

[3]

REVISED REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE TO THE MEETING OF THE NEGOTIATING COUNCIL OF 18 JUNE 1993

1. Background

The Negotiating Council, in its meeting of 7 May 1993, agreed to the following recommendation of the Planning Committee:

1.1 "Recommended Criteria and Process for New Participants"

Political parties or Organisations to qualify, must show:

1.1.1 Political Parties or Organisations to qualify must show:

1.1.1.1 That it is indeed a political party or organisation intending to participate as such (in the political party or organisation's own name) in the first election under a transitional/new constitution;

1.1.1.2 That it has proven substantial support in a national context;

1.1.1.3 That its admission will enhance the peaceful negotiating process.

1.1.2 Traditional Leaders

The principle of provincial representation should be maintained for the time being, but the problems around the representivity of existing delegations should be addressed in consultation with and a manner acceptable to all concerned. This issue should be discussed in the meeting of the Negotiating Council and, if necessary, be referred back to the Planning Committee.

1.1.3 Other Applicants

It is proposed that applications of organisations who are not political parties or organisations, be refused.

1.1.4 The problem of both the Administrations and political parties in one region participating in the Negotiating Process, has not been resolved and will require further attention.

1.2 Process

The following process for dealing with applications of political parties or

organisations is proposed:

- 1.1.2 Applicants should be informed of the criteria and requested to submit whatever facts and arguments they wish to, but they should be required to at least respond to the questionnaire annexed to this report (Annexure A);
- 1.2.2 Administration should cause a newspaper survey over the preceding year to be conducted to establish the type of press coverage every applicant has received;
- 1.2.3 As soon as all the information is at hand in respect of a particular application, it is put to the Negotiating Council for a decision."

(cf. Minutes of the Negotiating Council Meeting of 7 May, 1993, Item 1.)

The Administration therefore embarked on the agreed process and concentrated on those applicants which professed to be political parties or organisations.

2. The Process so far

- 2.1 Fifteen organisations applied to join the Multi-Party Process.
- 2.2 All applicants were requested in writing to supply particulars in support of their applications. These particulars were specified by the Negotiating Council on 7 May, 1993 and forwarded to the applicants on 11 May, 1993.
- 2.3. As at 1 June, 1993, six of those who had applied had not responded to the questionnaire. They are:
 - 2.3.1 People's Democratic Christian Party
 - 2.3.2 United Federal Party
 - 2.3.3 Sindawonye Progressive Party
 - 2.3.4 Reform Party of South Africa
 - 2.3.5 Insika National Party
 - 2.3.6 National Forum

A study of the press coverage for the past year shows no reports in the press about the above six parties in terms of reportage about their activities. There

have been reports that the application of the Reform Party of South Africa and of the Insika National Party were rejected at Codesa.

In the light of the above we would **recommend** that their applications be rejected.

- 2.4 The following applied and have responded in some measure to the questionnaire:

2.4.1 African Democratic Movement

2.4.2 Christian Democratic Party

2.4.3 People's Progressive Party

2.4.4 Merit People's Party

2.4.5 National Seoposengwe Party

2.4.6 Afrikaner Freedom Foundation

2.4.7 Volks Unity Committee

2.4.8 Third Force Nationalist Party

2.4.9 Green Party of South Africa

3. **Recommendations on applications received**

- 3.1 The **Volks Unity Committee** telephonically informed the Administration that it was withdrawing its application. Accordingly there is no need to take a decision on this matter.

3.2 **The Third Force Nationalist Party**

Its written response is a photostat copy. It is signed "T.F. Central Committee Collective Leadership". No individual name appears on it and it is not signed by any person. This document was received on 26 May, 1993 and there has been no further documentation received. A study of the press coverage shows no reports covering their activities or their existence. It is impossible to determine whether they really exist, where they are based, at what address they can be contacted, etc.

The Planning Committee **recommends** that their application be turned down.

3.3 Green Party of South Africa

Their response was received on 27 May, 1993. There has been no press coverage of their activities. They submit a copy of their constitution. But in their response to the questionnaire there is no information indicating when and where they may have held a national congress to elect their current national executive as per their constitution. They claim a membership of 13,500 and that they have held a number of meetings. There is no indication of the existence of any of the organisational structures reflected in their constitution. In their response they say they only have offices in Cape Town.

The Planning Committee **recommends** that this application is turned down.

3.4 The Merit People's Party

No press coverage save that its application was turned down at Codesa. Its activities are confined to Lenasia. In its response it states that it has two members in the House of Delegates; and that in the 1989 elections the Party contested three seats in Lenasia and won all three. It should also be noted that in this regard, in its response to the Codesa questionnaire it replied somewhat differently; while repeating the statement that three candidates were returned in the 1989 election it went on to say "two members have since joined Solidarity. There is an understanding that independent members of the House of Delegates will be included in the Merit People's Party delegation to Codesa."

In its response to the present questionnaire it also states "estimated membership throughout South Africa (as no efforts are made to sign up members) is at least 10,000 persons." While its activities are Lenasia-based it also claims that it has membership throughout Natal and the Transvaal.

The Planning Committee **recommends** that its application should not be accepted.

3.5 Afrikaner Freedom Foundation (AVSTIG)

To date AVSTIG has claimed that it is not a political party. During Codesa it was recognised as an interest group and as such was enabled to make written submissions without enjoying participant status.

In its current response it motivates why it should be accepted as a political organisation intending to participate in the first election. We quote: "Ideally we would thus most certainly take part in elections at the first possible occasion: as a state founding body it would be on state level and in facilitating capacity. But whenever it seems possible to attain or substantially promote these objectives, we would consider positively to take part in elections in another capacity and on other levels" (Our emphasis).

It is **recommended** that the Planning Committee enters into a discussion with this organisation to acquire more information.

3.6 African Democratic Movement of the Ciskei, the Christian Democratic Party of Bophuthatswana, the People's Progressive Party and the National Seoposengwe Party

All the abovementioned parties have submitted responses. The Planning Committee is aware that the Administrations of Ciskei and Bophuthatswana are participating in the process.

The ADM has supported its application with a comprehensive set of press cuttings.

The People's Progressive Party and the National Seoposengwe Party both of which claim to operate in Bophuthatswana and had their applications considered by Codesa. These two have responded to the questionnaire and have been publicly campaigning for inclusion.

It is **recommended** that the Planning Committee meets the African Democratic Movement for further discussions, but that the applications of the others are not accepted.

4. Conclusion

Due to the fact that the meeting of the Negotiating Forum has been postponed, there is adequate time to further investigate the applications of the abovementioned parties. Other applicants should be informed of these decisions.