APDUSA VIEWS

Issue No 33 **July 1990**

IN THIS ISSUE-

THE RETURN OF THE PRODIGAL

Like the return of the biblical prodigal son, De Klerk, president of fascist "while" South Africa - was welcomed with exuberant enthusiasm in the nine European capitals he visited during May 1990. From his first tentative step on French soil until he left Rome eighteen days later on May 26, he was patted on the back, wined and dined by heads of state "as well as" leading houses of European finance capital. He was accorded the "red carpet" treatment; his status was changed from yesterday's stinking polecat to today's perfumed statesman.

After four decades of international isolation, why should De Klerk be invited to break bread with the hub of Europe?

His "passport" was his "accomplishments" since his swearing in as President of "white" South Africa; the unbanning of political organisations; the release of prominent political prisoners; the repeal of certain minor discriminatory legislation; granting indemnity to certain selected persons; the now notorious Groote Schuur Talks and Minute that immensely brightened the future of murderous capitalist exploitation in South Africa; all liberally decorated with press photographs of smiling poses and warm handshakes with political opponents who had been jailed for years!

What De Klerk has in fact done is to assure his European hosts that "his reform package" is irreversible; that he now concurs that overt constitutional racial discrimination is no longer the most productive means to exploit the working masses in South Africa. He has told them that he can sell his negotiation fraud to a section of the Liberatory movement (presenting his Groote Schuur Minute as proof) and has convinced them that this plan will ensure long-term imperialist economic exploitation in South Africa.

In effect, De Klerk's European tour was booked and paid for by the acceptance and active canvassing of support for the politics of a negotiated settlement by the leadership of a sector of the liberatory movement.
The commitment of leadership figures to negotiate on fundamentals (in other words, our essential basic human rights) coupled with such totally unfounded descriptions of a thorough-bred Nat like De Klerk as a "man of integrity," has opened the door for a De Klerk to slip into the garb of a "world leader" WITHOUT CONCEDING A SINGLE DEMOCRATIC RIGHT TO THE OPPRESSED.

So it is that in one fell swoop the long list of atrocities committed by the South African government - that parallels the barbaric atrocities of the Nazis - is brushed under the carpet. Even if these European governments did not formally rescind sanctions on June 25 they have tacitly agreed that it is a thing of the past.
Britain and Portugal have gone further and unilaterally decided to drop sanctions.

In short, De Klerk has become the golden boy of capitalism-imperialism.

What has De Klerk actually done? The answer is: "nothing" substantial. A "brief" survey proves this.

1. The majority of the people do not have the franchise.

2. Unemployment continues to rise and grinding poverty prevails.

3. A putrid system of education still continues for the oppressed.

4. The state of emergency is only partially lifted and a battery of security legislation designed specifically to smash the organisations of the people remains firmly in place.

5. 87% of the population is still forced to live on only 13% of the land.

6. The health system has collapsed

7. Discriminatory legislation still exists

De Klerk's travelling European circus, like his fraudulent negotiated settlement, will not save fascist "white" South Africa in the long term. All the perfumes of Paris cannot hide the stench of brutality, greed and avarice of the South African ruling class that clings to a De Klerk. Acceptance in Europe and praise from his erstwhile political foes do not change the fact that De Klerk and the entire rotten ruling class in South Africa are the enemies of the freedom struggle In the country. The oppressed will never be satisfied with morsels meted out by the ruling class. It is only the long arduous struggle for full democratic rights in a single, undivided, nonracial South Africa that can lay the basis for permanent peace and prosperity.

##

BRIAN BUNTING AT IT AGAIN!

In the last issue of APDUSA VIEWS, we criticized Brian Bunting for falsifying history in a letter which was published in the Learning Nation of May 1990. Not being content with a mere letter in which to falsify, he was able to get the New Nation to allow him to write a series of articles in that newspaper. How he did that is a bit of a mystery, especially since the articles deal with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Its like asking an alcoholic to give a balanced viewpoint on the pros and cons of drinking alcohol. If the Learning Nation persists in getting people like Bunting to write in its columns, then we make bold to say that its readers will only learn falsified history.

We take two passages from his article on Eastern Europe which appeared in the Learning Nation of the 1521 June 1990:

1. ***"One of the benefits of glasnost is that the whole Stalin/Trotsky controversy can now be studied in the light of the new facts which are coming to light in the Soviet Union and elsewhere though the disclosure is by no means complete."***

Amazing! The serious and honest student of politics and history does not need "Gorbachev's glasnost" to write about the so-called Stalin/Trotsky controversy . To call it a "controversy" is in itself a distortion of the

truth. It was NOT just a controversy. It was a life and death struggle between the forces which upheld the revolution's objectives and those which sought to subvert the revolution. In other words it was a conflict between Marxism-Leninism and Stalinism.

What new "facts" is Bunting referring to? The facts of the conflict are all in books and documents which are available to the public. From those who defend the position of the Left Opposition, there is not much more that can be said. From the position of the Stalinists, there is nothing more to be said. Facts favourable to the Stalinists, if any, were used up within weeks if not days of the conflict. For the rest of the decades, there were only lies and still more lies.

Glasnost is not the invention of Gorbachev. As an ideal it existed centuries before Gorbachev was born. For glasnost means freedom of speech and conscience; it means dignity and honour (e.g. a person's word being that person's bond). It means candour and an obligation to disclose in furtherance of fairplay and justice.

To the Stalinists, "glasnost" came late in life; but even then, they only pay lip-service to it!
2. On the question of the Stalinist policy of "Socialism in One Country" Brian Bunting says:
"But he (Lenin) never said that socialism cannot be built in (one) country."

Bunting's denial is categoric - "never" I.e. NOT EVER.

What did Lenin say on this matter?

> "We put our stakes upon international revolution and were perfectly justified in doing this . . We have always emphasized that we look from an international viewpoint and that in one country "it is impossible" to accomplish such a work as a socialist revolution." (Lenin: Works Vol. XXV P474) (our emphasis)

Again:

> "The complete victory of the socialist revolution "**is unthinkable**" **in one country, for it requires the active co-operation of at least several advanced countries.**" (Lenin: Works Vol XXV 132) (our emphasis)

And again:

> "The final victory of socialism in a single country is of course impossible." (Lenin: Works Vol XXVI P470) (our emphasis) ", . , it is the absolute truth that without a German Revolution, "we are doomed." (Lenin: Works Vol XXVII P98) (our emphasis)

In the face of the above quotations how can Brian Bunting say:
"But he (Lenin) never said that socialism cannot be built in (one) country?" We leave it to the reader to judge the calibre of Brian Bunting, the Editor of the African

##

COUNTER REVOLUTION IN THE NAME OF DEMOCRACY

In Rumania, the National Salvation Front, an organisation allegedly of communists, took part in the recent elections held in that country. Observers from the capitalist countries judged the elections to be fair. Contrary to the general trend in Eastern Europe and contrary to the expectations of the imperialist West, the National Salvation Front won a landslide victory - more than 80% of the electorate voted for the Front. Although all organisations and interest groups were allowed to take part in the elections, the losers refused to accept the results. These anti-democratic forces caused riots and demonstrations and demanded that no communist should be in the government. When the police tried to disperse these anti-democratic demonstrations that became the signal for counter revolution to swing into action. This is how Newsweek a very pro-capitalist publication, described what followed:

> "They (the demonstrators) set cars and buses ablaze and, their numbers swelling into thousands, stormed the Romanian television station. Others hurled Molotov cocktails and used trucks as battering rams to break into police headquarters and the Interior Ministry," (Newsweek 25 June 1990)

So great was the force of counter revolution that the police were unable to subdue it. The government of Ion Liescu called on the miners to help. It was the miners, with the help of the Police, who literally clubbed counter revolution to the ground.
The imperialists were none too pleased with the outcome of events. In the first place, they did not expect the Communists to win. In the second place, they hoped for the counter-revolutionary forces to rouse public opinion against the Government of the day by initiating an anti-Communist campaign. When none of these happened, imperialism condemned the action taken against the counter revolutionaries.
Locally, the liberal bourgeoisie took their cue from their imperialist overlords. Hence, the editorial of the "Natal Witness" of the 18 June 1990 says the following:

> "Having apparently won the recent elections fairly, n (the Rumanian Government) has reacted to subsequent student protest in Bucharest by importing a host of tough miners to deal wnh the protesters. The violence was totally unnecessary for the protest was running out of steam anyway when the miners were unleashed."

Not a word in the editorial about petrol bombs; about the trucks being used as battering rams to break into the police headquarters!

Stripped of all sanctimony and hypocrisy, the criticism of the Rumanian Government means only one thing. That is that the imperialists and their agents want counter revolution unhindered and unobstructed. The fact that over 80% of the people of Rumania voted for the Government means nothing to imperialism. Such is the cynicism of George Bush, Margaret Thatcher and their hangers-on.

##

ISSUED BY THE AFRICAN PEOPLES' DEMOCRATIC UNION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA, AN AFFILIATE OF THE NEW UNITY MOVEMENT P.O. BOX 4592 DURBAN 4000