

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR DISCUSSION WITH THE HONOURABLE R. P. MEYER,
MINISTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNICATION

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

ULUNDI : FEBRUARY 12 1993

Thank you for having taken the trouble to come to Ulundi today. We are meeting at your request. We do so at a crucial time during transformation of our society. This meeting follows a long period of difficult relations between Inkatha Freedom Party and the KwaZulu Government on one side, and the South African Government and the National Party on the other side. Our meeting offers us an opportunity to do something constructive about this. We need a frank and open discussion.

Inkatha Freedom Party has been committed to negotiation since the time of its inception. We have never seen any alternative to negotiation. This commitment of ours carries with it a determination to be involved in negotiations and it is exclusion from important negotiations which lies at the root of the difficulties which have arisen between us.

You, Mr Minister, are prone to say that the IFP has excluded itself from negotiations by cancelling meetings that have been arranged. This matter must now be discussed and I ought never again to be accused of being responsible for the lack of bilateral discussions between IFP and Government.

When you are looking at ways and means of putting right that which is wrong, you have to go to the heart of the matter. Mr Minister, I was not consulted and there was no discussion on the question of how Government should respond to the ANC smashing CODESA by withdrawing from it and taking to the streets in mass action. Also I was not consulted, and there was no discussion, on how Government should respond to Dr Mandela's hideous charges in his address to the Security Council. Nor was there any discussion about how Government should respond to Dr Mandela's provocative ultimatum delivered in July. Government did its own thing. It met negotiation treachery with an offer of a whole weeks Bosberaad.

Then what Government was doing disappeared behind closed doors and all we had was the bland assurances that you, Mr Minister, and Mr Ramaphosa, were not discussing anything that had not been discussed in CODESA. I read this, as you saying in your own words, that you were continuing CODESA negotiations, bilaterally.

However it is put, and however Government justifies what it was doing to keep negotiations on track, it was doing what it was doing, unilaterally. This unilateralism culminated in the Record

of Understanding. It was that final straw which finally broke the camel's back. You can say that the IFP made a lot of noise about the Record of Understanding, and you can add I thought, rather provocatively, that the IFP is never the less backing discussions with Government. It is your prerogative to say that as Minister of Constitutional Development, but I can say that it was totally unbecoming to the dignity of your high office.

You make great play on the fact that the IFP withdrew from further discussions on federalism, and you can make great play on the fact that the IFP withdrew from COSAG's discussions with you about the agenda for a multi-party conference. That is your prerogative. But you do so at a cost which your presentation of these IFP actions, calls for.

We are not going to be forced into a position in which we are asked to participate in negotiations without an effective opportunity to negotiate on behalf of our constituency and of the people of South Africa.

Throughout my political life I have always spoken out, and I have always spoken the truth without regard to political costs. I shall not bend to the threat of marginalisation. For five years I refused to speak to, or have any contact with, State President PW Botha. I will not be intimidated and I do not appreciate anyone making the statement that the IFP or the Zulu Nation can be cut out from participating in the very process of transforming our society which I myself argued for and promoted in over forty years of political involvement.

Since the beginning of my involvement in politics, I elected non-violence and negotiation as the only method of bringing about a fair and just South Africa. I have always believed that dialogue and reason can triumph over the most fiercest enemies. I have never rejected an opportunity to talk with anyone, no matter how much I disdained their politics. For this reason I felt very taken aback by your negative comments about my dialogue with the Conservative Party and with some other political formations which clearly do not share the political agenda of the IFP. For many years the full might of the State has not been capable of curbing my freedom of speaking out. I can assure you that at this critical juncture of South African history I will not be subdued in any respect.

I have always felt deeply and personally insulted by the innuendos, and sometimes explicit statements, that people around me were able to influence my thoughts or manipulate me. Reference has been made to people who write speeches in such a way that it is inferred that I can not speak for myself. I have now heard this slander one time too many and I say bluntly that I am sick and tired of it. These kind of denigratory comments have been made for quite some time and they date back to the time when it was said that Mr Alan Paton was writing my speeches.

Quite clearly you entirely misunderstand Mr Felgate's role. You point to him without mentioning his name in Government's response to the IFP's paper delivered by Dr Mdlalose on 18th of January. That was an IFP paper. It reflected IFP consensus. I approved every word of it. Dr Mdlalose was party to that approval of it. Your criticism of the 18th of January document is a criticism of me, Mangosuthu Buthelezi.

I was not initiated into politics by Mr Felgate or by any other white man. I learnt my politics from my mother's knee. My mother, Princess Magogo ka Dinuzulu, told me from my childhood of how her grandfather, King Cetshwayo ka Mpande, was provoked into a war that he did not want, because the Imperial powers as represented by people like Sir Bartle Frere wanted "to break Zulu power once and for all."

She told me of how her father, King Dinuzulu ka Cetshwayo, was banished to the Island of St Helena, after a bloody clash with one of the "kinglets" that were imposed by the British to undermine the Zulu throne. She told me of her father's arrest in 1906, after the Zulu Rebellion or the Bambatha Rebellion of 1906. She remembered very vividly how British soldiers came to arrest her father, King Dinuzulu, when she was a mere child. But she also told me that Bishop John Colenso, of the Anglican Church, had always championed the cause of King Cetshwayo. She told me of how Bishop Colenso's daughters, and in particular, Miss Harriete Colenso, championed King Dinuzulu's cause. She told me how whites abused her for doing this, by throwing such expletives at her as 'Dinuzulu's whore'.

What you are doing to me in insulting my intelligence by implying that I am an empty-headed kaffir, who is pulled by the nose by a coterie of whites around me, reminds me of these insults that the whites hurled at my grandfather King Dinuzulu, merely because he was not a racist, but accepted the humanity of the Colenso family who also accepted his humanity.

My mother also told me of how some Afrikaaner leaders, such as Lucas Meyer, Mr Krogh and General Louis Botha, were friends of her father who assisted him. My mother told me of how, after the Union was formed, General Louis Botha became Prime Minister of South Africa. She told me of how General Botha ordered the release of her father, King Dinuzulu, from the Newcastle prison and gave orders that he be sent to 'Uitkyk' farm in Middelburg, where he died in 1913.

This is the background of my politics, Mr Minister. Dr Pixley Seme, who founded the ANC in 1912 was married to my Aunt, Princess Harriet Seme, the eldest daughter of King Dinuzulu. Dr Seme and my Aunt are not legends. I stayed with them even as a lad, doing my matriculation at the time, in the late forties. There were amongst my mentors in politics.

Professor Zechariah Mathews was my Professor at Fort Hare University. He was a great patriot and he was, at the time he taught me, the President of the African National Congress in the Cape. When I was rusticated from the University of Fort Hare in September, 1950, it was the same founder of the ANC, Dr Pixley Seme, who wrote a letter (a copy of which I still have), telling Professor Mathews who I was and of my possible future role in the Zulu Nation.

I was a member of the ANC Youth League, with people like Mr Oliver Tambo, Mr Nelson Mandela, Mr Joe Mathews, Mr Jordan Ngubane and Mr Robert Sobukwe, the Founder of the PAC. These were some of my soul-mates in politics during my youth, Mr Minister.

Chief Albert Lutuli, the Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, and the President-General of the ANC at the time of its banning, was my leader and mentor. I knew him from early times, when he used to attend meetings of Amakhosi at the Royal Residence of my uncle, Prince Arthur Edward Mshiyeni ka Dinuzulu, who was then Regent of the Zulu Nation, during the interregnum which followed the death of his brother, King Solomon Maphumzana ka Dinuzulu, the grandfather of the present King. The two brothers were my mother's full brothers.

Dr Alan Paton was a close friend of mine and we were the two Anglican laymen who were appointed by the Most Revd. Dr Joost de Blank, Archbishop of Cape Town at the time, as two laymen on the Board of the St Peter's Anglican Seminary, where Archbishop Desmond Tutu lectured as a young priest.

Mr Minister, I am only trying in broad strokes to sketch from whence I come in my politics, so that you can see the impact of your insult to me when you make me a lackey or a Zombie of Mr Felgate or any other white person. I want you to see the depth of the hurt that your animadversions have had on me. It has wounded me in a manner I cannot describe adequately to you. Your whole reaction to the document of January 18 contains some of the worst insults I have had from anyone in my entire political career.

You went so far as to say that the entire document reflecting the IFP's political position and negotiating strategy was the result of me being badly advised. You spoke as though some individuals were manipulating my thoughts and the thoughts of the IFP National Chairman, Dr FT Mdlalose. The implication of your comments are that both I and Dr Mdlalose are the stooges of some evil individual who works for us.

I was dumbfounded and flabbergasted by your reaction to that specific memorandum, which reflected the views which I expressed to State President FW De Klerk when I met with him on December 10, 1992. They also reflected some of the thoughts I expressed to the State President, in your presence, on September 17, 1992, nine days before he signed the Record of Understanding, which has destroyed trust between us. This was in your presence. The State President himself reacted angrily and stated that I implied that he was weak-kneed in dealing with the ANC/SACP alliance. But exactly nine days after this, some action was taken which gave confirmation to this.

I can assure you that position papers are not released under the name of Inkatha Freedom Party until and unless they have been fully reviewed and approved. The memorandum presented to Government on January 18, 1993 reflected the contents of a position paper adopted a few days earlier by the IFP Central Committee Executive. It was later fully endorsed and ratified by the full Central Committee of the IFP, and it was later adopted by the Caucus of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. As we stated in our press release, the IFP makes no apologies whatsoever for that memorandum and stands in closed ranks to support its tone, its contents and its spirit. We cannot pussy-foot when we see our country being dragged step by step into a Holocaust.

The IFP shall be granted the right to express its perceptions and assessment about the politics of the National Party. It might be questioned whether the IFP perceptions and political assessments are correct. However, it is unconscionable to demand, as you did, that the IFP abandons its political vision as a condition for continuing in negotiations with the Government of this country. If our politics do not qualify the IFP to sit at the negotiating table, then so be it. The newspapers, who got this somewhere, have already requested ad nauseum that we should be left out and so be it.

You have been negotiating in seclusion with the ANC/SACP Alliance for over 10 months, and it is hard for me to believe that this has not led to the identification of areas of agreement and areas of disagreement. After a few days of negotiation between the IFP and Government I think it is already possible to identify some areas of agreement and commonality. Why then do you so greatly resent and object to our inquiring about the areas on which the Government and the ANC are not at conflict or are in agreement? I raise this as a matter which needs to be addressed in order to rebuild trust between us.

When I last wrote to State President FW De Klerk I indicated to him that a climate of trust and mutual respect can only be restored with political deeds and not merely with political statements.

The IFP made it very clear that it would not go back to multi-party negotiations on the substance of a new constitutional dispensation for South Africa, until and unless some preliminary issues are resolved. We made the point very clearly that we do not wish to negotiate for a new constitution for South Africa until there is an agreement on the type of process which should govern negotiations, including negotiations about a two-phase approach centred around a transitional constitution, a Government of National Unity or a Constituent Assembly.

The IFP also indicated our unwillingness to return to multi-party negotiations until and unless a preliminary substantive fundamental issue is addressed and resolved. We indicated that before we go back to a restructured negotiating forum it must be decided what

type of constitution should be negotiated. Negotiations for a unitary state solution would not involve us in the same structures and processes as negotiations for a federal solution. We need to know what we are going to do before we begin to do it.

During the meeting between COSAG and the Government, the IFP indicated that these are items which must be put on the agenda for the Multi-Party Conference of Review, and in our January 18, 1993 memorandum we tabled the same agenda for the Multi-Party Planning Conference.

You must come to acknowledge that our position is that we are not willing to negotiate constitutional principles before some preliminary issues are resolved. Quite clearly you have not heard us.

You talk of holding a Multi-Party Planning Conference for one or possibly two days. This is a clear rejection of our entire approach to the conference as a negotiating forum on preliminary issues. You well know that if the conference is to be a negotiating forum there is no saying how long it will take to reach an agreement and the time frame required to complete the work of the conference needs to be regarded as open-ended.

You well know that it would take more than two days to decide seating arrangements, other practical matters and the kind of consensus required for the decisions of the Conference. In two days the conference will be unable to restructure a new negotiating forum and review what of the CODESA process can be salvaged for the future process. After a two day planning conference the only thing left to do would be to return to CODESA, however disguised and renamed. The IFP told you at the outset that we had no interest in transforming the Planning Conference into a replica of the Preparatory Conference which preceded CODESA I.

The message I am conveying to you is that skillful negotiating techniques and properly orchestrated misunderstandings do not produce sound agreements on which the process of transformation of our society can be based. In your negotiating effort you need to carry the Inkatha Freedom Party with you, and you will also need to carry the KwaZulu Government with you. It will avail you nothing to manipulate us into things which are totally against what we stand for. If the Government thinks that our demands are not acceptable it should say so at the outset.

The Government over-reaction on the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu astounded me. It was reminiscent of National Party leader's reaction at the height of apartheid when we initiated the Buthelezi Commission and the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. It was Mr PW Botha, and Mr Chris Heunis, all over again. It was amazing, particularly as we were mistaken in thinking that we had left that Baaskap world on the 2nd of February 1990, when the State President delivered his historic announcement abolishing apartheid.

You know very well, Mr Minister, that we were given assurances by the State President many times and sometimes by him through Dr Gerritt Viljoen, in writing, that you accepted that delegations would be constituted exactly as they were when we attended the President Conference on Intimidation and Violence in May 1991, and also when we attended the Peace Convention on September 14, 1991. I led an IFP delegation. Dr Madide led a KwaZulu Government delegation. The King attended on both occasions, accompanied by a delegation as is customary. But as soon as the ANC/SACP alliance disapproved of this, the Government started prevaricating about it as well. Suddenly we were told by the State President that "the agreement" was that only parties attended. His Excellency, the State President said this notwithstanding the fact that the ANC itself was not a political party and refuses to become one at present. So, even for this reason alone, the argument that it would only be parties involved was not valid.

In fact, it destroyed my respect for the Government. It reminded me of many promises that were made by white rulers to black people over generations, which were broken. What is worse is that the Xhosas of Transkei were represented by a Government delegation. No one said that it was adequate that Mr Mandela was present, who comes from Transkei and has built a house worth more than half-a-million rands there recently. The Xhosas of Ciskei were represented by a government delegation. The Tswanas of Bophuthatswana were represented by a government delegation and the Vendas of Venda were represented by their government delegation.

Can one think of any worst betrayal of the Zulu Nation than this! When the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly produces a Constitution for the State of KwaZulu/Natal Hell is let loose! Who must speak for the Zulu Nation? We in the IFP have never claimed a right to speak for the Zulu Nation.

It is also to no avail to try to create divisions amongst the members of the IFP. Now, more than ever, the Inkatha Freedom Party stands in closed ranks behind my leadership. It is sad for me to think that anyone could attempt to gain political ground by trying to drive wedges into the other political formations. These techniques will never work against the IFP in spite of whatever results they might produce in other contexts.

What is more, these methods are obsolete dating back to the days of the Roman Empire when Divide et Impera was the order of the day. They were used here against us by the British in the last century and early this century and did not succeed. The National Party Governments in the past used them as well, when they founded the Zulu National Party, followed by the King Shaka Spear Party, followed by Inala Party. These were all founded by the National government's departments in the past two decades in an effort to oust me but were all abortive.

I am talking about things which are germane to issues of confidence and trust. Good faith, honesty and intellectual responsibility should guide our political actions in each step we take on this crucial path of negotiation. For this reason I received with great disappointment and anger the comments you made to Parliament related to the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal. Characterising our Constitution as a confederal solution is utter nonsense, totally unjustified by technical or historical arguments. I look at this as another attempt to discredit me personally, and the IFP in general, and I find that particularly painful in light of my thirty years of commitment to a federal solution for South Africa.

You well know that the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal is a piece of a mosaic that will need to be completed with the provisions of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of South Africa. You also know that there is nothing in the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal which is inconsistent with sound federal principles, and that the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal in its entirety would be totally incompatible with any known model of confederalism.

You well know that it is generally understood that confederacies are held together by agreements which are virtually and intrinsically rooted in international law, rather than constitutional law. Confederacies very often do not lead to the creation of a separate entity such as a confederate state compared to a federal state. In a federal system the member states and the federal state are all sovereign and share in a system of split sovereignty, while in a confederate system only the member states are sovereign.

Usually confederal systems are governed by a common organ which, in most cases, is a confederate assembly often described as a permanent international convention. In a confederal system only the member states, and not the people, are represented within the representative organ of the confederate system. There is none of this in the Constitution of the State of KwaZulu/Natal, and I can see no reason to label it as a confederal solution other than once again to attempt to denigrate our political contributions to the process. I hope that this issue can be addressed and discussed as a technical matter during the forthcoming bosberaad between the Government and the IFP, so that it can be closed once and for all.

Mr Minister, I think you must understand the depth of my feeling about the secret dealings between Government and the ANC/SACP Alliance when you bear in mind that I had to suffer the affront in the atrocious statements made by Dr Mandela to the UN Security Council. Despite this, Government reacted with a policy of appeasement towards the ANC, beginning with the bosberaad and culminating with the Record of Understanding.

I had to bear the mortification of my people witnessing their Government entering an agreement calling for the ban on cultural weapons and the fencing of the hostels. Nobody consulted me prior to the finalisation of the Record of Understanding.

Mr Minister, there is a lot of work that the Government and the IFP will have to undertake to rebuild a climate of mutual confidence and trust. This will need to be done through political actions and the commitment to fair and honest negotiations. I am keeping a very close eye on the negotiating process and I will assess the signs of improvement in our relationship.

The first challenge which we will face is the political determination, or lack of determination, of the Government to finally disband MK. The resolution of this issue will either make or break the future of South Africa. In this respect I want to stress here today that my delegation has not overstated the importance of this issue. Simply put, we will not negotiate while our friends are being decimated in a planned campaign of mass assassination and the refusal of Government to address the issue of the political responsibility of this matter.

People are asking me the question whether the government is insensitive to the seriousness of this issue of Umkhonto's disbandment because its cadres are only killing IFP leaders and members. I do not know what to say to them as this question is unanswerable in these circumstances. Apart from the Golela find in which top MK Commissars are involved, the newspapers today are full of reports of another find in KwaMashu also in KwaZulu.

According to a report 'the haul from a house in L section, KwaMashu, included two folding stock AK47 rifles, one 9 mm pistol, a .38 special revolver, three F-1 hand-grenades, 456 rounds of AK-47 ammunition and about 9 mm rounds. Police also seized items of SADF uniforms 13 ANC membership cards and 79 ANC posters proclaiming: "1993 Year of Democratic Elections - Peace, Freedom and Democracy'.

Mr Jeff Radebe, the ANC Southern Natal Chairman, admitted that some of the men arrested by police in connection with an arms cache were ANC members.

My people are asking how long will this last before the issue is taken as a non-negotiable issue that Umkhonto must be disbanded. How many IFP members and how many Zulu people must die before the government is moved to do something drastic to stop the operation of MK which is doing all these things.

And it is not just IFP members that are being killed; Amakhosi and Indunas and ordinary Zulu citizens are being killed and yet the Government connives with the ANC/SACP alliance when they prevent a Zulu delegation from Multi-Party negotiations. Can the negotiation process succeed if the peace process does not take off. These are the perceptions amongst my people.

I sincerely appreciate your visit here today and I have been hoping for an open and frank conversation with you. Our meeting alone can not change the situation. You have my commitment to do everything in my power to keep the doors of negotiation and dialogue open. And I look forward to sharing with you the results and the blessings of a positive outcome from our negotiating effort. If we fail in this effort the consequences are going to be disastrous.

You and I are participating in this process from different positions. We have different backgrounds and we are at different stations in life, and yet we share the burden of enormous responsibilities before God and all the people of South Africa. I often pray to the Almighty God that he may give strength to all of us who are left with the final responsibility of making the right decisions. You know, Mr Minister, that it was I who suggested that a Multi-Party Conference of Review be called after the ANC/SACP alliance walked out of CODESA. I hear that since the ANC/SACP alliance and their allies object to that name, it has been decided to call it a Multi-Party Planning Conference. I really do not care, for a Rose is a Rose by any other name.

I, more than any other leader in South Africa, document the progress of my thoughts on central issues. That documentation is completed after consultation with my colleagues in Cabinet and in the Central Committee. I ask you to accept, Mr Minister, that the IFP positions, as set out in my December 10 address to the State President, and the paper delivered by Dr Mdlalose on January 18, reflect my current positions. The IFP will come back to those positions again and again until they have been fully considered in the multi-party forum. It is those positions that I table at the multi-party forum and our preliminary discussions should be about how we can best do so.

Bilateral discussions coming up next week are going to be important. I certainly hope that while most things must remain negotiable, the integrity of the IFP's position and approach to negotiations, will be accepted. The sooner we get into multi-party negotiations the better. It is my plea to you, Mr Minister, to hasten our arrival at a multi-party negotiation forum, by taking us seriously and by accommodating our need to make the Multi-Party Planning Conference a forum in which we can settle the issue of deciding the form of state we need in South Africa, deciding on the negotiation process and the negotiating structures that we will need to reach our goals.

-----0-----