

[]

PARTICIPATION BY THE ZULU KING AND ZULU CHIEFS IN
CODESA.

PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE AND STATEMENT BY THE
LEADER OF THE UNITED PEOPLE'S FRONT: M.N. RAMODIKE
AT CODESA ON WEDNESDAY 18 MARCH 1992.

The participation or non-participation by the "Kings", "Paramount Chiefs" "Chiefs" or Traditional or Hereditary Rulers should be judged against the domain and hegemony and the events of history and the traumatic experience they had in the rise and destruction of their powers as rulers and landlords. It is against the account of this background that Codesa should decide the role that can be played by our Traditional Rulers "Kings" or Paramount Chiefs or Chiefs.

The history of the Pedi, the Zulu, the Swazi, the Tswana and the Sotho Kingdoms by contrast gives a view of the Pedi Kingdom in Sekhukhuneland, the Zulu Kingdom in Natal, and the Swazi Kingdom in Swaziland. it is also against this background that Codesa shall have to address the question of whether special attention should be given to the "Zulu King" only over and above other kings or paramountcies in his participation at Codesa weighed against "a fame, the dignity and the importance of all the traditional leaders and to examine or determine whether there are inferior or superior "Kings", Paramount Chiefs, Chiefs or Traditional and Hereditary Rulers. Mr. Peter Delius the author of the book "The land belongs to us" illustrates and addresses this question and I quote, "The Pedi Paramount Sekhukhune enjoyed a fame as a Chief of dignity and importance hardly inferior to the fame of Cetewayo among Zulus" and this focuses on the history of the Pedi Polity which dates way back to the 1820's and 1870's.

The fact of the matter is that the Western Culture starting with the Colonial Government up and until the present minority White Government stripped and diluted not only the culture of our black society including the structure of relationships through which our Kings, Paramount Chiefs or Chiefs administered the affairs of their tribes. The dynamic role and involvement of our Magoshi (be it Kings, Paramount Chiefs or Chiefs) in the wars they fought to defend their rights over land and their subjects should in any way never be under-estimated by Codesa. The illuminating analysis of the Kings, Paramount Chiefs or Chiefs then as natural political Leaders who performed in the past, during difficult times and their present role of continuity in performing symbolic functions should also seriously be considered by Codesa.

Throughout, the South African history over the last decades centres around the African political systems with Kings, Paramount Chiefs and Chiefs as hereditary political figure heads of our society.

The books "The land belongs to us" and "By the rivers of Letaba" examine the challenges and the changing nature, devolution and distribution of power within the Pedi, the Roka, the Koni, the Kopa, the Ndebele, the Kutswe, the Pulana, the Makgoba, Maleboho's Paramountcies, inter alia and explores further the internal, economic, political and ideological struggles.

The beginnings if not the revival of Black protest politics as outlined in the book "Vukani Bantu" against the white rule in South Africa to 1912 and the role and the involvement of Paramount Chiefs and chiefs in the struggle for freedom of black people in South Africa relates their involvement and the role they played in assisting the black political organisations in their efforts to galvanise the people into becoming politically aware and active - a role that is still played by Contralesa today.

Having given this brief historical background, in particular that the status of the "Zulu King" can be equated to that of King Sekhukhune, King Moshesh of Lesotho, King Seretse Khama of Botswana and King Mswati of Swaziland etc. and that there are also some other Paramount Chiefs and Chiefs besides those in Kwazulu; U.P.F. wishes to submit as follows:-

01. In terms of our tradition, culture and custom our Kings and Paramount Chiefs in particular are above politics and they are symbols of Honour who cannot easily rub political shoulders or cross political swords with their subjects or commoners e.g. The Queen of England, The King of Swaziland, The Rain Queen Modjadji. It is common course that Kings, or Paramount Chiefs in particular appear on a public scene during ceremonial functions, giving a direction of a national policy etc.
02. U.P.F. would naturally therefore support a proposal that Magoshi should not be involved in acrimonious political debates which shall obviously temper with their symbolic status and that they could be given an observer status at Codesa.
03. As a result of the demand and insistence by IFP to have the Zulu King and his chiefs participating in Codesa, U.P.F. wishes inspite of our reservations to propose and support our magoshi in their submission to take part in Codesa. U.P.F. is diametrical opposed to an arrangement whereby a preferential treatment could be accorded to one King or one Paramount Chief or Kwazulu Traditional Leaders only. We reject any arrangement which will place our magoshi below the status of any King Paramount Chief or chiefs anywhere in the country.

04. Two basic factors should however be borne in mind, to wit: The Zulus have their King in Natal or Zululand, the Tswanas in the Transvaal have their King in their place of origin i.e. Botswana, the Swazis in South Africa have their King in Swaziland, and the South Sothos in Lesotho. It will be infra-dict therefore to expect that all these groups should demand to be represented by their Kings at Codesa. Equally so, there are English people who have taken South African Citizenship but who still pay allegiance to their queen of England. The second factor is that many chiefs are not traditional or hereditary rulers per se but were appointed by the Government to neutralize the powers of the real Kings, Paramount Chiefs and Chiefs in order to implement the separate development policy. Paramount Chiefs like the late Kgoshi Makgoba was sentenced to death and his domain crushed for resisting against the deprivation of his land. King Sekhukhune's domain was also distabilised because of his rejection of separate development policy. Some blue eyed boys of the Government were appointed chiefs even though they have no tinge of blue or royal blood. Their hands had to be greased for having been instrumental in expediting the implementation of Separate Development Policy, e.g. some Chief Ministers or Chief Councillors during the period of territorial authorities.
05. The point at issue is specifically however whether the Zulu King and his Chiefs should be allowed to take part in Codesa or not.

U.P.F. proposes consequently that all the Kings, Paramount Chiefs or Chiefs in whatever form of their own arrangement e.g. Lebowa College of Magoshi should be allowed to take part at Codesa

or alternatively that they be accorded an observer status.

06. It should of course further be borne in mind that establishment of Bantu Authorities and Bantustans was made after consultation with the traditional leaders and that they are in fact the ones who were involved in the establishment of the homeland structures and further that the present Bantu Homeland constitutions were amended by the chiefs to make provision for inclusion of commoners in the Homeland Legislative Assemblies, and that the magoshi/Chiefs are still in majority in some Homeland Legislative Assemblies and have still consequently a majority vote in the respective Homeland Legislative Systems. This arrangement dragged our traditional leaders deeper into Politics contrary to the generally accepted principle that a King is above politics.

Their involvement may consequently be useful in undoing what they brought about through the tactics of the Architects of Apartheid, Dr. Hendrick Verwoerd, Dr. W.W.M. Eislen etc.

U.P.F. submits consequently that the traditional leaders should directly be involved in dismantling or phasing-out the Bantustan structures.

07. Large tracts of land over which the Homelands governments have jurisdiction are allocated to the Chiefs (Magoshi) and held on their behalf in terms of ownership by the State President. The Kings, Paramount Chiefs or Chiefs should consequently be involved in the re-allocation and distribution of land.

Some Chiefs and their tribes have freehold title over large tracts of land. No decision can be taken i.r.o. this land without the consent of the magoshi or chiefs.

08. In addressing the land question the chiefs or magoshi should be consulted or directly be involved because of overcrowding and congestion of the people in their respective areas. U.P.F. submits that this matter should be addressed by Codesa in conjunction with the Traditional and Hereditary Rulers who are still regarded as Landlords.
09. The majority of people in rural areas on the periphery are subjects of the Traditional Rulers. These people recognise and accept magoshi or chiefs as their mouth pieces on matters affecting their day to day lives. The involvement of chiefs or magoshi at Codesa and their representations will consequently adequately articulate the demands of the above-mentioned categories of people who are inspite of their silence a strong force to reckon in casting a vote. It should also be borne in mind that most of these people in rural areas have not as yet joined any political party or organisations as a result of lack of political education or understanding. Membership of all the political organisations and parties in South Africa will clearly indicate that thousands of people are not members of any political party or any organisation. The tendency by the vast majority of blacks unlike Whites support an individual Leader and not a party or organisation per se. U.P.F. support consequently ^{the} request by the 135 Traditional Leaders in Lebowa to be represented in Codesa. In the context the kinship is the determining social system and the individual is transfixed at the centre of a kinship network.

In conclusion, U.P.F. submits that there should be the open-door policy in particular at the Provincial or Regional level and the local level for the traditional leaders. Political organisations should throw the prejudices against the traditional leaders and hereditary rulers, aside. Blacks recognition of the superiority of their chiefs cannot be wished away. Lebowa magoshi ask for equal opportunity and open door at Codesa. They will be instrumental to a "fresh start" which will politicise South African blacks now living on the peri-phery.

Ramodi M.N.

SIGNED: RAMODIKE M.N.
"UNITED PEOPLE'S FRONT".

All Traditional Leaders are equal with separate territories and jurisdictions which do not overlap. Each Traditional Leader therefore enjoyed his own independent authority and sovereignty over his own territory and tribe. It did occur, however, that a number of Traditional Leaders in a given area might per agreement and consensus elevate or recognize one leader amongst themselves to the status of a King paramountcy. Historically the status of a King existed only in as far as the word could be equated to a "Kgoshi" in North Sotho or "Inkosi" in Zulu. The status of paramountcy therefore developed only where traditional leaders agreed to accept one leader amongst themselves as paramount chief and the jurisdiction of such a paramount chief will be limited to only those areas under the jurisdiction of traditional chiefs recognizing him.

Given the history of this country as well as the ethnic diversity which we recognize one will therefore expect more than just one paramount chief in the country and indeed if it is the spirit of Codesa that traditional leaders be represented by paramount chiefs, quite a number of them will emerge from the various regions in the country. It is along these lines that we call for an equitable and even representation of traditional leaders at Codesa.