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Our front cover shows a picture taken in the early sixties of two leaders of the ANC, Oliver Tambo and Nelson Mandela.
Our back cover shows Albertina Sisulu, one of the Vice-Presidents of the United Democratic Front, and at present a prisoner on a charge of high treason.
The ANC conference scheduled to take place this year will definitely take a form of people’s parliament, not only because this will be the biggest and most significant meeting of the ANC since the 1969 Morogoro Conference, but also because the ANC itself has undergone changes in terms of its strength (military and otherwise), its social composition, its popularity amongst the people at home, and so on. It is the hope of our people, who are expecting a lot from this conference.

South Africa itself has changed since 1969. Trade unions, women’s organisations, youth movements — the whole nation is moving forward with the Freedom Charter, to the Freedom Charter. Umkhonto We Sizwe has become the shield and spear of the people. Nelson Mandela is not only a leader of the ANC — important as that is — but a leader of the nation.

Internationally as well there have been changes. Vietnam is not only liberated but united. Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau are independent. What about Nicaragua, Zimbabwe and so on?

This combination of favourable — relatively speaking — internal and international conditions fills us with hope. There have also been setbacks — Grenada, the Nkomati Accord.

These setbacks fill us with more determination, not only to continue the struggle but to intensify. This determination and confidence can be seen in the ‘furious’ and enthusiastic unending discussions in position papers and documents, in meetings and discussions — everybody arming himself to the teeth for the coming harvest, the military and political defeat of the racist Botha regime. Many questions are being raised, solutions being put forward, criticisms being made and changes being suggested.

This conference takes place in the year of the 30th anniversary of the Congress of the People, which adopted the Freedom Charter. The continuity, the commitment and identification, cannot be more evident. This is the year in which Nelson Mandela, for the first time since his arrest in 1962, talked — through his daughter, Zinzi — to the South African people, telling them: Your freedom and mine cannot be separated. Again, the continuity, commitment and identification cannot be more evident.

By the way, Nelson Mandela is a founder member of Umkhonto We Sizwe, and in a sense he was addressing Umkhonto cadres. That is why armed struggle will be central in the conference deliberations. Mandela is a youth inspirer — their problems will also be central. Mandela is a political and military strategist — this explains our preoccupation with these questions.

It is not surprising that this conference takes place in 1985 — the Year of the Cadre — and in the ANC everybody (young and old) is a cadre: all are determined not only to live up to expectations but to rise to the occasion.

This is why we call this conference a People’s Parliament — people will decide about the future of their country, the future of their nation, the future without and against the racists and imperialists.
MANDELA'S REPLY TO BOTHA

'Your Freedom and Mine Cannot be Separated. I Will Return.'

This is the full text of Nelson Mandela's response to the conditional offer of freedom made in Parliament by the State President, PW Botha.

The response was read on Mandela's behalf by his daughter, Zinzi, at a rally in Jabulani, Soweto, on February 10th, 1985.

I am a member of the African National Congress. I have always been a member of the African National Congress and I will remain a member of the African National Congress until the day I die. Oliver Tambo is much more than a brother to me. He is my greatest friend and comrade for nearly 50 years. If there is any one amongst you who cherishes my freedom, Oliver Tambo cherishes it more, and I know that he would give his life to see me free. There is no difference between his views and mine.

I am surprised at the conditions that the government wants to impose on me. I am not a violent man. My colleagues and I wrote in 1952 to Malan asking for a round table conference to find a solution to the problems of our country, but that was ignored. When Strijdom was in power, we made the same offer. Again it was ignored. When Verwoerd was in power we asked for a national convention for all the people in South Africa to decide on their future. This, too, was in vain.

It was only then when all other forms of resistance were no longer open to us that we turned to armed struggle. Let Botha show that he is different to Malan, Strijdom and Verwoerd. Let him renounce violence. Let him say that he will dismantle apart-heid. Let him unban the people's organisation, the African National Congress. Let him free all who have been imprisoned, banished or exiled for their opposition to apartheid. Let him guarantee free political activity so that people may decide who will govern them.

I cherish my own freedom dearly, but I care even more for your freedom. Too many have died since I went to prison. Too many have suffered for the love of freedom. I owe it to their widows, to their orphans, to their mothers and to their fathers who have grieved and wept for them. Not only have I suffered during these long, lonely, wasted years. I am not less life-loving than you are. But I cannot sell my birthright, nor am I prepared to sell the birthright of the people to be free. I am in prison as the representative of the people and of your organisation, the African National Congress, which was banned.

What freedom am I being offered while the organisation of the people remains banned? What freedom am I being offered when I may be arrested on a pass offence? What freedom am I being offered to live my life as a family with my dear wife, who lives in banishment in Brandfort? What freedom am I being offered when I must ask for permission to live in an urban area? What freedom am I being offered when I need a stamp in my pass to seek work? What freedom am I being offered when my very South African citizenship is not respected?

Only free men can negotiate. Prisoners cannot enter into contracts. Herman Toivo Ja Toivo, when freed, never gave any undertaking, nor was he called upon to do so.

I cannot and will not give any undertaking at a time when I and you, the people, are not free.

Your freedom and mine cannot be separated. I will return.
ANC AND SWAPO APPEAL

STOP OILING
APARTEID
WAR MACHINERY

In March 1985, the ANC and SWAPO launched an appeal to the countries of the world to force the oil embargo against the apartheid regime. The call was signed by President O R Tambo and President Sam Nujoma, and we give the text of it here.

In December 1979 the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for an oil embargo against South Africa, as part of the international campaign for sanctions against the Pretoria regime and in support of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa.

Yet, to this day, Pretoria continues to meet its oil requirements with the assistance of governments, companies and individuals who permit or facilitate the supply and transport of crude oil, the provision of finance, capital equipment and technology for South Africa's own petroleum industry, and for prospecting and development of resources in Namibia and South Africa.

The strategic importance of oil and petroleum products for Pretoria's military capacity cannot be overemphasised. Oil is a key factor in the racist regime's illegal occupation of Namibia, in the acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and other neighbouring states, and in the terror, repression and death meted out against the peoples of Namibia and South Africa.

At the same time, it is an incontestable fact that the apartheid regime is vulnerable to an oil embargo, as it is, and will remain, dependent on international sources and assistance for a significant part of its liquid fuel needs.

Rather than meet the demands of our peoples and the rest of humanity, the apartheid regime is today embarked on an attempt to entrench the apartheid system through so-called constitutional reforms, and continues to seek new ways to consolidate its colonial domination over the people of Namibia.

However, the peoples of Namibia and South Africa who have, for decades, waged a life-and-death struggle to liberate their countries from colonial and apartheid domination, remain ever committed to genuine liberation and independence. In pursuit of these noble goals, popular resistance in our countries continues to escalate and is stretching the apartheid regime to its limits. Now is the time for all men and women of goodwill to act decisively in support of our struggles.

On behalf of the millions of oppressed and struggling peoples of Namibia and South Africa, we appeal to those who have it in their power to restrain and stop the continued oppression, imprisonment, torture and slaughter of the men, women and children in our countries.

Stop oiling the war machinery of South Africa and help bring about genuine peace in our region.

President O R. Tambo (ANC SA) and President Sam Nujoma (SWAPO)

Lusaka, 7th March 1985

On the same day, 7th March, the ANC and SWAPO released to the press a list of companies known to have been involved in the oil embargo, together with an account of the vast
SASOL burns after attack by soldiers of Umkhonto We Sizwe. June 1980.

sums of money Pretoria has paid for this illegal oil and oil technology. This was new information that had never been released before. We print here the analysis of what the oil embargo has cost the apartheid regime.

The Cost of the Oil Embargo

The South African economy is being drained of billions of dollars annually by the Pretoria regime's efforts to overcome the embargo imposed by most of the world's oil-exporting countries. These costs have been hidden from the South African public. In Parliament and official inquiries it is suggested that the only additional costs arising from the embargo are the premiums that have to be paid for the clandestine purchase of embargoed oil amounting to $150-200-million per annum. The real cost is many times that figure and in the last year exceeded the country's budgeted military expenditure. These unpublicised amounts have contributed to the present economic problems and to the recent 40% increase in the price of fuel.

Billions of dollars have been wasted on uneconomic projects that have been undertaken purely in order to reduce the impact of the oil embargo. The Sasol plants cannot be justified on economic grounds as the process is at least 20% more costly than the conventional method of refining crude oil. Some experts estimate the additional costs to be much higher. South Africa claims to have stored up to two years of its crude oil needs in contrast to the 90 days supply stockpiled by most industrial countries: an excess of 21 months needs. It is the determination to maintain apartheid that has led the regime to consort with criminals and resort to corruption in order to buy oil in the international market place.
Pariah Costs Million US$
Construction of Sasol plants and ancillary facilities written off over 15 years ..................................... 700
Additional annual costs of production of 85 000 b/d using Sasol process .. 175
Excessive oil stockpile (21 months) write-off of preparation of storage facilities ........... 40
loss of interest on outlay for purchase of excess oil in stockpile @10% per annum ................. 525
Exploration costs ........................................ 150
Premiums, kickbacks, bribes or commissions paid for purchase of embargoed oil averaged over five years 1979-1985* .................. 390
Loss on frauds: Salem, 'sniffer planes'. iten off over five years .................. 10 US$1 990

The above figure of $1 990-million does not include the loss of potential earnings on the export of coal used in the Sasol process, or the costs of pollution and ecological damage e.g. Sasol used 100 million litres of water a day while the country is short of water resources. The loss of opportunity on capital tied up in unnecessary projects would, on a conservative basis on 10% per annum, amount to an additional $1 050-billion.

Even then the basic figure of $1 990-million at the current rate of exchange exceeds the military budget, is more than double that of health and welfare and many times more than that for education and training. If the Mossel Bay project is carried through to production, South Africans will be faced with an additional cost of at least $167.75-million per annum for the next eight years. Notwithstanding this vast expenditure, apartheid South Africa has not achieved self-sufficiency, is not immune to the oil embargo and has cause to fear its extension.

The costs are based on some of the contracts, the information in the Advocate-General's Report June 1984 and evidence presented in the South African courts.
The reaction of the majority of the people of South Africa to the re-election of Ronald Reagan as President of the United States was expressed by the publicity secretary of the United Democratic Front in the Western Cape, Mr Jonathan de Vries, as follows:

"Although the result was expected it still came as a disappointment to us. We can now expect another four years of US connivance with the South African authorities behind a smokescreen of "constructive engagement." Internationally the election result will also be a shock to peace-loving and democratic forces in general. With his belligerent foreign policies President Reagan is one of the greatest threats to world peace."

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the danger resides in the person of Reagan himself. The President is still little more than the B-movie actor he was when he first came to public notice 50 or so years ago; he has merely transferred his activities from the big screen of the cinema to the small screen of television. Far more sinister are the forces behind the President, who manipulate him as a puppet, who write his scripts and feed him gags. It is the military-industrial complex which he represents that constitutes the real danger to the world.

Human Rights and the Western Countries

We will never be able to interpret the politics of the cold war, and in particular the motives of the so-called western democracies, unless we understand that the devotion of their ruling-class politicians to "freedom" is in essence a devotion to "free enterprise," to capitalism as a way of life which they consider superior to all others. The appeal to "democracy" and "human rights" is merely a cover. It is not the alleged violation of human rights that outrages a Reagan or a Carter and inspires them to describe the Soviet Union as an "empire of evil." It is the fact that the exploiters of man by man have been expropriated, that there is neither stock exchange, Wall Street nor Bond Street in Moscow, that fills them with alarm.

It is the pursuit of private profit that turns the wheels of the economy in the United States, Britain, West Germany, Japan and other capitalist countries. After the Russian revolution of 1917, the armed forces of 14 nations invaded the territory of Soviet Russia in an attempt to restore capitalism. They were the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, China, Finland, Greece, Poland, Rumania, Turkey and Japan. The Red Army beat off the attacks at the time; and in the intervening years a number of those 14 countries have undergone
a change of government and are today also following the socialist road. With one or two exceptions, those who remain form the core of NATO, still desperately hoping to be able to create a situation, by subversion or aggression, in which the historical process of social change can be slowed down or reversed.

It is only when contemporary politics is seen in this context that we can understand why, in the western media, the murder of one Polish priest is considered a greater outrage than the murder of the Archbishop and 40,000 other citizens of El Salvador by right-wing death squads; why the killing of thousands of our people in 1984 by the racist army and police is ignored; why the fate of Polish Solidarity leader Lech Walesa is considered of consequence than that of Rodolfo S ęja, the Christian Democratic leader of the Chilean copper miners, who has suffered infinitely greater persecution, but whose name has never been mentioned by Ronald Reagan; why our great leader Nelson Mandela rots in gaol while Jonas Savimbi is fêted in Cape Town and Washington, as an ally in the fight for "freedom and democracy."

The United States and Liberation Movements

The United States was born of revolution against the tyranny of the British monarchy in 1776, but today stands opposed to revolution against tyranny everywhere in the world. It is a sad fact of life that the US has not supported any genuine liberation movement anywhere at any time. When the Monroe Doctrine was adopted in 1823, 43 years after the American revolution, the US President, James Madison, warned that any intervention by a foreign power in the Western hemisphere would be regarded as "dangerous to our peace and safety." Even at that early stage "our peace and safety" were regarded as justification for US hegemony over the whole of North and South America, and US troops have invaded the territories of Central America alone more than 25 times in the ensuing period in order to preserve that hegemony, culminating in the brutal invasion of Grenada in 1983 and the aggression against Nicaragua in 1984. Nor is US hegemonism confined to the Americas. US warships bomb Lebanon and patrol the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean to protect what Reagan calls "our vital interests" — mainly Arab oil, which accounts for 40% of US consumption. And this extension of the Monroe doctrine to cover the whole globe also justifies Reagan's policy of "constructive engagement" with the Botha regime to guarantee continued US access to and control over the resources of our sub-continent.

United States Interests and South Africa

Reagan was quite open about this when, on television, shortly after coming to office, he called South Africa a "friendly country" and asked:

"Can we abandon a country that has stood beside us in every war we've ever fought, a country that strategically is essential to the free world in the production of minerals we all must have?"

And in 1984, US Secretary of State George P. Schultz listed four reasons why Africa is important to the United States:

"First, we have a significant geopolitical stake in the security of the continent and the seas surrounding it. Off its shores lie important trade routes, including those carrying most of the energy resources needed by our European allies.

"Second, Africa is part of the global economic system. Our exports to Africa have dropped by 50% in the last three years; American financial institutions have felt the pinch of African inability to repay loans. And Africa is a major source of raw materials crucial to the world economy.

"... Africa is important to us politically because the nations of Africa are now major players in world diplomacy. They comprise nearly one-third of the membership of the United Nations, where they form the most cohesive voting bloc in the General Assembly.

"Finally, Africa is important to us, most of all, in human terms: 11% of America's population traces its roots to Africa."
Missing from these declarations is any real concern for the welfare and happiness of the 100% of the peoples of Africa themselves. Western policies determined by the 'me first' principle of private enterprise, place African interests nowhere. In the capitalist countries, profit comes before principle. Take the record of the United States under President Reagan. Of the 38 resolutions concerning South Africa considered by the United Nations General Assembly from 1981 to 1983, the United States failed to cast a single affirmative vote. It abstained five times and voted 'no' 33 times. It abstained on every resolution concerning Namibia. During 1984, when the South African people were in revolt against Botha's new constitution, which has no place for the African 70% of the population, the United States and Britain abstained on resolutions in both the Security Council and the General Assembly, declaring the new constitution null and void — resolutions endorsed by the overwhelming majority of UN member states.

A Decade of Hypocrisy
The hypocrisy of the west over South Africa has been exposed by the events of the past decade. In 1976 there were disturbances at Soweto and elsewhere as Black children demonstrated against inferior education. Over 1,000 Africans, mostly school children, were shot dead by the police. In 1977 a number of Black Consciousness organisations and newspapers were banned, and world opinion was outraged by the murder of Steve Biko by the security police. On November 4th, 1977, the United Nations Security Council — for once, unanimously — passed Resolution 418, imposing an arms embargo on South Africa, though a call for the imposition of economic and oil sanctions was rejected by the western powers. However, an arms embargo was an achievement for which we had been working for nearly two decades. After the vote was passed, the UN Secretary General said:

“We have today clearly witnessed a historic occasion. The adoption of this resolution marks the first time in the 32-year history of our organisation that action has been taken, under Chapter VII of the Charter, against a member state.”

Hopes that this resolution would be followed by effective action against the racist regime were dashed. On April 9th 1984, the chairman of the UN Special Committee Against Apartheid, Major-General J.N Garba, reported to the Security Council:

“We had hoped that the mandatory arms embargo would at least reduce the capacity of the apartheid regime to carry on its wars against the people of South Africa and Namibia, and against the independent African states, and indeed persuade it to begin the process of dismantling apartheid. I need hardly tell you that these hopes have not been fulfilled.”

Pretoria's Arsenal
On the contrary, the military budget of South Africa increased from R1 650 million in 1977-1978 to nearly R4 billion in 1984, and South Africa's Armaments Corporation (Armscor), the regime's armaments production and procurement agency, now owns assets totalling nearly R2 billion, with 15 factories and a work force of over 100,000 and an annual expenditure of over R2 billion of which about half is spent overseas in countries which are supposed to be implementing the embargo. South Africa's nuclear capacity in particular is due to the support and encouragement it has received from the US, Britain, France, West Germany and Israel.

The western countries do not lack reasons — both economic and strategic — for ensuring the survival of the apartheid regime. The United States is South Africa's biggest trading partner, while Britain is the biggest investor in the South African economy. Hundreds of US, British and other western companies are established either directly or through subsidiaries in South Africa, and draw huge profits from the cheap labour system in operation there. It is largely for this reason that General Garba, in his report to the Security Council already referred to, added:

“The powers concerned — especially the major western powers — have not shown the will to stop the criminal acts of aggression and destabilisation by South Africa, nor indeed helped to preserve peace in Southern Africa.”
Under the umbrella of Reagan’s policy of “constructive engagement” South Africa has been encouraged to regard itself as a regional power in Africa in the same way as Israel in the Middle East, with the same disastrous consequences. Charging that it is being subjected to a “total onslaught” by “Russian imperialism” and “international communism” the Botha regime tried to draw the western powers into its support — or should we put it the other way round?

United States and ‘Linkage’

Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, Chester Crocker, has admitted that it was the United States which gave birth to the doctrine of “linkage” between Namibian independence under Security Council Resolution 435 and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Whichever way one approaches this question, one fact is obvious — that Reagan’s re-election will draw still tighter the bonds which unite South Africa and America against what they regard as their common enemy. With striking unanimity, South Africa’s business interests, English and Afrikaans (as reported in the Rand Daily Mail of November 8th 1984):

“greeted President Reagan’s re-election as a guarantee of economic stability in the US and a spur for the South African economy. The chairman of Anglo-American, Mr Gavin Relly, said policy stability arising from Mr Reagan’s victory should be regarded as a plus rather than a minus, but the US’s political initiatives in Southern Africa could be taken further.”

What are the United States and South African initiatives in Southern Africa? If we are to judge by their input in the Nkomati Accord on Mozambique and the Lusaka Agreement on Angola, the racists and imperialists are united in their determination to strengthen the basis of colonialism of a special kind in South Africa, to preserve or restore the front line states within the orbit of capitalism, and to destroy the liberation movements, the ANC and SWAPO — at least in their present form.
In a speech at the beginning of December 1984, Chester Crocker defended US policies on Southern Africa, insisting that "constructive engagement" with the Botha regime opened the way for peaceful reform, which was preferable to the alternative of violence.

Pretoria Regime — Source of Violence
The fact is, however, that it is the Botha regime's denial of democratic rights to the majority of the population that is the source of all violence in the region, both inside South Africa and beyond its borders. South Africa calls its army a Defence Force, but this is a misnomer. Since its foundation as a unitary state in 1910 South Africa has never been attacked or threatened with invasion by any front line state or combination of states. On the contrary, it has itself been a source of suppression and aggression against its own people and its neighbours. Its posture towards Africa and the world has been aggressive, not defensive.

Everybody has seen in the recent period the mass murders perpetrated by the regime in South Africa and Namibia, where hundreds have been killed by the military and the police and thousands gassed, whipped, baton-charged, detained, tortured and 'disappeared.' Reagan and Thatcher make polite noises about their "detestation" of apartheid, but do nothing to stop the bloodshed. On the contrary, the flow of weapons and the sophisticated technology required by South Africa to pursue its aggressive policies continues without interruption, apart from an occasional hiccup, like the arrest of the Coventry Four.

Let us not forget that it was South Africa's blatant invasion of Angola in 1975 which led to the Luanda government's call to the Cuban government for assistance in repelling this aggression from outside. Today the United States and South Africa have the impertinence to demand the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola before they will consider conceding independence to Namibia. In terms of Security Council Resolution 435 — yet South African occupation of Angolan territory — the original provocation which led to the Cuban "intervention" — continues, in spite of the Lusaka Agreement of February 1984, that all South African troops were to be withdrawn from Angola by the end of March 1984. The most recent Angolan proposal setting out, with Cuban backing, a plan for winding down the tension over Angola and Namibia and leading both to Namibian independence, plus a Cuban withdrawal has met with a negation in Pretoria and Washington.

Death and Devastation For The Innocent
South Africa, with the connivance of the US and other western states, has been guilty of military attacks on all the front line states, which have led to death and devastation for hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children. The South African excuse is that it is engaged in "hot pursuit" or "pre-emptive strikes" in the course of defending itself against the "total onslaught" to which it claims it is being subjected. The human and material damage the South African racists have inflicted on the front line states has been a major factor in the planned destabilisation of their governments.

The Nkomati Accord signed by Presidents Botha and Machel last March was aimed at halting the alleged incursions of the ANC into South Africa from Mozambique, while in return South Africa pledged to withdraw support from the MNR rebels operating in Mozambique. The ANC has never operated militarily from Mozambique, but has nevertheless been compelled to withdraw its personnel except for a token mission of ten in Maputo. But the activities of MNR in Mozambique have been vastly extended since the Nkomati Accord was signed, leading to further destabilisation of the FRELIMO government and attempts by South Africa and the US to compel it to change its ideological direction. Behind the ambiguous wording of the October 3rd Pretoria agreement (FRELIMO, MNR and South Africa) can be discerned a clear attempt on the part of South Africa to dictate to Mozambique what type of government it shall have, what policies it shall follow — and even the hope that South Africa will be invited to send its troops into Mozambique to monitor a ceasefire.

Similar pressures are being brought to bear on Lesotho and Botswana, and there is no
doubt the ground is being prepared for further aggression against Angola to compel MPLA to accept UNITA as a partner in government. Swaziland was bludgeoned into submission three years ago. Zimbabwe, too, is increasingly being brought into the line of fire. In all this South Africa is following to the letter the tactics employed by the United States in Central America and Israel in the Middle East — using its military and economic muscle and all manner of dirty tricks to install governments of its choice in the neighbouring states.

Counter-Revolution Imposed

Nor do the ambitions of the racist regime stop there. The leaders of the ruling Nationalist Party — we long regarded it as their historic duty to see on the White man’s burden allegedly abandoned by the colonial powers and win back the African continent for the West. Shortly after taking office as Minister of Defence in the late 1960s, P W Botha said that in the fight against “terrorism” South Africa should “carry its influence over its borders.” (Rand Daily Mail April 4th 1968) On April 11th 1984, Defence Minister General Magnus Malan boasted in the White Paper he presented to Parliament that it was South African military aggression that had paved the way for the Nkomati and Lusaka Agreements:

"Forceful military action by the South African security forces during the last decade or more has provided sufficient time to allow Africa to experience the dangers of Russian involvement in their countries, as well as the suffering and retrogression that follows upon the revolutionary formula."

Yet the peoples of Africa know only too well that the suffering and retrogression they have experienced has been inflicted on them by the counter-revolutionary formula imposed on
them by South Africa’s troops and the imperialists, not by “the Russians,” who have no military presence anywhere in Africa.

South Africa’s imperialist ambitions can only grow in the wake of Reagan’s election victory. Already in September 1984, after the biggest military manoeuvres held in the country since World War Two, the divisional commander in charge, Brigadier George Kruts, was quoted as saying:

“South Africa has become expert in blitzkrieg-type warfare and intends getting better at it.”

Defence Minister Malan added that the exercise had shown that:

“We could go right through to Cairo.”

(Rand Daily Mail September 10th and 13th 1984)

Clearly the time has come for the world to administer a decisive rebuff to the ambitions of the South African racists and their imperialist allies. The South African gangsters must not be allowed to run amuck in Africa. They must not be allowed to murder and destroy either in South Africa itself or in the front line states. They must be called to account for the crimes they have committed in war and peace, for their repeated violations of the UN Charter, and the various UN declarations relating to Southern Africa.

We Must Fight on All Fronts
The racist-imperialist offensive against the independent states and liberation movements of Southern Africa must be combated on all fronts:

★ The armed struggle must be intensified and ever more weighty blows struck against the enemy.

★ The struggles of the oppressed peoples in South Africa in the schools and colleges, in the townships, in the factories, on the buses, in the bantustans, must be raised to a new level and co-ordinated. The underground presence of the ANC and SACP inside the country must become an effective reality so that the mobilisation of the masses can become a continuous process, and proper political leadership provided to the people. More determined efforts must be made to win to our side increasing numbers of White democrats.

★ International solidarity action must be stepped up to isolate the South African regime militarily, politically and economically.

We Have a Reservoir of Support
Let us not be dismayed by the apparent drift to the right in the western countries. The reactionary policies pursued by Reagan and Thatcher represent a frantic attempt by the counter-revolutionaries to claw back something of the sweeping gains registered by the progressive forces world-wide in the 1970s. The mass struggles being waged against imperialism everywhere are a guarantee that in due course the tide will once more turn in our favour.

Furthermore, for all their claims of “sweeping successes” in this year’s elections, neither Reagan nor Thatcher enjoys majority support among the electorate. Reagan was returned to office winning 59% of the votes cast in a 56% poll, which means that only 33% of US voters actually voted for him. Mrs Thatcher was likewise returned to office despite the fact that she was rejected by the majority of Britons who went to the polls. These figures mean that in our international solidarity work we can appeal to a substantial reservoir of opinion in the leading western countries which does not support the adventurous and reactionary policies represented by Reagan and Thatcher.

The African National Congress is now recognised nationally and internationally as the leading force in the liberation movement, the force most capable of uniting the South African people of all races in the struggle to overthrow the apartheid regime, and in the genuinely free and democratic society which will be established thereafter on the lines set out in the Freedom Charter. Even the enemies of the ANC have been compelled to recognise its strength and authority. During 1984, approaches were made to the ANC by both the US administration and the Botha regime, indicating the lines on which “talks” may be arranged to settle the conflicts in Southern Africa.

We must beware of warmongers who talk of peace. The Crocker-Botha plan which is be-
ing mooted amounts to a call for total surrender by the ANC. It has three main objectives:

★ The ANC must abandon its tactic of armed struggle.
★ The ANC must abandon its alliance with the SACP.
★ The ANC must sever its relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Were these conditions to be accepted, the ANC would go into the debating chamber naked and defenceless, having thrown all its weapons away. Nevertheless, we can expect the Crocker-Botha offensive against the ANC to be intensified in the wake of Reagan’s reaction, for the destruction or subversion of the ANC, after all, is the main objective of the anti-imperialist strategy.

The ANC Must Defend Its Gains

The ANC must defend its hard-won gains. Nothing must be allowed to disrupt the unity it has built in its ranks, and between itself and its allies. We must all recognise that the hostility of a Reagan or a Botha to the ANC is not due only to the ANC/SACP alliance or the ANC’s relations to Moscow, but to the fact that the ANC has developed its own anti-imperialist philosophy on the basis of its own historical experience. The anti-Communist and anti-Soviet line adopted by the enemy in its approach to the ANC is merely another form of the old imperialist tactic of "divide and conquer." Separate the ANC from its allies, bring tension into its ranks, undermine it, weaken subvert it, then it will collapse — that is the enemy’s strategy.

We must cherish the unity that has been built in decades of bitter struggle like the apple of our eye. In the crucial coming period, we must not allow ourselves to be diverted or sidetracked by witch-hunts or red herrings; we must allow nothing to distract us from our main task, which is to gather strength to implement our decisions and defeat the enemy. Far from narrowing our alliances, we must broaden them, seek new friends on the basis of our basic principles. In Africa we must work to strengthen the front line states so that they are in a position to withstand the Crocker-Botha pressures, sabotage and subversion. We must call on the OAU, the Non-Aligned Movement and the UN to help us in this task.

Our front line, the front line states, must be aided and strengthened; the Botha regime must be isolated and weakened. That must be our battle-cry in the coming period. That is the way to victory.

Southern African leaders: Nujoma, dos Santos, Mazire, Nyerere, Mugabe, Kaunda, Machel, and Tambo.
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