

OUR POSITION ON THE OCTOBER MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

In response to enquiries about our stand on the October Municipal Elections, we as a public organisation are duty-bound to respond in clear terms.

1. **APDUSA is an affiliate of the New Unity Movement.**
2. **The programme of the New Unity Movement is the Ten Point Programme. This programme is a list of minimum demands which are not negotiable. The acceptance of anything less would mean acceptance of the claim that we are less than human beings.**
3. **The first point of this programme is:-**
“The franchise, that is the right of every man and woman over the age of 18 to elect and be elected to a new democratic parliament and to all other levels of government, both regional and local.
This means the end of all political inferiority, of all communal or indirect representation. It means granting to all people of South Africa the same, universal equal, direct and secret ballot. The tri-cameral parliament and the system of dummy “homelands” parliaments must go. In their place a single, democratic parliament elected on the basis of a common franchise for all shall rule in the common interests of all South Africans. It means the liquidation of all location systems and the network of community councils, management committees and related bodies which enforce apartheid, oppression and exploitation at present.”
4. **Membership of the New Unity Movement and APDUSA is based on the acceptance of the whole of the Ten Point Programme.**
5. **Since the elections concern institutions and bodies which are racial in character and those for the Africans, Indians and Coloured people are without real power, these bodies run in direct conflict with the kind of municipal franchise envisaged in the Ten Point Programme.**
6. **For the reasons set out above, no organisation affiliated to the New Unity Movement and no member belonging to APDUSA and the New Unity Movement will participate in the elections either as candidate or voter.**

CONSENSUS POLITICS – COERCION

All recent claims by the present government that it believes in consensus politics, i.e. political decisions reached through agreement or dignified compromise, convinces nobody. The words of the government do not match its deeds.

The oppressed people have always been told what is good for them and what is in their best interests. This approach is based on the lie that the oppressed people are incapable of knowing what is best for them. The latest act of "goodness" for the oppressed by the government is the local authority elections. Without proper consultation with the oppressed, the elections are thrust down their throats. When we protest at this blatant undemocratic practice, we are branded as revolutionaries, agitators, communists etc. When we refuse to participate in the cut and dried plans of the government we are told that we are spurning the hand of friendship offered to us by the government. We may well ask: Which hand? It must be the left because the right hand (traditionally used by people with two hands to show friendship, pleasure etc.) is bonded to Dr Andries Treurnicht.

The latest accusation is that the oppressed people do not wish to communicate their views and feelings to a government which is bent on "reform". In other words the people do not want to engage in dialogue. Again, this is simply untrue. The oppressed people have always made plain their wishes and feelings. The methods employed by the oppressed people have not always been to the liking of the government.

In the early days when the people found that their new guests were intent on robbing them of their land and cattle, and when they realised that they had improper designs on their womanfolk, they expressed their displeasure by applying their sticks, spears and bows and arrows. At other times, petitions, memoranda and pleas were the means. When that did not work, the people embarked on a totally independent course of action to express their feelings. This was the time of the boycotts, protests, demonstrations and non collaboration. Again, there was no mistaking how the people felt.

At no time was the government unaware of the feelings of the people. Yet it continued to ignore these feelings. The communication was always there. But that was not enough for the government. It felt that it had to call all the shots; it had to decide on the agenda and it had the right to choose the solutions. When people rejected this high handed method and refused to cooperate, they are accused of being ungrateful and of biting the hand that feeds them.

Instead of paying heed to the aspirations of the people, the government has engaged in a multi-billion rand campaign of political trickery. Example of some of the tricks are the setting up of the bantustans, the Tricameral Circus and massive propaganda campaign to dupe the people. This is coupled with intimidation of the worst kind. The more the people reject the sham solutions to their problems, the greater the threats. Threats are no longer confined to people engaging in the armed struggle or violence. Threats now cover those people who refuse to "cooperate." So what has happened to the pious avowals of consensus politics? The truth is plainly stated: **CONSENSUS IN WORDS. COERCION IN DEEDS.**