

Yet it is this united fraud that some newspapers have presented as a "united left-wing front". Others, such as that shady character Dennis Worrall, dress up this grouping with the term "creative opposition". In fact, apart from being not in the least creative, all that this group opposes is the crudity of the overt racism of apartheid. What they do not oppose is the continuing degradation of human life in South Africa that flows from the vast majority of people in South Africa being denied fundamental democratic political rights.

For those of us concerned with the elimination of oppression and exploitation the vital question is that of the unity of the oppressed. This unity must be built on the basis of an independent struggle for the complete democratisation of South Africa. For us in the New Unity Movement the minimum basis for unity is the Ten Point Programme coupled with the policy of non-collaboration. This latter policy breaks any links with ruling class elements that attempt to dilute and misdirect the life and death struggle of the oppressed for liberation. In this struggle the only road for the oppressed is forward. Forward to freedom !

DITHERERS NOT WANTED!

Introduction:

The strife which has broken out in the ranks of the Natal Indian Congress (NIC) has become the talking point in political circles. We have no intention of getting embroiled in the internal matters of the NIC. Matters like the existence or otherwise of a CABAL or alleged unconstitutional conduct are best dealt with and sorted out by members of the Natal Indian Congress themselves.

What does concern us, however, is the very serious allegation by top NIC person, Mr. M.J. Naidoo, that there are persons in the leadership of the NIC who have been putting forward the line that the oppressed people should participate in the Tricameral Circus. That is not just an internal matter of the NIC. It concerns the entire liberatory movement.

In writing as we do, we are mindful of :—

- (a) A public denial by the NIC that any member of its leadership has recently advocated participation, and
- (b) The re-affirmation by the NIC that it would not participate in the Tricameral Circus.

NON COLLABORATION SHOWN TO BE THE CORRECT POLICY

1. The question as to whether the oppressed people should participate or not in government created political institutions, designed specially for the oppressed, was first raised and discussed in 1935 when the Fusion Government of Smuts and Hertzog took away the last remnants of the African vote. In its place was given the dummy Native Representative Council and three White Native Representatives to "represent" the African people.

2. Those who advocated participation used arguments which have been taken over by the collaborators in the Houses of ill-fame i.e. Delegates and Representatives. We are all familiar with such arguments— “fight from within”, use of dummy bodies as “platforms”, “boycott candidates” etc ad nauseam. Time has shown that these arguments are devoid of any substance, thoroughly spurious and false beyond doubt.

The only beneficiary from these arguments was the ruling class because the liberatory movement was divided from top to bottom on the issue of collaboration.

3. The bantustans, the end product of dummy bodies, have been exposed to the oppressed and to the world at large to be nothing more than organised gangsterism engaged in savage repression and shameless robbery of the public coffers.
4. By the early sixties, all segments of the liberatory movement committed themselves to the policy of non-collaboration. The only exception was a coterie of individuals belonging to various organisations — e.g. Arenstein from the Congress of Democrats, Koyana from the Unity Movement, Letlaka from the PAC and Joe Matthews of the ANC and the Communist Party. These individuals were exposed without mercy and the oppressed regarded them as traitors.
5. From that time until the present, the policy of non-collaboration became the official policy of the entire liberatory movement and not just that of the Unity Movement which founded and consistently upheld that policy.
6. From about the early seventies when all the older political organisations were either banned or driven underground through repression, it was the Black Consciousness Movement which kept alive and advocated the policy of non-collaboration. By this time the oppressed people as a whole, regardless as to whether they belonged to any political organisation, seized this policy and adopted it as their own. Hence in rapid succession, the Urban Bantu Councils, the Community Councils, the South African Indian Council, the Coloured Representative Council, the Local Affairs Committees etc were consigned to the refuse dumps of discredited dummy institutions.
7. It was the wholesale and sustained rejection of these dummy councils and the refusal of the oppressed people to work the machinery of their own oppression which set the stage for the nation-wide rejection of the Tricameral Circus. A whole people stood on their feet. Only the clowns remained on their knees — providing degrading entertainment for their masters.
8. The struggle for the acceptance of the policy of non-collaboration by the liberatory movement as a whole spanned some fifty years of our recent history. It was a fierce and a protracted one. It had divided the entire liberatory movement. It divided families and friends. The oppressed paid a heavy price for the time spent in the in-fighting.

The result of this struggle is one of the most outstanding victories scored by the oppressed people. Today the policy of non-collaboration has become deeply ingrained in the political psyche of the people.

9. We have reached the position when no organisation in the liberatory movement, and, no individual (apart from sellouts) regardless of reputation or image, will dare to publicly advocate participation in the Tricameral Circus or to advocate abandonment of the policy of non-collaboration. Those who have tried it received a sharp rap on the knuckles. Others were not so lucky.

DITHERERS NOT WANTED

In this ethos of high political consciousness and militancy in relation to the dummy bodies, we still hear voices of ditherers. We are told that the boycott is "a tactic and not a principle". The implication is clear. "Today we boycott and tomorrow we participate". We are told of an "ongoing debate" as to whether to participate or not. The names of those who stand for participation are carefully concealed. In view of all that has been said above, we find this approach not only sterile but highly dangerous. **IT IS BUT A SMALL STEP FROM DITHERING TO ACTUAL COLLABORATION.**

CONCLUSION

It is the task of the leadership to:—

- *consolidate the achievements and victories of the oppressed people.
- *take the struggle on to a higher plateau.
- *work for greater unity of the various segments of the liberatory movement.

It is NOT the task of the leadership to:—

- *confuse people by acting and behaving inconsistently.
- *to undermine Unity which has been achieved on a fundamental policy.
- *undo a major achievement of the liberatory movement as a whole.
- *try and slip through the back-door a reactionary policy which has been soundly discredited.

THE POLICY OF NON-COLLABORATION IS HERE TO STAY!

BARTOLOMEU DIAZ

This year marks the 500th anniversary of the arrival of Bartolomeu Diaz on the southern shores of South Africa. On the 3rd February 1488 Diaz landed at Mossel Bay. Four years earlier, in 1484, another Portuguese, Diago Cam landed on the coast of Namibia near Swakopmund.

The ruling class in South Africa are celebrating the event with much pomp, ceremony and tax payers' money. The oppressed in this country see this event as the beginning of the invasion of South Africa. The oppressed have no cause to celebrate and are boycotting the celebrations just as they have boycotted the Van Riebeeck celebrations in 1952. Even Hendrickse and his cronies of the House of Representatives did not attend the Diaz festival at Mossel Bay. Beach apartheid is still enforced at Mossel Bay. And we know how Hendrickse likes to swim.