02 November 2026

Mr S.O.R. Mahumapelo, MP
Chairperson: Portfolio Committee on International Relations and Co-operation
South African Parliament
Parliament Street
CAPE TOWN
8000

By e-mail: smahumapelo@parliament.gov.za

Cc: Mr R.O. Lamola, MP
Minister of International Relations and Cooperation
Private Bag X152
PRETORIA
0001

By e-mail: minister@dirco.gov.za; lamola@dirco.gov.za

Dear Mr Mahumapelo

REVOCATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN CITIZENSHIP: AFRIFORUM / INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE

AfriForum thoroughly examined the content of the International Relations Portfolio Committee meeting that was held on 7 October 2026. Consequently, we found it necessary to respond to the many disconcerting statements that you had made in your capacity as chairperson of that committee.

The meeting in question featured in the public discourse. On 19 October you appeared to retract some of your statements through a press release. However, the press release failed to address the serious and undemocratic proposal to revoke the South African citizenship of people who – as we will argue – are merely criticising the South African government.

We will first address the relevant parts of the committee meeting, and thereafter the press release.

Committee meeting

At the meeting of 7 October you proposed that the committee adopt a recommendation in terms of section 55(2) of the Constitution. The suggestion was to amend current legislation on the issue of South African citizens who travel abroad and hold opinions that differ from the government's opinion on certain matters. You referred particularly to the South African Citizens Act 88 of 1995 to allow the government to revoke the citizenship of South Africans

under certain circumstances. AfriForum was specifically mentioned among other organisations that had travelled to the United States of America (US).

This is a troubling proposal that marks a turning point on how the government treats citizens who express views that are not aligned with the government's own views. It indicates that influential government officials like yourself is willing to mobilise state power to control individual thoughts and opinions.

We record that you presented the following as facts without offering any evidence to substantiate your claims:

1. The so-called "conduct" of groups like AfriForum had solely led to the actions of the US and the strained relationship that exists between the South African and US governments.
2. AfriForum had "misrepresented" the state of South Africa and had lied about a "genocide" on "white Afrikaners." Even in subsequent discussions in the committee meeting following your proposal, members could not provide any evidence that AfriForum had indeed "misrepresented" the state of South Africa or claimed there is a white genocide in South Africa. These members admitted as much during the discussions and fervently supported your proposal, except for a single committee member.

Your proposal also includes the strengthening of laws to meet the threshold for a successful conviction of high treason easier, to cover the circumstances you refer to with AfriForum and other organisations. On this matter it is appropriate to mention that on 3 March 2025 Lieutenant General Godfrey Lebeya, the head of the Hawks, did indeed confirm that the Hawks had opened a docket to investigate four leaders of the Solidarity Movement, including myself, for high treason.

Another disturbing statement that you made as chairperson of the meeting was to argue that the South African government cannot control the US, and that the focus of the South African government should therefore not be on President Donald Trump or Ambassador L. Brent Bozell III. You stated that, on the contrary, the South African government should take direct action against us. You explicitly stated that the government has "total control" over South African citizens. This is particularly vindictive and totalitarian in nature.

Unfortunately, Mr Ronald Lamola, the Minister of International Relations and Cooperation, did not caution or raise a concern about the nature of the proposal that you had made. He also did not indicate that such an action would be in violation of the Constitution; nor did he point out that there is no established factual basis on which to argue that we had supposedly misled the US, or that we had spread false information.

Press release

In the press release of 19 October you sought to clarify your proposal. In fact, you took great care to explain that there was no proposal on the table for government to withdraw the

citizenship of South Africans who are holding different political views. Instead, you argued that it was merely a policy question as to the response from government on the "conduct" of organisations that liaise with foreign governments.

The press release is still based on the false premise that we 1) had spread misinformation, and 2) that this misinformation had solely led to the actions of the US. Both accounts are untrue. Merely repeating the notion that we had spread misinformation and lies about South Africa does not make it a fact.

We refer you to an op-ed that was written by Mr Flip Buys, the chairperson of the Solidarity Movement: The ANC and the media's "missed information" in claims against the Solidarity Movement. For your convenience, I also attach the article. In the article, Mr Buys explains the official position of the Solidarity Movement (which includes AfriForum and Solidarity) regarding our engagements in the US. He outlines the position that the US itself had expressed the reasons why they are reviewing the relationship between the US and South Africa. He also discusses some claims that we have **not** made, for the public record, which are relevant in the light of the committee meeting.

The Constitution and the *Parliamentary code of ethical conduct*

For the sake of completeness, we mention relevant constitutional and parliamentary provisions that your statements violate, as we will argue.

First, we are of the view that your proposal in the committee meeting would directly violate sections 16, 18 and 20 of the Constitution, whether read together or separately. These sections protect South African citizens' right to free speech – which is not limited to the borders of the country – as well as the freedom of association and the right not to be deprived of one's citizenship.

Second, the *Parliamentary code of ethical conduct* – specifically sections 2.4 and 4 – requires MPs to be objective and to act with integrity. You have undermined both requirements in the committee meeting by threatening the core freedoms of citizens. It is also clear that you operate under an apprehension of bias against AfriForum, which further contravenes the parliamentary ethical codes.

Third, you labelled AfriForum and other organisations as being engaged in treasonous acts. This is highly offensive and irresponsible in accordance with rule 84 of the National Assembly, and therefore constitutes unparliamentary language.

Four, in terms of rule 158 of the National Assembly, you are not empowered in your capacity as chairperson to make unilateral factual or adverse findings, neither against a member of the committee, nor against a member of the public. Your statements about AfriForum amount to factual findings, and on this false basis you propose far-reaching and extreme measures that have severe constitutional implications.

Formal request

The fundamental shortcoming remains that you propose far-reaching measures on a false basis against representatives of AfriForum. As we explain in this letter, AfriForum has not misrepresented South Africa, and it has not stated that there is a “white genocide” in South Africa. It is this false basis that informs your view that this justifies the withdrawal of the citizenship of our representatives, and that laws should be amended to enable you to find us guilty of high treason.

We view your proposal and utterances in the meeting in a serious light, and as such we request the following:

1. Withdraw the proposal and remarks on revoking South African citizenship of representatives of AfriForum.
2. Withdraw the statement that AfriForum engaged in treasonous acts in the US, or elsewhere.
3. Conversely, provide evidence if you maintain the position that AfriForum had indeed spread misinformation about South Africa, or that we had proclaimed that there is a “white genocide” in South Africa.
4. Provide us with an opportunity to address the international relations portfolio committee on the position we do hold in terms of the relationship between the US and South Africa, and the national interest in foreign affairs.

We kindly request your written response to this letter.

Yours faithfully



Kallie Kriel
Chief Executive Officer
AfriForum