

barrier to united action. The experience of freedom loving forces the world over has confirmed more than a hundred times that ideological differences cannot be an obstacle to unity. The most important thing is to agree on a minimum programme of action against the main enemy and that programme must spell out categorically clear who that enemy is. Moreover, it is absolutely vital that in practical action, in the day to day battles, the main blows are directed at the common enemy. The organisations must have the inalienable right to safeguard their organisational and ideological independence. Nobody, for example, is saying to AZAPO that before it can join the UDF it must renounce its ideology of black consciousness. Although most of the organisations comprising the UDF subscribe to the Freedom Charter, they do not and cannot put it as a precondition for joining the UDF. On the other hand, they would naturally and rightly so resist any attempts aimed at watering down their ideological stand as organisations. In future there might be a further proliferation of organisations in our country. Some will appear only to fade away, there will be vacillations and betrayals. Yet others will endure. We must be ready and able to identify even the smallest pockets of resistance and draw them into the mainstream of assault on the common enemy.

In conclusion, it must be strongly suggested to have as part of the political programme lectures on research material based on the experiences of other revolutions. Problems connected with mass mobilisation, alliances, forms of struggle, propaganda and agitation would feature in that programme. Works by Lenin such as "Left-wing Communism - an Infantile Disorder" and writings by Vietnamese revolutionaries are a rich store-house of experience.

DEFENCE OF APARTHEID

Under the 'new constitutional proposals' the executive President, who is also the chairman of the cabinet is given dictatorial powers. He decides on the common issues which are to be discussed by the cabinet.

Falling under these common issues is what they term defence - the defence of apartheid; the defence of white racist privileges. Defence is common only in as far as it means increased repression against the people, detention without trial, bannings, deaths in detention, massacre of South African refugees and the destabilisation of Southern African states.

This is exactly the terms of the homelands, so that who says that the constitutional proposals are wrong and unacceptable because they exclude blacks is wrong. He may as well say that bantustans were wrong because they excluded Coloureds and Indians, because what the new constitutional proposals of 1983 stand for is what the old bantustans dispensation of 1929 stood for.

If the bantustan dispensation was able to boldly declare a conglomerate of scattered barren farms and dilapidated townships a country called Bophuthatswana, what can stop a racist mentality from declaring Allen Hendrickse a president of a certain Bophuthacoloureds and Rajbansi a president of Bophutha-Indians?

Radio Freedom - Luanda