

passed by two-thirds majorities of the First Chamber and the Second Chamber. This means that minority and background groups could present changes to the Constitution. In addition, if the amendment of the Constitution affects the specific rights of any background group, it would have to be agreed to by a majority of that group (6 out of 10). Again, five members of that group have an EFFECTIVE VETO.

8. **Composition of Cabinet.** The Prime Minister (leader of the majority in the First Chamber) appoints half the Cabinet. The other half is appointed (by proportional representation) by the minority parties in both chambers. Every background group is entitled to at least one Cabinet post. All ministers will be part of the decision-making process in the Cabinet and will head Government departments. The Cabinet will operate on a consensus-seeking basis.

In addition to the eight main mechanisms power-sharing is reinforced by:

- **Cultural Councils** (including a Council of Chiefs). These will represent the cultural interest of the various segments of the population and are entitled to view all draft legislation (new laws not yet enacted). They have the right to give evidence before any Standing Committee, to demand information from government and to apply to the Supreme

Court to have any Bill set aside before it becomes law.

- **The Bill of Rights** defines and protects the rights of every individual irrespective of race, colour, language, sex, etc. The Bill of Rights is interpreted and enforced by the Supreme Court.
- **The Economic Advisory Council.** This ensures that the Government is responsive to the views and advice of knowledgeable business and labour leaders on whose expertise the economy depends.
- **The Education Council.** This will be composed of representatives of teachers, parents and others involved in education. It is designed to ensure that the Provincial Government is responsive to the education needs of communities and the Province as a whole.

The proposed effect of those interlocking power-sharing mechanisms is that any government of KwaZulu/Natal would have to rule by consensus.

Any attempt by any group or party to impose its will would immediately be checked. The only way to govern would be with the consent and participation of all affected.

The Supreme Court operates independently of Government and ensures that the Provincial Government observes the power-sharing and other provisions of the Constitution.

Inkatha backs Indaba proposals in principle

The 15 000 Inkatha delegates and members (representing 1 544 609 paid-up members) who attended the annual general conference of the national liberation movement held at Ulundi in July, unanimously accepted a resolution to support the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba proposals in principle.

The conference praised the services which the Secretary-General, Dr Oscar

Dhlomo, and the National Chairman, Dr Frank Mdlalose (who participated in the Indaba deliberations) had rendered to the politics of negotiation.

The Conference pledged its

support for every effort to be made to make the proposals "household knowledge in every town, village and hamlet in the KwaZulu/Natal region . . ."

The resolution, as passed, resolved:

- (1) To record our acceptance of the Indaba proposals in principle.
- (2) To instruct the Secretary-General to set up regional mechanisms through which the Indaba proposals could be got to every Inkatha

branch and to be tested in every branch throughout the country.

- (3) To instruct the Secretary-General to get the Indaba proposals to every AmaKhosi Council in KwaZulu and to test their acceptability in these Councils.
- (4) To instruct the Secretary-General to submit ongoing reports to every member of the Central Committee about the progress being made in these endeavours.

KwaZulu Natal



Indaba

In his Presidential address to the annual general conference of Inkatha, Dr M G Buthelezi made it clear to delegates that he believed there must be ongoing debate regarding the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba proposals.

He moved that they be accepted in principle.

A recommendation by a special Inkatha committee asked that the Indaba proposals be accepted in all their detail as they stand. After two nights and a day of debate, the full conference resolved (as noted above) that the

Indaba proposals be accepted in principle.

"As I stand here today I am not yet persuaded that the people want me to support the Indaba proposals in all their details," Dr Buthelezi said.

"There must be definitive debate on this issue . . . I will have to be very satisfied that the people want me to endorse the Indaba proposals in detail before I do so."

Dr Buthelezi reiterated a previous address he had made to Inkatha's Central Committee when he noted: "The Indaba looks good to me. That is why I have jammed my foot in the door. I will, however, not walk through that door unless the whole of Inkatha walks through with me . . ."

Although the proposals were a "shining example" of what the politics of negotiation could achieve in South Africa, the fact remained that they still had to be "popularised".

"If I have any respect for the Indaba proposals at all, I must do nothing which will interfere with the democratic right of the people of this region to accept or reject the proposals. It is only the people who can legitimise the proposals," he said.

The Indaba was attempting to draw together individuals and organisations throughout KwaZulu and Natal — including many who had not been a party to the proposals.

Dr Buthelezi told the conference that he did not think Inkatha (by accepting the Indaba in all its detail) should give "pretexts" to black and white ideologues in organisations and elsewhere to say that they had been presented with a "take it or leave it option".

"We still (may) want to emphasise our open-mindedness in any discussions we may have with them on what we have accepted in principle," he added.

"I know that there may be fears that we are encouraging upsetting these very finely tuned proposals of the Indaba, by anyone including those who do so purely for ideological

reasons.

"Do we say that we are not prepared to talk to anyone about every one of these proposals, once the lines are opened between us and those who did not participate in the Indaba, for whatever reason?"

"I think we owe it to the Indaba proposals themselves not to be accused of slamming any doors in front of anyone.

" . . . It is only those committed to the armed struggle and to the politics of hideous violence which eschew the need for compromises to the solution of our country's problems.

"If there are no compromises there will be killing.

Compromises, however, are like great cannons of war which must be fired at the right time and in the right circumstances. In compromises one gains as much as one gives. Without this balance, compromises amount to capitulation."

Dr Buthelezi made it clear that he was not prepared to move away from "our time-honoured goal of establishing a one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary state in South Africa" if it meant "capitulation to racism."

"Every regional negotiation we undertake bears on national negotiation we will yet undertake. Do delegates today want me to go to national negotiations and there be faced with compromising from an already compromised position?"

"To me it is a question of tactics and strategies. It is a question of timing.

"The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba has always been very careful not to present itself as tackling a national question. They have never once said that the accord reached in KwaZulu/Natal is an accord which must become prescriptive for the rest of the country.

"I ask delegates to lend strength to the President's (of Inkatha's) power in negotiations by agreeing with the Indaba proposals in principle. Please avoid tying my hands in the politics of negotiation."