

BA 322.405
MAY
S. 89/173

mayibuye



Bulletin of The
A . N . C .
(South Africa)

CONTENTS

E D I T O R I A L	page 1
The Mediator	page 3
Bantustans in S.W.A.	page 4
Apartheid Madness	page 5
Whiter Cities by night	page 7
The Anglican Church in S.A.	page 11
The United Party Congress	page 13

E D I T O R I A L

THE CONGO

Last week's invasion of the Congo by a handful of mercenaries no doubt angered all partisans of the African Revolution. But this anger was tinged with sadness and considerable dismay. Intermingled, too, was a feeling of shame that a few mercenaries could march up and down an African country with such apparent ease.

We wondered, too, why a hot reception had not been prepared for these armed thugs. After all, it was well-known that these mercenaries were making preparations in Angola to launch an attack on the Congo. President Mobutu's accusations were based on definite information despite Portugal's denial.

To add to our anger and sadness, Zambia Television on Saturday the 4th featured a documentary on the capture of Bukavu by mercenaries in August last year. The whole content of the programme was propaganda for the mercenaries. The Congolese population and the Congolese National Army were made to appear a bunch of cowards while the mercenaries appeared as humanitarian saviours of the civilian White population whose lives had been threatened until they were "saved". We wonder how such a biased and racist feature got on to Zambia Television.

But good news was not far behind. From the weekend, news began filtering in of intense fighting in Bukavu and the re-capture of that town by the Congolese National Army. This has now been confirmed and remnants of the mercenaries are now in camps in Ruanda under armed guard. News has also come in that the invasion of the Congo from Angola has proved a total fiasco and the thugs are in disarray, most having retreated back into Angola.

But we are puzzled at the report that the International Red Cross is supervising the flying out of the mercenaries from Ruanda to some sort of refuge. The mercenaries are nothing but thugs and gangsters of the most vicious kind. They have murdered, looted and raped. They have held a whole town hostage for over a year. They are criminals and we agree entirely with President Mobutu that they should be extradited to the Congo to stand trial there.

The activities of the mercenaries poses another vital question for Africa. Who finances the mercenaries? They are armed with the most modern weapons including tanks and trucks. These cost a lot of money and have to come from somewhere. The whole history of Africa, past and present, and the particularly bloody events in the Congo since independence culminating in the brutal murder of Patrice Lumumba can lead to but one conclusion.

It is only imperialism which stands to gain from chaos and confusion in independent Africa; it is imperialism which has instigated a series of coups in Africa; it is imperialism which was responsible for Israel's aggression in the Middle-East; it is imperialism which shores up the fascist-racist regimes in Southern Africa; and it is imperialism which finances the mercenaries. Imperialism is the arch-enemy of Africa.

And by imperialism we do not mean some vagues theoretical concept nor some group of shadowy international financiers. We mean the governments of countries such as the United States, Britain, Belgium, France, West Germany, Portugal etc. It is in the circles of these governments that the plots against Africa are hatched. It is they who speak of Aid to undeveloped countries etc., while they are busy exploiting these countries and undermining their governments.

Let us be warned. Let us know and recognise our main enemy. Let us take proper and adequate steps against imperialism. Our failure to do so will destroy the African Revolution.

THE MEDIATOR

Natzi Vorster, Prime Minister of South Africa, has been acting as go-between for Wilson and Smith - a sort of messenger, adviser, conciliator...Nor is this a recent role but one which Vorster has accepted for some time.

But in the past the goings and comings between Pretoria and London and Pretoria and Salisbury were carried on with some discretion and at times even in secrecy. But the recent meeting between Foreign Minister Muller of South Africa and Wilson and Brown as also the meeting between Smith and Vorster in Pretoria were undertaken openly and with full publicity.

Vorster's role as intermediary has certainly not been donned in a spirit of altruism but rather for very selfish motives. The recent lack of discretion merely underlines the fact that the issue is approaching a climax (sell-out) and that the time for secrecy and diplomacy is past. The very urgency of the need for a "settlement" precludes secrecy. The need for a speedy "solution" is the result of the activities of A.N.C., and Z.A.P.U., guerrillas in Zimbabwe and the inability of the Smith rebel forces to counter them.

Vorster's interests and motives as mediator are three-fold.

First of all, the whole politico-economic structure of present day South Africa is utterly dependent for its continued survival on the imperialist powers notably Britain and the United States. As such these powers can apply pressure on Vorster unless he is to some extent amenable to carrying out their directives. These imperialist powers have found Smith somewhat intractable and are using Vorster in their nefarious scheme of creating a facade of compromise in which Smith must appear to give some ground.

Secondly, Vorster realises that it would be impossible to prevent or control a revolutionary war of liberation in South Africa if the Freedom Fighters were able to use the Limpopo River rather than the Zambezi as a backdrop. He hopes to continue using the Zambezi as a first line of defence. However, the illegality of the Smith rebel regime makes this diplomatically a hazardous task. This has not deterred him up to now but as the struggle gains momentum and the fighting becomes fiercer he will find himself in a more and more impossible situation. On the other hand a "legal" regime (created as a result of a sell-out, of course) could overtly invite military and economic assistance from South Africa.

4/...Thirdly

Thirdly, we wonder if Vorster is not expecting something from Britain in return for his efforts as mediator? Several South African Cabinet Ministers and Premier Vorster himself have recently been vociferously demanding the lifting of the arms embargo and calling upon Britain to supply South Africa with arms. This has been accompanied, on the one hand, by loud boasting that South Africa could manufacture its own weapons, and on the other hand, that South Africa would be compelled to buy arms elsewhere if Britain refuses to supply them. We think this verbal acrobatics is but the curtain-raiser to a deal which Vorster has made with Britain. We think it unlikely that Britain herself will be prepared, at this stage, to risk lifting the embargo. However, Wilson may have agreed not to protest too much if some other country such as France or West Germany undertakes to supply South Africa with armaments. In any case there are already several joint Anglo-French munition ventures and one of these could be used as the Supplier.

+++++

BANTUSTANS IN S.W.A.

As we reported last week the fascist-racist White minority regime in South Africa is pushing ahead rapidly with its plan for Bantustans in South West Africa.

We also said that they would have to find stooges to carry out this policy as the majority of the people were opposed to it. This has in fact happened at a meeting of the Herero which was held at Okakarara last week and the majority of the tribe boycotted it and refused to attend.

Even so the government representative at the meeting had to use threats to get the few headmen present to accept the government's policy. As he put it:-

"the time for playing around had come to an end. The government had two hands - one was soft and the other was a fist. Forget about the United Nations which has not been able to help you."

But, despite threats and despite the fact that most of the tribe was absent, the remaining headmen only accepted the proposals "in principle". They could not agree to the movement of the Herero people from Ovitoto, Otjimbingue and Otjihorongo, the proposed consolidated Hereroland in the East of South West Africa - largely semi-desert.

After the meeting Mr. Clemens Kapuuo, a representative of the Herero people, angrily rejected the decision as unrepresentative. He said that acceptance of Bantustans means acceptance of apartheid.

He demanded the return of the Herero tribal land which had been sold to Whites from South West Africa. He said it was impossible for the Herero people to move to the semi-desert area which they were being offered and which they had never previously occupied.

The response of the Herero people makes it clear that as in South Africa the fascists will have to use the "fist" to implement the Bantustan policy in South West Africa.

+++++++

APARTHEID MADNESS

In September a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church took place in East London. As the Church has African members, some African Churchmen also attended the Assembly.

Realising that a "mixed" (i.e. of Whites and Africans) gathering could create many problems particularly as there would be delegates from outside East London, the organisers of the Assembly took every precaution to see that no laws or regulations were contravened. East London's Senior Presbyterian Minister, the Rev. W.D. Campbell, went to the extent of giving the Department of Bantu Administration a list of the non-White delegates and where they would be staying.

But alas, for the organisers of the Assembly, the laws, By-laws and regulations controlling the lives of Africans are so numerous that even lawyers have difficulty keeping track of all of them. Despite all the precautions they had taken the organisers fell foul of the law. Some of the African Ministers and their wives could not be accommodated so they were put up by three prominent White members of the Church - a common enough gesture of hospitality in all parts of the world where decency exists. But not in South Africa. To their horror the three Whites were awakened at 2 a.m. by the police and charged for contravening the Native Urban Areas Act. By this Act no African may be given shelter by anybody else without a permit!!

One of the Whites refused to awaken his guest and was, in consequence, additionally charged for obstructing the police. Another commented that it was most strange for the police to visit anyone at such an unearthly hour for "doing no more than extending Christian hospitality."

This is the idiocy and madness that is Apartheid.

Brigadier P.J. Eberson of the Cape Town Police :-

"Although in law non-White police could arrest Whites, it was policy that this should not happen. He could not recall an arrest of a white by non-white policemen.

Under normal circumstances where a non-white police officer was aware of an offence involving a white person, he told a white officer who made the arrest."

Brigadier Eberson was commenting on remarks made by Justice van Zyl in the Cape Town Supreme Court, who said that at this stage of the country's development it could create trouble if Africans were allowed to arrest Whites!!

+++++

"The White man makes all the laws, he drags us before his courts and accuses us, and he sits in judgement over us.

It is fit and proper to raise the question sharply, what is this rigid colour-bar in the administration of justice? Why is it that in this courtroom I face a White magistrate, confronted by a White prosecutor, and escorted into the dock by a White orderly? Can anyone honestly and seriously suggest that in this type of atmosphere the scales of justice are evenly balanced?

Why is it that no African in the history of this country has ever had the honour of being tried by his own kith and kin, by his own flesh and blood?

I will tell Your Worship why: the real purpose of this rigid colour-bar is to ensure that the justice dispensed by the courts should conform to the policy of the country, however much that policy might be in conflict with the norms of justice accepted in judiciaries throughout the world.

I feel oppressed by the atmosphere of White domination that lurks all around in this courtroom....."

(NO EASY WALK TO FREEDOM) pp. 127. - NELSON MANDELA.

WHITER CITIES BY NIGHT

For almost twenty (20) years now the Nationalist Party Government has ruled South Africa. Their propoganda and State policy has been APARTHEID. It is still apartheid. But the implementation of this heinous policy has brought nothing but grief and suffering to the African peoples and other non-Whites. There has been a steady drift towards fascism and police dictatorship until to-day South Africa is a fully-fledged POLICE STATE. Gone are the days when Mr. Justice Leslie Blackwell could give a Court injunction ordering the police not to interfere at a legally convened meeting and giving them the historic warning: "SOUTH AFRICA IS NOT A POLICE STATE, YET". NOW South Africa is a police state. Thousands of opponents of apartheid are held in prisons and denied the courteous treatment they deserve as POLITICAL PRISONERS. The United Nations has called for their release to no avail.

Many other anti-apartheid militants are grilled under torture by the police for periods of 180 days without recourse to an open, fair trial in a public court of law. These 180-Day detainees will never hear any charges, criminal or civil, being laid against them. Their lot is to rot in jail without trial. And their families survive somehow.

There are other anti-apartheid stalwarts like Mrs. Helen Joseph whose homes have been converted into prisons. For them social life begins and ends in solitary confinement within the four walls of ones house. House arrest is another form of police persecution which proves the tyrrany that reigns in South Africa. House arrest cannot be simulated by those who are free as it is mental and physical torture which no living human being can impose upon himself. Mrs. Helen Joseph was the first person to be placed under house-arrest in South Africa in October 1962. For five long, weary and lonely years she only had her cat to keep her company. She had to commune with herself. She wrote a book during this period - "Tomorrow's Sun" which speaks of the courage and tenacity of her unbending and unbreakable spirit. But the new banning orders have extended her house-arrest by another five years. And as if that is not inhuman enough, the fascist Vorster regime has forbidden her from writing books or articles or letters to newspapers in South Africa or abroad. Mrs. Joseph cannot seek her remedy in a court of law. She is at the mercy of the police. She must live alone. She must report to the police daily except Sundays and public holidays. She is not allowed to go beyond the magisterial confines of Johannesburg. She is not allowed to receive visitors at her home, and she may not communicate with any banned person or a person whose name appears on a list kept by the Liquidar of Communism.

She is forbidden to attend any gathering, political or social. She must be at home between 6.30 a.m. Her life has been circumscribed by the police. Her plight is a heart-rending demonstration of the vicious application of apartheid and what it means. That she has decided to remain in South Africa is a symbol of her dedication to our freedom struggle which will triumph in our life time.

But South Africa is not only a police state but also a vast concentration camp where millions of people are shunted hither and thither like floating straws in the air. For the non-White people their homes are prisons and have become worse than that during the past 20 years of fascist rule. Some time ago, Dr. W. Eiselen as Secretary of Bantu Affairs propounded the policy of drawing a demarcation line from Cape Town to East London. On one side of the LINE would live Whites only and on the periphery and beyond, Coloureds and Africans. He rigorously advocated the removal of the Africans from the Western Cape, especially in the Cape Town area. This was known as the Eiselen Line. It represented one of the facets of the meaning and implementation of apartheid.

But the facts confound the Eiselen Line. And the realities of apartheid defy its exponents and drive the fanatics to acts of callous desperation. The farms and industries in the Western Cape cannot exist without African labour. The influx of Africans into Cape Town area rose from about 66, 000 in 1960 to 99, 000 in 1966. This represents a 50% increase in spite of the heatless enforcement of apartheid regulations to control African influx. To justify the introduction of the Coloured Cadets Training Act which will regiment the labour of Coloureds, especially in times of war, The Vorster regime spreads the lie that the removal of Africans from the Cape is necessary because they "take the bread out of the Coloured people's mouths." Yet official Hansard figures for 1967 show that there were only 74 skilled and 379 unskilled, unemployed Coloureds in the Western Cape in 1965. If Africans are removed it could not be on the pretext that they deprive the Coloureds of their livelihood. The trade unions of Coloured workers and their benefit societies are recognised by the Government while those of the Africans are not.

Economic surveys reveal that the South African economy grows at such a rate that 130, 000 new jobs are created every year. The White immigrants who average 40, 000 a year cannot fill all these jobs and so non-White labour is used. This is the greatest challenge to the feasibility of apartheid. It is the bane of the narrow-minded adherents of separate development, Bantustan homelands, and the building of industries on the borders of the African Reserves.

Yet in spite of all this incontrovertible evidence, Mr. Blaar Coetzee, Minister of Bantu Administration is determined to implement the Eiselen Line. He is hell bent on removing Africans from their homes and jobs in the Western Cape to arid areas near East London where local statistics show the existence of a high rate of unemployment among the Africans. Blaar Coetzee regards himself as the saviour of White South Africa, the reincarnation of King Canute who can order back the tides of economic reality in our country.

Blaar Coetzee wants lily-White cities by night and is resolved to "impose stricter regulations to separate the races and stop them from mixing in White areas". Towards this end, a new company has been formed in Pretoria to provide special housing for African servants in African ghettos. These servants are to be hired out to Whites by day only for R1.50. (15/=) per day. This scheme has the support of the Department of Bantu Administration and Development. This type of regimentation of African labour will be used to keep their wages low and to apply oppressive laws with greater ferocity.

But what will happen to Africans in the essential services who have to be in the cities by night? This pipedream of all-White cities by night is yet another apartheid illusion. In these White cities by night who will be the nightwatchmen, newspaper and milk delivery men, petrol station attendants, hospital nurses and orderlies, policemen, chauffeurs, boiler-men etc? White cities are an unrealisable wish which will only aggravate the racial tension and animosity that plague our motherland.

And we are not the only people who condemn this race-separation madness. Dr. A.M. Hugo of Stellenbosch wrote to "Die Burger" recently and complained that "A Government which chases people out of their homes and congregations out of their Churches ought at least to compensate them sufficiently for them to re-establish themselves".

"Die Burger" of November 3, 1966 published a summarised report of a Commission of the Nederduits Gereformeerde Mission Church on group areas, especially in District Six, Cape Town. District Six has now been declared a White area under the heinous Group Areas Act. The N.G. Mission Church report expressed its disapproval of the way in which the government authorities enforced resettlement of people and communities.

According to the Commission's report, congregations which had long paid their debts would have to build from scratch in new areas. Some buildings were of great historical value but faced the risk of demolition under the removal schemes. The Commission, in this respect, specifically referred to the South African Sending Gestig in Long Street, the Sionskerk in Paarl, the Rhenish Church in Stellenbosch, and other churches at Worcester, Beaufort West, George, Upington etc. All the places referred to here are within the ambit of the Eiselen Line.

The lives of thousands of people in South Africa are insecure and unstable. Whole communities are uprooted and scattered to satisfy the whims and fancies of the administrators of apartheid. The entire Republic of South Africa is smothered in this crisis. People of all shades of political opinion and colour are seeking a way out. Any resistance by discontented people is suppressed by police force, house-arrest, banishment, removal, and a host of banning restrictions. The way out is inevitably: armed struggle. Where fascism rules there can be no retreat to reasonable dialogue. Fascists rule by force. Fascists do not respect the rule of law. Fascism must be destroyed. Not even the voice of the Dutch Reformed Churches, (their own Churches) will bring the mad men at Pretoria to their sober senses. The crisis that confronts South Africa to-day is of the making of Vorster's fascist regime. Vorster and all fascist White minority regimes in Southern Africa must be destroyed. The voice of the African people and all democrats shall triumph over the evil decadence of White domination.

+++++++

ALL SHALL BE EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW

"No one shall be imprisoned, deported or restricted without a fair trial;
No one shall be condemned by the order of any Government official;
The courts shall be representative of all the people;
Imprisonment shall be only for serious crimes against the people, and shall aim at re-education, not vengeance;
The police force and army shall be open to all on an equal basis and shall be the helpers and protectors of the people;
All laws which discriminate on grounds of race, colour or belief shall be repealed."

- F R E E D O M C H A R T E R -

Adopted at the Congress of the People, Kliptown, South Africa,

on 26 June 1955.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA

The severely racist views of the Calvinist Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa are well known. Basing themselves on certain sections of the Bible these churches have given a moral underpinning to the Fascist-racist practices of the Nationalist government. Regarding the Blacks as children of Ham they have succeeded in salving the Afrikaaner conscience for the evil practice of apartheid and White domination.

But one hears much less of the Anglican Church. This is partly because some individual Anglican Church leaders have courageously thrown in their lot on the side of the oppressed people and thus have suffered personal persecution. It is also due to the fact that the Anglican Church subscribes to the concept of the equality of all men without regard to colour.

But in actual practice the Anglican Church itself practises the colour bar in its various activities. It runs Schools on colour lines with most reserved for Whites; it has churches throughout the country most of which are segregationist; it runs many functions such as bazaars and fetes on racial lines; most of its Sunday schools are separationist. True, the Church claims to do this unwillingly and has as its long term objective, the elimination of the Colour bar. The Church also claims that the laws of the country compel segregation. This is, of course, true now. But the harsh fact is that even when there was no legislative compulsion, and even now in instances where compulsion does not exist, the Church continued to practise the Colour bar.

The tragic truth is that the Church in South Africa inadequately grapples with the problems of apartheid and White domination. It has failed to abide by Christian beliefs for fear of losing its support; it has failed because an honest carrying-out of the precepts of Christianity would result in persecution and suffering; it has failed even to teach its own following the meaning of a common Christian humanity.

At a recent Diocesan Synod the House of Laity completely rejected three anti-apartheid motions, one of which merely demanded that Sunday School children should be taught that apartheid is a moral evil. To cap it all, Premier Vorster congratulated the laity on its decision!!

As the Rev. S.J. Peake, Rector of a Cape Town parish said, in discussion there was evidence of "real" race prejudice. Mr. Peak went on to say:-

"The continued practice of apartheid in many of our parishes is another indication of the views of many of our laity.

"Mr. Vorster is not mistaken... in thinking that the Anglican laity agree with apartheid....

"The Synod has not taught me that apartheid can only be defeated by slow but persistent exposure to the sufferings it causes. The Black Sash, Race Relations Institute, and numerous Church bodies have been doing precisely this for the past 17 years but the sober fact remains that more Christian people vote Nationalist now than ever before".

In the light of such a state of affairs within the Anglican Church itself, the views expressed by the Rt. Rev. Leslie Stradling, Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg, are indeed astonishing. Bishop Stradling last week delivered his charge to the 42nd Synod of the Diocese of Johannesburg.

In the course of his address he condemned violence outright and described the activities of Freedom Fighters as "terrorism". In this he is no different from the race fanatics. But not satisfied with this he went on to condemn protest by means of "explosive speech, marching with banners, aggressive condemnation" etc. He went on to say:-

"If we are speaking to secular authority are we satisfied that all other means of making representations and bringing pressures to bear have been tried before we make our public protest? Can we be content with the negative aspect of protest? Should we not rather seek to take positive steps to build up a spirit of goodwill and understanding?"

The answers to Bishop Stradling's questions are provided by the Rev. Peake in the quotation from his comments on the meeting of the House of Laity. It is to be remembered that Rev. Peake himself is an Anglican.

These quotations demonstrate clearly the reasons for the controversy within the Anglican Church of South Africa. The Church has not been able or willing to meet the challenge to Christianity that apartheid poses. Instead it has relented to political pressure by various White supremacist regimes. The Church in South Africa has evaded the answers to the problems of apartheid.

Does Christianity really reject warfare? If so, what role do army Chaplains play? The Anglican Church has no right to condemn others for attempting to solve the problems of South Africa in the only way possible - an armed struggle for National Liberation.

But there are welcome and hopeful rumblings within the Anglican Church in South Africa. Disgusted with and depressed by the Vorster regime's acknowledgement and approval of the acceptance of apartheid by the Anglican laity, the Rev. Gray Featherstone, curate of St. Mary's Anglican parish in Woodstock nailed "95 theses for 1967" to the door of St. George's Cathedral, Cape Town. It will be recalled that this year marks the 450th anniversary of that historic day when Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, nailed his 95 theses to the door of the castle Church on October 31, 1517. And so the Reformation began. It is being celebrated throughout Christendom

In the preamble to the 1967 theses, the Rev. Gray Featherstone has stated:

"Out of love and concern for the truth, and with the object of eliciting it, the following propositions will be the subject of a declaration drawn up by the young people of the parish of Woodstock. They request that whoever cannot be present personally to debate the matter orally, will do so in absence in writing".

Their 95 theses register a rejection of apartheid and constitute a challenge to the entire Anglican Church. We are looking on. The world is watching to see how the Anglican Church in South Africa will resolve the question of the irreconcilability of Christian thought and practice with the inhuman policy and practice of apartheid.

+++++

THE UNITED PARTY CONGRESS

Despite racist oppression of almost 80% of the population who are denied even the vestiges of democracy, the fascist minority regime in South Africa continues to play the parliamentary game.

Every five years elections are held, with all the trappings of a two party system. Candidates are solemnly nominated, meetings are held, babies are kissed, banners and stickers handed out and fund-raising functions are held. On the 'great' day voters go to the polls, votes are counted and members are duly elected.

But it is all a facade, a huge deceit. For the voters as well as the candidates are Whites only and they represent only about 20% of the population. In such a situation it is inevitable that racism plays the major part in the elections. Equally, it is inevitable that the party giving the largest dose of racism must win the election.

The Nationalist Party has carried racism to its fine fascist art and raised it to the level of an ideology. It is, therefore, not surprising that since 1948 it has won every election, each time with an increasing majority.

The opposition United Party has been thrashing about from year to year, changing its policy this way and that way, in the hope of finding the "right formula". But all its efforts are doomed to failure. It cuts an utterly moribund figure not even to be able to play effectively its role of opposition. For it, too, is unable and unwilling to escape from the poll of racism which hangs over White South Africa. It serves the solitary purpose of acting as a suitable foil to the Nationalist Party in its pretence of parliamentary democracy.

Recently, the United Party had another of its annual Congresses. And again it has come out with a new "formula" in the hope of catching the votes. Being ever opportunistic, the United Party's new formula attempts to out-do the Nationalists in racialism. But one can safely say that the White voters will not be impressed. They have a good thing in the Nationalists - why should they change?

Before the United Party adopted its new formula it had a policy of race federation - a policy which nobody understood. But one clear pledge which the U.P. gave in 1955 and reiterated year after year was that, if elected (an unlikely event), they would put the Coloured people of the Cape back on the Common Roll. This pledge was given after the U.P. had made strenuous, but unsuccessful, efforts to keep the Coloured people on the common roll - for opportunistic electoral reasons.

The new policy kicks this solemn pledge aside. Instead, it now envisages Separate Representation for Coloureds via 6 members in parliament. Similarly, there will be 8 African representatives and 4 Indian representatives. Except in the case of Coloureds, where Coloureds may be elected if so desired, the African and Indian people will be represented by Whites.

The plan also moots some sort of National Committee - one for Africans, one for Indians and one for Coloureds - to liaise with the White parliament.

The blatantly reactionary and totally undemocratic nature of this policy is self-evident. We will not go into it. There is nothing new in this policy. Similar policies were in effect before and were rejected by the oppressed people. The prototype of the mooted National Liaison Committees was the Native Representative Council which voluntarily abolished itself in 1946 because of its ineffectiveness. Separate Representation was so overwhelmingly rejected by the Indian people in 1947 that it was never ever tried.

If anything, the present policy of the United Party is in some ways more racist than that of the Nationalists. It is the old attempt of the U.P. to out-Nat the Nats - and it will fail.

The lesson to be drawn is that there is no change of policy away from racialism among representatives of the Whites - no evidence of a change of heart. Decades of peaceful, non-violent struggle have produced nothing but more oppression. There is no representative group with whom a meaningful dialogue can be commenced. The call for discussion and negotiation in this context is not only irresponsible but mischievous.

The die has been cast by the oppressor - we did not help to mould it in any way. But we will fight for our birthright in the only way open to us - by force of arms.