

character. Discipline means taking principled uncompromise on revolutionary positions, it means resolute defence of the organisation against opportunist corruptions and moral vacillations. Discipline is timeliness, not only in the attendance of meetings but precisely in the political field - a punctual response to a political situation. Untimely action, it has been said, is just as dangerous as untimely inaction. The working class alone is scientifically endowed with the capacity for consistent political positions under gruelling and torturing conditions. These then are the qualities that our organisation should acquire in order to fit the definition of an organised political movement.

TO BE CONTINUED IN THE NEXT ISSUE.

The road to collaboration

(EXCERPTS FROM AN INTERVIEW WITH COMRADE MAC MAHARAJ)

Q: How has the decision of the Labour Party to participate in the "President's Council" been received by the oppressed?

A: The decision of the Labour Party under the leadership of Reverend Allan Hendrickse at Eshowe in January this year has been received by the masses of our people with unqualified revulsion and anger. At the same time Botha and his racist regime have reacted to it as if it is furthering their cab and a triumph of the cause of racist domination. This decision has got once more sharply into focus a question that will live with our national liberation struggle, that has lived with it from its birth and will live with it to its triumph, a question of the road to collaboration, a question of the road to reformism. There is no doubt today in the minds of our people that the Labour Party's decision is the decision that has firmly taken it a step on the path towards collaboration. This is evidenced in statements made by Reverend Boesak and others. This is the time that whilst we mobilise our anger and increase our pressure to bring about the unity of the oppressed forces and all progressive forces in our country, we should also take stock and develop a better understanding of the roots of collaboration.

However, our starting point, the point that distinguishes those who take a road to collaboration and those who remain committed to the revolution, is what we should always remember in formulating our strategy and tactics. It is the question of the nature of our exploitation and oppression. We are assured of victory as every oppressed and exploited people in history were because any system of exploitation and oppression depends on the minority living on the backs of the majority. That is an objective in-built fact of a system of exploitation and oppression, and that means the

majority is capable of being organised, of becoming conscious of the nature of their oppression, of the need to unite and act in unity and also of the fact that no revolution, no people's struggle, has succeeded in history without it becoming part of an organised force, a force which will marshall every weapon in the armoury of struggle depending on the concrete conditions that one is faced with.

Now this question of the strength, the source of our ultimate victory, the fountain from which we are able to draw inspiration, courage and determination, the knowledge that we will win, rests therefore on the strength of the people.

Q: What distinguishes a revolutionary from a reformist?

A: What distinguishes a revolutionary from a sell-out, however much that sell-out may protest that he is opposed to the system by taking a path which he or she believes will make it easier for the people to achieve ultimate victory, is the lack of confidence in the people. A revolutionary lives and thrives in the consciousness that the masses of the people - the overwhelming majority - are going to rise and that their understanding, their consciousness, will match their objective situation. Therefore a revolutionary bases his strategy and tactics on developing that consciousness because he is confident that he will eventually achieve his end. And that confidence as I say depends on the objective fact that the majority are oppressed and exploited.

On the other hand those who wavered, those who begin to look for easier ways out will end up trying to suppress the militancy of the masses. They end up by trying to use the masses as cannon fodder, as people to be manipulated so that by their action, they nearly reinforce the position of the same 'great leader' or of some click. This I think is the distinguishing mark and it is the framework within which we should be looking at the forces that are being engineered by the regime in order to perpetuate its rule. And we should look behind the protestation of all those people among the ranks of the oppressed and exploited who begin to betray these symptoms. We should always go back to see where the roots of their reformists thinking are.

Q: To develop our point further, how do you characterise the situation in the enemy camp in the light of the presently escalating struggle? What are the manoeuvres and tactics that the enemy is employing?

A: There are people who today look at the actions being taken by the South African regime and examine them as if they are something new. Obviously there are new elements but there is a continuing trend in what the enemy



The Eshowe Congress of the Coloured Labour Party.

today is planning to do. The first trend that I think we should isolate is the fact that even the current regime has in the history of its 30 odd years of rule shown at different moments of history that it is prepared to try to hoodwink our people by holding out all sorts of promises.

Today it is in our history that the constitutional proposals centering around the 'President's Council' are a measure devised by the regime with the aim of enticing the South African people of Indian origin and the so-called Coloured community into the camp of white domination. They think they can alter the balance of forces by juggling around with the constitutional arrangements and drawing off a large segment from the camp of the oppressed and exploited.

Now how and why does the regime come to this position today? The constitutional proposals are not an isolated development. They include the regime's labour legislation, its bowing down to the pressure and militancy of our workers who defied the law and created their own trade unions which today are growing at a tremendous pace. Our people in the same way defied the reign of terror that the regime unleashed in the 60's that suppressed all avenues of legal opposition and they created in the early 70's bases for themselves to act within the framework of the law. The regime, as I say, reacts to a particular situation.

Sometimes there are people who try to credit the regime with too much farsightedness, forgetting that the regime is caught up in a crisis of its own making. It is worthwhile recalling that in the crisis of the 50's, that in the face of the mounting campaigns organised by the ANC, the Massacre of Sharpeville, and the mass pass burning campaign that was launched by our late President Chief Albert Luthuli, the regime reacted from both sides of its security forces. They promised in the heat of that crisis that they will do away with the pass laws, a fundamental legislative machinery which is aimed at perpetuating the enslavement of our workers. It's aimed at being able to have for the sake of employers a labour pool which can be manipulated by the regime to supply the needs of the employers when required and make our people temporary and superfluous appendages to what they regard as a white economy. That response was made at a time when the enemy perceived a crisis and it became necessary for it to make promises which he believed could defuse that crisis and mollify our people.

One may recall that this is the time when the Coloured Representative Council and the South African Indian Council (SAIC) were created by the regime to try and entice Indian South Africans and so-called Coloureds into the regime's camp. Diedericks went on record as calling on Indian

Transvaal Anti-Saic Committee CONGRESS 1983



Helen Joseph addresses the Anti-SAIC committee congress. The congress unanimously decided to form a United Democratic Front to oppose the President's Council's proposals.

South Africans and the so-called Coloureds to join the white oppressors and he called for "five million hearts to beat together". This was a dramatic statement, poetic in its content but without any substance. What they offered was the SAIC of 1960 and the Coloured Representative Council of the mid-60's.

So you see we have to look at the enemy and see what he is trying to do. I believe the South African racist regime today is caught in a crisis. It recognises that the mass of our people, that the organised forces of our revolution, spearheaded by the ANC and its military wing, Umkhonto we Sizwe, are today on clear record visibly acting in unison and signalling that victory is going to come. Against this situation they too, amongst themselves see the danger signals but, like all the oppressors, they believe that by manipulating, lies, hoodwinking and cheap tricks they can stave off what is inevitable. To do so they have to dress their real design in the line they think will win them more supporters.

Q: There are some people who want us to believe that through the "President's Council" the enemy has taken a step towards reforming apartheid out of existence. How do you respond to this?

A: Let us be clear again that the package deal it likes to dress up as a reform is not really a reform in any way. It accompanies this process of ever-increasing repression and it is the combination of these two, of repression and so-called reformism that betrays the nature of the regime. The constitutional proposals therefore must be looked at from the process in which the racist regime of South Africa is embarking, seeing the rising tide of the revolution. The centre underpins of the regime's proposals of course is the scheme of separate development which it initiated at a constitutional level with the Bantu Authorities Act of 1954. That act and the so-called bantustan law brought on to the South African scene a concerted drive to divide our people. The regime had to find collaborators amongst the Blacks around promises of accommodating them within these sorts of constitutional structures.

To look at the roots of that collaboration let us just go back to the beginning of separate development in terms of Bantu Authorities and Bantustans. In the 50's in the face of the opposition being mobilised by the ANC and the Congress Alliance you had people like the puppet Matanzima Brothers who argued that it was correct for them to go into the Bantu Authorities scheme. But at that time they dressed their argument around the idea that it is facilitating the process of liberation for our people. They argued that by going into the Transkei arrangement of a Bantustan they would open up more avenues, more space for our people to wage a struggle along constitutional lines. So at the beginning the highlight of

their approach was to protest that they were there taking the steps to serve the masses and it is now opened for the people to argue how sincere they were. That process, that road they had once launched themselves on had led to its natural conclusions today.

There is no one in our country who fails to recognise that the Matanzima regime is a regime of sell-outs. The warnings that were issued by the ANC and the national liberation movement as a whole were ignored and every step in their progress underlines those warnings. These warnings centred around the fact that they were now on the road to collaboration and that in that process they will have to serve their real masters and demonstrate their services. Indeed that is precisely what they have done. That road has led them today to become amongst the black community the clearest example of black serving the white fascist state, forgetting those statements of protestations. There's little reference at the surface which brings them from time to time to statement of conflict with the South African regime. In fact they know that they are not in power but just sitting on the backs of the black people as intermediaries between the South African racist state and the oppressed majority. The result today is that it is a logical part of their development that they should have the organiser of the sellous scouts in the struggle of Zimbabwe in Transkei organising the Transkei armed forces. The trust of all their activities therefore is to sit on the black people, to find them and mushroom themselves on the side of the South African state against the national liberation movement.

We can see this pattern of development repeating itself in various other communities. Whether we look at the Ciskei, the Sebe brothers, Coloured Representative Council which was created by the regime in the 60's or the so-called Freedom Party. We look at individuals in the Labour Party that has gone into the Coloured Representative Council with their advert purpose of bringing it under the leadership of Sonny Leon. When he fell it was because he had become entrapped in the system and was now prepared to go along the road of further collaboration. The same process overtook Hendrickse in the Labour Party. We see the same process in the SAIC. The road to collaboration is clearly paved, all the signmarks can be discerned. But what is more, it is in the process of what they are doing that you can see more into the regime's designs aimed at dividing the forces of liberation.

The effectiveness of those manoeuvres in using the collaborationist forces can be seen in what happened in the so-called Bantustans. There you have, right after its formation, the Transkei demanding land from the next Bantustan, Kwa-Zulu, so that black fight black for the slice of 13% of the land which has been allocated to the black communities by this racist re-

gime. You have the same situation of struggles and quarrels between Xhosa and Sothos. You have the struggle between Xhosa and Xhosa as represented in the struggle going on between Transkei and Ciskei. You also have the regime creating mini-Bantustans (Bantustan itself being mini). Now the regime is creating a mini-mini-bantustan in the form of Kwa-Ndebele, a new Bantustan to accelerate and sharpen the quarrel between the black communities, between the Tswanas and the Southern Sothos.

Q: How do you respond to the argument prevailing in white circles that a kind of middle class among black people should be created, that is black should have a stake to defend in apartheid? Would you say this is in line with the Bantustan and the "President's Council's" policies of the enemy?

A: There are many people today speaking of the regime's designs to build a black middle class. I would like to trail on this argument today and as a dimension we have to ask ourselves whether to term "middle class" the people reflected by this process. For an example it is my view that the Transkei collaborationist stratum, that section of the Transkei people who are associated with the Matanzimas can hardly be described as a middle class. All the Matanzima brothers have done for themselves is a space to grab land and the right to open bottle stores. The regime has therefore created this structure which is more close, in my view in certain respects with what the Chinese called the compradore bourgeoisie, the running dogs of imperialism. Their whole existence doesn't even near, in any way the real aspiration that one can associate with the middle class in the classical development of capitalism with the classes that saw their way into a developing bourgeoisie. I think therefore it is a correct characterisation of these forces that their whole existence depends on serving the South African racist state.

We can see it even in the bantustan that could be described by some people as one with the greatest economic potential of developing and some viability, that is Bophuthatswana. The first act the Mangopes did to convince their masters was to call for a border fund where they asked their own impoverished people to contribute ten cents for a border fund which was going to help the South African state fight against so-called terrorists who, in fact, are revolutionaries of our country.

So there you have a glimpse of the logic of that collaboration atmosphere. The regime is only prepared to sponsor you, to set you up in the position of a running dog, if you will serve its needs.

TO BE CONTINUED IN THE NEXT ISSUE.