issue of Traditional Leaders

The lack of resolution of the vexed issue of the conflict between the powers and functions of municipalities and those of traditional authorities will continue to bedevil the IFP-ANC relationship. The ANC President made a formal promise to traditional leaders that the powers of traditional authorities as they existed before 1994 would not be eroded and if eroded, would be restored. On November 30, 1999 a delegation of Cabinet ministers led by Deputy President JG Zuma and specifically mandated by Cabinet reached a formal agreement with the Coalition of Traditional Leaders that chapters 7 and 12 of the Constitution would be amended as soon as possible after the December 1999 elections to recognise local government powers in traditional authorities. The failures to fulfil these promises places the IFP in an impossible position because its continuous co-operation with the ANC in the national Government portrays it as an accessory to this fundamental breach of trust.

The President promised that the issue of traditional leadership would be settled through an interim measure before the December 1999 elections. Eighteen months later, no solution is in sight nor is there any reliable, credible process which seems to be addressing the problem. The perception that a breach of trust and honour has occurred is compounded by the fact that the issue of traditional leadership is one of those outstanding issues which former President Mandela had solemnly agreed would be settled through international mediation. This promise was also dishonoured.

Therefore, it is essential that government commits itself to fulfilling the promise that the Constitution will be amended. In fact, all the experts who have reviewed the matter and have reported to the relevant Department and to Cabinet, have clearly indicated that without a constitutional amendment the door cannot be opened to vest any local government powers in traditional authorities. The government's own fundamental policy document on the matter clearly stated that without such a direct vesting, the final chapter on the dissolution and obliteration of the powers and functions of traditional leadership will be written. Against this background, it is preferable for the IFP if the ANC comes clean on the issue and openly states that it is not its intention to provide traditional authorities with any local government powers or traditional leadership with any significant powers of governance. The IFP would respect the ANC for doing so as it would respect its position. This would enable the IFP to agree to disagree with the ANC,

rather than continuing to find itself being manipulated in participating in a process of deceiving traditional leaders and stringing them along, which forces the IFP to question in public government policies and the good faith, honesty and integrity of the ANC leadership. The recently published White Paper shows that Government has no intention of solving this problem and has in fact moved in the direction opposite to the one expressed in its previous many promises to traditional leadership.

Violence and criminal system

During my reply to the President's state of the nation address I mentioned the IFP's serious concern that the criminal justice system is no longer a guarantee that political wrong-doing may be redressed. I mentioned how the perpetrators of the hideous killing of the mayor of Nongoma, Mr Joseph Sikhonde have not been brought to justice and that their trials took place in a climate of strong suspicions of political interference in the investigation and prosecution. Too many acts of political violence remain uninvestigated and without adequate prosecution. I further mentioned the failure to put on trial the suspects who attacked my Deputy, Mr Shodoba Ndlovu, and also the IFP candidate in Vosloorus, Mr Justice Radebe, in the year 2000.

If the ANC is serious about promoting reconciliation between the IFP and the ANC and the general political climate in South Africa which is no longer characterised by political violence, it must make a fundamental policy decision. It must be decided that priority should be given to the investigation and prosecution of politically motivated violence and that measures must be taken by the police and the Department of Justice to prevent the occurrence of such events.

For instance, both parties are now confronted with the most unsettling situation of plans having been discovered for the murdering of IFP national organiser, Mr Albert Mncwango. The way this matter will be handled and the degree of efficacy of the investigations relating to it, will be the acid test of the ANC's good faith in rooting out forever the evil of political violence from our democratic life. The IFP wishes to make this a test case of whether democracy has taken root in our country or like in Zimbabwe, political violence and assassinations may continue to remain a hideous and vile feature of our political dynamics. There were murders and violence during elections in 1994. There were murders and violence during the 2000 local government elections. Are we to expect similar happenings during the forthcoming elections in 2004?

Policy Differentiations

There have been many embarrassing situations which have undermined the proper functioning of the ANC-IFP co-operation at the national level. They include situations in which the IFP was not adequately informed and consulted and found itself having to read from newspapers decisions ostensibly taken by the Government and in the name of the state. Amongst them were the legislation allowing the crossing of the floor and the holding of an international workshop on the middle eastern crisis.

The IFP does not intend to suggest that the IFP and the ANC should agree every time and on everything. In fact, since the beginning, the IFP has predicated its co-operation with the ANC on its right to disagree on any relevant policy issue. However, we indicated that we would disagree without being disagreeable and we would do so when we felt that the interests of the country are at stake or on important matters of principle, and not for purposes of political point-scoring. We feel that during the past eight years

we have been faithful to this undertaking. However, even if our positions are different and may remain different in many respects, we felt that the requirements of comity and fair partnership call for our prior consultation before fundamental policies of the state are formulated and announced.

Unfortunately, during the past eight years there has been little party to party consultation between the IFP and the ANC at the national level in the formulation of national policies.

The IFP's input has only taken place when matters were already in Cabinet or in Portfolio Committees, often leaving the IFP only the option to accept them or note its principled opposition. Soon after the July 1999 elections, the President had written to me as the IFP leader indicating his intention to have periodic, possibly monthly meetings among himself, the IFP leader and the Deputy President to forge together the general domestic and international policies to be followed by the Government. However, none of such meetings ever took place with the exception of one in November last year which ended up dealing only with the issue of the former Director-General of the Department of Home Affairs.

This has created serious difficulties for the IFP both in terms of fundamental policies relating to domestic matters as well as those controlling our foreign policy. Domestically, we are concerned about the insufficient efforts made to generate employment, create incentives for economic growth, liberalise the economy, increase training of public officials, introduce flexibility in the labour market, fight crime, lawlessness and rebellion and, last but not least, to fight the war against HIV/AIDS. In terms of foreign policy, we are concerned about South Africa having engaged in creating dynamics which juxtapose north and south, or rich countries and developing ones. We see an international climate in which it is imperative for our country to stand firm, defending the values of democracy and freedom, and embracing the positive aspects of globalization as the fastest route for our own economic growth and development. We prefer this to the option of segregating developing countries into a new bloc, even though that may give us a position of international primacy in such a bloc.

The IFP is also concerned by the ANC strategic intentions. We cannot help seeing in the crafting of the legislation allowing the crossing of the floor in the provincial Legislature the opening of the opportunity for a surreptitious attempt to gain control of the KwaZulu Natal Government, in spite of and against the will of the electorate. In fact, there was no reason whatsoever to bring to the fore this legislation when only that dealing with the crossing of the floor in local government was necessitated by the split in the Democratic Alliance. We cannot understand why this legislation had to be pushed forward at this juncture when the country needs to write a new electoral law which in all likelihood will address this issue adequately and permanently.

Therefore, it is essential that the ANC makes a commitment to co-operate with the IFP on different bases at the national level, consulting with the IFP on a variety of fundamental issues before they are concretised in policies or legislation. IFP inputs should also be taken into account. The fact that we wish to convey them to the ANC privately should prove that our concern is not that of scoring political points but ensuring that the greatest interests of the country are served with the benefit of the best inputs we can make. We believe that in order to concretise a change of attitude, the ANC should withdraw the *ad hoc* and *interim* legislation allowing the crossing of the floor in national

and provincial Legislatures so that the issue can be handled properly and transparently by the pertinent policy formulation task group approved by Cabinet.

Past seemingly resolved issues

Important issues have polluted the IFP/ANC cooperation in Government. These issues now belong to the past and seem to have been resolved only by virtue of their having been overtaken by events. However, they should be mentioned if one is to be comprehensive in analysing the causes of the present breakdown between the IFP and the ANC. Amongst such issues is the suspicion, contempt and obstructionism with which I as the Minister of Home Affairs was met when promoting the reform of our system of migration control. In this respect, the matter was not political in nature and yet my Immigration Bill was turned into an unprecedented political football. The reform of migration control became one of the most controversial debates in the country, albeit the ANC never publicly tabled its own policy on international migration and never really opposed anything of substance in the Bill. I was allowed to become a punch bag of ANC Members of Parliament, who had little knowledge of the subject matter and went out of their way to embarrass me and discredit the process I had undertaken.

Other initiatives which I undertook as the Minister of Home Affairs have been equally opposed or met with suspicion, even though they had little political value. Amongst them I can mention the appointment of the Electoral Task Team and my efforts to promote the decentralisation of the delivery aspects of civic affairs. However, the most salient example of how I have been regarded with suspicion and my ministerial functions have been undermined relates to the saga of my former Director-General, Mr Billy Masetlha. It is untenable that any Minister of State could be required to serve and exercise his ministerial functions and responsibilities without the benefit of a Director-General whom the Minister can trust and rely on. I had to work with a Director-General who was defying me on any opportunity he had and who effectively led the Department into a massive administrative crisis. My many efforts aimed at remedying this problem met with no cooperation, sympathy and assistance. Effectively, the interests of the State were compromised as my functions as a Minister became increasingly more difficult to carry out.

The present crisis

The KwaZulu Natal Government needs partners who are willing to support the IFP Premier and support his Government. Mr S'bu Ndebele has given indication time and again that he intends to topple Premier Mtshali's Government. He has also called for early elections. The DA is also committed to the notion of early elections. The IFP cannot be in the way of a call which intends to devolve to the will of the people the resolution of a political controversy. What we cannot allow is that the will of the people is turned upside down and that an IFP Premiership is substituted by an ANC premiership not by election but by virtue of legislation. The provision in the Constitutional Amendment Bill which purports to fire elected Members of Parliament to substitute them with other people who are at present private citizens is, in our eyes, an attempt on our constitutional order and the very notion of democracy. It is the type of legislation which turns countries into banana republics. I must honestly and frankly give notice that we will do everything in our power which is legitimate and allowed under the Constitution to prevent this legislation from coming into force or to frustrate its intended effects. Under the circumstances, with the ANC seeking to gain power in KwaZulu Natal through legislation it should be no surprise that we sought and found the assistance of the DA

with whom we have shared long-standing ties of ideological and policy affinity. We never regarded the DA as an enemy, but we have always considered them as partners. They have been our partners in local government since 1999. We value their contribution in the governance of KwaZulu Natal. I am surprised that their participation in our Government should be the source of so much consternation when Mr S'bu Ndebele himself in one of the many speeches he delivered in anticipation of being the new Premier of KwaZulu Natal indicated that his government would be open to the DA's participation. I wish to record for posterity that I have done all I could do to ensure that we consolidate our relations as two parties that went together into the Government of National Unity in 1994 and which after the expiry of the Government of National Unity in 1999 continued to work together at the invitation of the President who asked that I and the IFP continue to work together with the ANC.

It is now history that the President offered me the position of Deputy President. He first discussed this with me before the 1999 elections. On the 8th of June 1999, the President formally offered me the position of Deputy President, but then, to my surprise, the President told me that he had a meeting earlier that day with a delegation led by Mr Sbu Ndebele in the same lounge where we were at Oliver Tambo house. The President told me that Mr Ndebele and delegation had suggested that if he was going to offer me the Deputy Presidency, I should then give the Premiership of KwaZulu Natal to Mr Ndebele. I could not accept this without offending the people who had voted for me and the IFP in KwaZulu Natal in 1999. So I preferred not to accept the position of Deputy President on those terms.

I am quite astonished that the delicate relationship that we have tried to consolidate between our two parties that were at war in the 80s and 90s should be trampled underfoot in the manner in which this is being done merely to ensure that Mr Ndebele becomes Premier of KwaZulu Natal by other means.

We must continue on the path of reconciliation, even accepting that the circumstances have changed. We cannot turn the clock of history backwards. We must move forward under different circumstances, salvaging whatever may be salvaged and consolidating our working relationship where it exists and where it may function in the interests of the country.

-----oo0oo-----

link2media

the accepted press release gateway into newsrooms

| [Back](#) | [Home](#) |

Story 1144596

BC-PR-KZN-MAKHAYE-SPEECH
PR-KZN-MAKHAYE-SPEECH
SAPA PR WIRE SERVICE - SAPA PR WIRE SERVICE - SAPA PR WIRE SERVICE
SAPA PR -- HOUSING MEC RESPONDING TO SPEECH DELIVER BY MTSHALI

Issued by: KwaZulu-Natal Department of Housing

Attention: News Editor

For Immediate release:

28 Nover 2002

SPEECH BY DUMISANI MAKHAYE, KWAZULU NATAL MEC FOR HOUSING,
RESPONDING TO SPEECH DELIVERED BY PREMIER LIONEL MTSHALI -
28 November 2002.

Karl Marx opens his marvellous work, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" with the following words: "Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce." This fact also applies to falsehoods and personages of mean.

In the Book of Revelations a story is told of "war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the devil; and the dragon fought and his angels. And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven.

And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: He was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.

And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.

And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death.

Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea 'We kuwe mhlaba' for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." This was a tragedy.

The tragedy has repeated itself as farce. Early in 1999 there was war in heaven, the National Government. And the great devil was cast out into the earth, KwaZulu Natal, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.

As Premier Lionel Mtshali made his speech on Tuesday, these passages from the Holy Book flashed in my mind. Indeed, KwaZulu Natal is cursed and we shall be overcome by the blood of the Lamb. The Lamb in this case are our people united in their diversity for peace, democracy and development. Counted also among our people to save our province are all political parties, including the healthy forces within the IFP, the worker and the businessperson, the peasant and the intellectual, the believer and non-believer, men and women, black and white, young and old.

The speech of the Premier was unprovoked, irresponsible and extremely scarce on truth. Even a cheap gossip peddling the untruth would know that floor-crossing was declared constitutional. What was at issue was the mechanism to effect floor-crossing which will be corrected by amending the constitution. We have sufficient numbers.

The Premier spoke at length about the sanctity of multi-party democracy. Well, was there any multi-party democracy in the KwaZulu homeland under the IFP? Ask the people of Lamontville, KwaMashu, Umlazi, KwaMaKhutha, Esikhawini, Ngwelezane, Portshepstone, Trust Feed, Imbali, Clermont, Bhambayi and Inanda! Ask the students of Ongoye who dared to air their views. Ask the families of those young people who were massacred in Ulundi on the eve of the 1994 elections.

The Premier talked about the people having elected him into the premiership. He must be living prior to 1999. The reality is that in 1999 the IFP's representation into this legislature was reduced by the electorate from 41 to 34 while the ANC representation was increased from 26 to 32. Both the ANC and IFP are guaranteed 34 votes each in this legislature. The Premier's imaginary majority reminds me of Hitler's hallucinations. When the great generals of the Soviet Union were knocking at the doors of Berlin during World War 2, Hitler was still issuing orders to armies long annihilated by the Red Army, armies that no longer existed. Hitler had lost touch with all reality.

Is this the case with our Premier? Has the Premier forgotten that he is the Premier thanks to the votes of 32 ANC MPLs, 3 NNP MPLs, 2 MF MPLs, 1 ACDP MPL and 1 UDM MPL? Can he really forget such generosity? Of course, the Democratic Party put up its own candidate for premiership.

The Premier wants to tell us that he is a man of principle and is dead against floor-crossing. But he has accepted councillors from other parties who have crossed into the IFP of which he is the National Chairperson. When the Floor-crossing Act passes as it will soon pass, can the Chair of the IFP make a public statement and say the IFP will never accept MPs and MPLs crossing from other parties to it?

The Premier talks about ANC members in the Cabinet to toe the IFP line or reconsider their positions. We are in that Cabinet by right and not by goodwill of the IFP. The IFP National Cabinet members who are there per invitation of the ANC vigorously and publicly campaign against certain ANC government positions. The ANC has not yet told them to reconsider their positions in the ANC Cabinet.

Let us warn that whoever hopes to threaten and carry out violence against our people in order to rob our people the right to choose their public representatives free of any intimidation will curse the day he was born. South African democracy is ready to defend and extend its frontiers.