

rule by adopting jackboot tactics, it takes stock and re-emerges under another disguise. The imperialists had warned the South African ruling class that it cannot continue to rule like in yester year. After much soul searching, the ruling class came to the conclusion that they must embark on a reform programme. Fundamental changes were not considered.

There is nothing more dishonest than to present CODESA as a mechanism to eliminate oppression and exploitation. It would be extremely naive to believe that the oppressors and their hirelings would be concerned genuinely to uplift the lot of the masses. What matters most for the ruling class is the improvement of the economic situation and preservation of their assets and investments without endangering their power. Throughout history this is now the dominant classes have always acted.

We in APDUSA have rejected CODESA as nothing more than a continuation of the negotiation process – as a sellout and as a betrayal of the hopes, aspirations and expectations of the working class and rural poor.

We must continue independently our struggle for Liberation – for a single Democratic South Africa free of oppression, discrimination and exploitation, where the interests of the rural poor and the working class will be paramount.

---

### MANDELA'S MOMENT OF TRUTH AT CODESA

CODESA (Convention for a Democratic South Africa – even the name belies its function) has come to pass; and for the oppressed the only truthful statement made throughout those two days was, unbelievably, that from Nelson Mandela. Not his sugary opening statements nor his conciliatory closing remarks, but that which lay in between.

F.W. de Klerk, after asking for permission to address CODESA last on the opening day, launched an attack on the ANC, saying: “. . . an organisation which remains committed to the armed struggle cannot be completely trusted when it also commits itself to peacefully negotiated solutions.”

Nelson Mandela, asking for special permission to speak thereafter, launched a counter-attack. He stated, amongst other things, that De Klerk:—

- \* Was less than frank.
- \* Is the head of an illegitimate, discredited, minority regime.
- \* Is the type of person with whom very few people would like to deal.
- \* Was abusing his position.
- \* Is regarded by the people as killing innocent people.
- \* Was taking advantage of this meeting for petty political gain.

He went on to say that:

- \* The Nationalist Party had a double agenda — of talking peace and at the same time conducting a war.
- \* De Klerk is not fit to be head of the government if he was unaware about government funding of Inkatha.

At the end of his speech one wondered what the ANC was doing there in the first place if that was its honest assessment of the government.

In ruling class circles, Mandela's tirade was greeted with dismay. He was accused of marring the proceedings; of breaching the good faith between De Klerk and himself.

For the oppressed, however, for once in a long time the ANC was saying something that was true and induced some revolutionary fervour in them; what a pity it had to be in that den of thieves, CODESA.

Mandela, however, was not motivated by any sudden inspiration to reveal the truth; he was not serious about taking his accusations against the government to its logical conclusion and disassociating the ANC completely from any further negotiations with the government. So what was the real reason? The real reason was that Mandela was angry at De Klerk — not because his accusations against the government were true but because De Klerk had attacked the ANC without giving prior notice to him, Mandela. Mandela also wanted CODESA to present a harmonious picture to the outside world; he wanted it to be a gracious occasion — rather like a banquet where everyone heaps praise on one another; not a meeting concerning the liberation of the oppressed. Therefore, when De Klerk attacked the ANC, Mandela saw red. He lost his temper (and found the truth), revealing the true nature of the government.

The ANC's behaviour thereafter though was a spectacle. They met the National Party delegation and ruefully made up. At a press conference later, Mandela said that it was past history, as though it were a lover's

tiff and not issues pertaining to the life and death struggle of the oppressed. Mandela kowtowed to the only principle he now espouses – that of compromise – and the happy relationship between the ANC and the government was put back on track.

The little game of deceit, however, was and will be one of many. CODESA cannot hope to deliver the oppressed out of the political servitude and socio-economic deprivation that is their lot. The oppressed have to learn that hope alone, whether it be in an organisation, in an individual or in an ideal – cannot realise our liberation. History teaches us that only sound organisation of the people themselves, guided by scientific principles of political struggle can win our freedom in South Africa. Any other route or quick-fix solutions can only set us back in this quest; and this is the very task of CODESA – to hijack the struggle in this country.

---

### **"I'M NOT THE LAST WHITE HEAD OF STATE" – F.W. De Klerk**

Mr F.W. de Klerk recently told a German political magazine, "Der Spiegel", that he did not believe he would be the last white head of state in South Africa. At the same time he warned that if South Africa became "ungovernable" . . . "we (the government) have a lot of options left (to reverse this) . . . Unfortunately, they are not attractive ones." Nor did he rule out the possibility of reimposing a state of emergency if political talks failed to "achieve desired ends". He insisted that "whites will play a critical role in any (future) government, no matter under what constitution". (The Star, the Johannesburg International weekly, 20 November 1991)

De Klerk added that he wanted a system of government by coalition which would be representative of all players and have "a rotational presidency"! "The Westminster system in which a group with 51 per cent of the vote has all the power, is unsuitable for South Africa . . . For example, we need a second parliamentary chamber to look after minority interests." There would be "trouble" if a new system led to "the suppression of minority rights and violation of property rights," he added. There should not be "a repeat of the conditions in other African countries." By the same token, De Klerk contended that "there