

CONFIDENTIAL

THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE

Opening remarks by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, Chairman

---

Hotel Richards  
Richards Bay

21st October 1983

---

My colleagues and brothers Mr. Mabuza, Mr. Chinsamy, Mr. Middleton, my brothers and sisters who comprise the delegations of Inyandza, the Reform Party and INKATHA, and other brothers and sisters present. I have great pleasure in welcoming you to this session of the South African Black Alliance. Thanks to our Heavenly father for it is through His mercy that you all travelled in safety to Richards Bay.

We are sorry that our meeting had to be postponed because the venue at which we were hoping to hold it was not available on the date on which we intended holding it. We are however meeting here at a crucial time in the history of South Africa. The ugly aspects of the present political dispensation which prompted Mr. Chinsamy and Mr. Sonny Leon to come up to Ulundi in order to propose the setting up of this Alliance are today all glaring at us at his time. Not since the setting up of the then Union of South Africa has there been such an emotional contentious issue as the one that faces all South Africans at this time.

Whites have for generations been living a lie in pretending that Black people are not part of the population of South Africa. When they formed the Union of South Africa they left out Africans who were not included as citizens in that Union of South Africa. Despite the snubs and insults hurled at Africans, Africans have felt over the years that they were unrecognised citizens of the State named South Africa. When the First World War broke out thousands of our people went to war on behalf of the State of South Africa, despite this failure to recognise them as citizens of the country of their birth. Many thousands of Africans died for South Africa. When the Second World War broke out, again many of our people joined the war effort and many of them again died and some were maimed for South Africa.

We have contributed again in no small measure towards the creation of the wealth of this country. The economy of South Africa in fact rests on the



backs of Black people of this land. This contribution is not recognised. It does seem to me that there is nothing we can do to convince White South Africa that we too deserve a place in the sun.

In a statement of belief which I wish to read again to you here, we have articulated our vision of a just society in South Africa. If I may remind you, it reads:

1. We believe that respect for individuals and the value placed on cultural and large groups is synonymous with progress towards a politically stable society.
2. We believe that political rights of all national groups should be protected within a constitutional framework which outlaws discrimination based on colour, sex or creed.
3. We believe in individual equality before the law, equality of opportunity, and equality of benefits from the institutions of the State.
4. We believe that the identity of an individual within a particular cultural milieu is essential to his identity as a South African; but we believe also that culture belongs to all men and that no social, economic or political impediments which hinder the free movements of individuals from one cultural milieu to another are in any respect justified.
5. We recognise that there are privileged communities and under-privileged communities, and we believe that it is the very special duty of the State to provide the opportunities, and back those opportunities with resources, to enable every individual who is under-privileged to develop to the maximum of his ability.
6. We believe that the resources of the country and the wealth which has already been created, which is controlled by the State, belongs to all the people of South Africa; and we believe that the resources and the wealth of the country should be utilised for the greatest good of the greatest number.
7. We believe that we are facing a grave crisis in which the poor are threatened with greater poverty, and we believe it essential that all men join hands and enter into a partnership with the State, to effect the greatest possible redistribution of wealth commensurate with maximising the productivity of commerce, trade and industry, whether State-controlled or privately owned.
8. We believe that fiscal control is essential to regulate the quantity and flow of money and near money, and we also believe that State control by equivalents of the Reserve Bank are essential for the utilisation of land, water and power in the interests of the economy and in the interests of developing under-developed areas and populations.



9. We believe in the elimination of secrecy in public administration, and we believe individuals should have rights of appeal to the courts to protect his or her privacy in the pursuit of that which is lawful.

10. We believe that practices acceptable in civilised nations should characterise the methods and the procedures used by the police in the enforcement of law.

11. We believe that the enforcement of law is devoid of meaning outside of the rule of law, and we believe that there should be both a criminal code and a justice code in which rights to appeal to the highest courts of the land are the rights of all persons; and we believe that upon pronouncement of an impartial law society, that the State should bear the costs of appeal where the appellant pursued a course of action to protect his individual rights.

12. We believe that in living the good life in a just society, an individual should be free to attend any educational institution in which he has entry qualifications, reside where he wishes, own ground where he wishes, and become qualified in any trade or profession for which he has the required degree of competence.

13. We believe that the development of trade union guilds and associations should be encouraged by the enactment of enabling legislation and courts of arbitration.

14. We believe that the accumulated injustices of the past, and the injustice now present in the institutions of our country, have created a bitterness and anger among the under-privileged sections of our populations; and we believe that growing fears of this anger and bitterness makes the privileged sections of our population intransigent in the face of the need for change.

15. We believe therefore that the transition from an unjust society to a just society will be difficult.

16. We believe that in this eleventh hour of South Africa, responsible leadership must publicly declare its commitment to bring about a just society within the foreseeable future; and we believe that leadership must meet the demands of responsibility by taking whatever steps remain from time to time to avoid a race war.

17. We believe that the mobilisation of constituency protest and a refusal to act within the restrictive confines of race exclusivity holds a promise we dare not abandon.

We came together to form this Alliance on the basis of this Statement. As I have already indicated it was the revulsion which Mr. Chinsamy and Mr. Leon



felt when Mr. P.W. Botha proposed setting up a President's Council which had no place for the African majority, which prompted them to approach me with a view to launching this South African Black Alliance. When it was launched it was Mr. David Curry and members of the Labour Party who insisted on us calling it a "Black Alliance" when the question of the name of the Alliance was debated. I must remind you of these things at this time when our exclusion from the constitution is being enshrined in the new constitutional proposals of Mr. P. W. Botha. This is a time when we have been deserted by erstwhile friends on both sides of the colour line.

I want to confess to you my brothers and sisters that in all the political storms we have gone through since 1978, when the South African Black Alliance was formed, I have found it to be a great tower of strength for me. There is nothing, nothing whatsoever which has made me regret for one moment the formation of this Alliance. No organisation I know of in the entire history of the struggle has ever experienced the betrayals we have experienced through desertions in mid-stream, such as that of the Labour Party of South Africa and the Dikwakwentla Party. Desertions of this kind have to be seen as a purification process, rather than something we should regret. It is much better to be a smaller body of convinced loyal followers than an amorphous and unwieldy organisation with members who in terms of our commitments are really neither fish nor fowl.

We have at all times tried to avoid being an organisation whose main thrust is to denigrate other Black organisations. There are many organisations who do just that. It has at times been painful for us when we have had to use the political sjambok to retaliate when our integrity has been put to question by some of our Black detractors.

Whites have already passed the Constitutional Bill. It has gone through Parliament. The Prime Minister is now putting the whole White electorate through a farcical referendum, where Whites are now supposed to endorse through the vote what Parliament, the final decision-making body, has already passed.

Our stand on this whole exercise is well known. We have made it clear and we continue to make it very clear for the sake of White South Africa whose naivety in politics boggles one's mind, where we stand. We also must have the whole world as our witness that when they imposed this abortion of a constitution on the African majority we made it clear what the consequences of that would be.

I have been accused by Ministers of Mr. P.W. Botha and others of intimidating Coloureds, Indians and Whites each time I have spelled out the reasonable consequences of imposing such a constitution on the country which



excludes the African majority. I have similarly been accused of the same by the National Party's newly acquired satellites, the New Republic Party, such as Mr. Derrick Waterson. I have never tried to intimidate anyone, but I have considered it to be my duty as a Black leader to spell out the consequences of going ahead in implementing this constitution, which spells nothing but disaster for the whole country. If there is any definition of battle lines between White South Africa and Black South Africa, it will be done as has never been done before by this constitution. When I have spoken in these terms, I have been misinterpreted. When I have spoken about this constitution making killing for political purposes a new ball game South Africans will be forced to play, people say that I am threatening people with violence. I do no more than say that the dark clouds that are gathering on the horizon are going to cause a storm that will break over our heads if this constitution is implemented.

In 1978 we asked the Prime Minister to draft a statement of intent with us. He promised to do so after touring Black areas, so-called, including Soweto. When we were eventually invited by him to his office in Cape Town, we were made to file into his office one by one as schoolboys would do into a School Master's office. When he set up the President's Council, I appealed to him to declare a moratorium on all constitutional experimentations until such time as we reach a consensus. He ignored this, and went ahead to establish a President's Council which excluded Africans. Because of our strong protest against the setting up of a President's Council, the Prime Minister tried to make for it by setting up a Black Advisory Council. We had already rejected this most strongly. And yet the Prime Minister, being a man who specialises in imposing his will on others, called us up to Pretoria with the intention of cajoling and coaxing us. I refused to attend such a meeting. Now, during the course of the ongoing debate on the constitution, the Prime Minister and NRP spokesmen, such as Mr. Vause Raw and Mr. Derrick Waterson, are blaming me for refusing to say 'Ja Baas' to Mr. P.W. Botha when he wanted to get credit for political innovativeness by making us as Africans accept the deal he was offering us of our own accord, in the form of this Black Advisory Council.

Just about that time we had an Alliance meeting in Port Elizabeth. Leaders such as Dr. Phatudi, Professor Ntsanwisi, Mr. K. Mopeli, and other Black leaders on their own promised to attend our session of the Black Alliance in Port Elizabeth. I agreed to this and yet except for Dr. Phatudi who sent his Minister of Education, Mr. Kwakwa, none of our brothers came, nor did they offer any excuse for not turning up or any explanation. This was a time when we needed Black solidarity more than at any other time in history. But we were again seen by friends and foes as being in complete disarray as the Black community of South Africa. Thereafter our meetings completely disintegrated under the chairmanship of Professor Ntsanwisi and we have never met again until the 11th of July this year and the 5th of October.

I have seen too many incidents where we as Black people get together only to



disintegrate later. In 1973 all leaders from the so-called Black areas of South Africa met at Umtata in the hope that we would present a united front as our oppression had nothing whatsoever to do with our ethnic groupings. The history of how that disintegrated after some members opted for independence a' la Pretoria is well known to all of you. We in this Alliance have been in existence for six years now. That is a record, despite the casualties who fell by the wayside in those six years. We must preserve and nurture this Alliance of ours. It is a core of something very precious which will contribute considerably to our liberation struggle.

At our last South African Black Alliance meeting, I reported about the initiative of the President of the Transkei, Chief Matanzima and Dr. Phatudi. Delegations from this Alliance have met with delegations from Transkei, Lebowa, Gazankulu, QwaQwa and on some occasions from Venda and KwaNdebele. And also delegations from NAFKOC, UCASA and IDAMASA. In between we have had two conferences of leaders on July 11 and also on the 5th of this month. The only leader from an 'independent' state who has attended so far is the leader of the Transkei. Chief Matanzima senior attended in July and Chief Matanzima junior attended our last meeting on October 5th. It is quite clear that it is not possible in the foreseeable future for any other so-called Head of State from an 'independent' state to attend or join in in these discussions which we have had so far. Although Venda was represented at an earlier meeting, it is clear that their leader will not join us. President Matanzima told us that he was making efforts to get Chief Mangope of Bophuthatswana to attend. However so far this is clearly not on at all. The Ciskei is out of the question, as Ciskei and Transkei are hardly on speaking terms. Since it is Chief Matanzima, the President of the Transkei, who was asked to persuade members of the 'independence' league to join us, it is quite clear that Ciskei is just out of the question, that is quite apart from the insurmountable internal problems which face them within the Ciskei.

The main advantage I could see in these meetings was the sabotaging of Mr. P.W. Botha's confederation of states, which would complete his apartheid plan for South Africa. The result of it all being the complete elbowing out of Africans from the South African body politic once and for all. If all the so-called independent states joined us it would completely wreck Mr. P.W. Botha's plans. But if only the Transkei joins with us I can see very few advantages for us in being involved in these talks. I have actually tolerated being involved at all because I could not spurn the hand of brotherhood of the Transkei, and of millions of Transkeians, some of whom felt betrayed when 'independence' was taken in the first place. I have also done so for the sake of our brothers in NAFKOC and UCASA. Apart from this, all our brothers who are now involved in these talks with us are the same people who have found it not necessary to join with us in this Alliance. I am as a result of this faced with a real dilemma at this point in time. Must I bear with them for the sake of the Transkei, when Mr. P.W. Botha is clearly going to succeed in forming a confederation of states with Ciskei and others who so far have not heeded Chief Matanzima's plea to join hands with us. I



am faced with a very serious dilemma and I want to be quite blunt about it. This past history, starting in 1973 of these get-togethers and the way they fizzled out over the years, makes me very uneasy about them.

The Transkei continues to be an 'independent' state and has not indicated to us that they want that 'independence' to be dismantled in any way, or reduced to the status, for example, of KwaZulu. I do not even know whether this is possible had they wanted to do so, after the nearly 100 contracts which President Matanzima signed with the late Mr. B.J. Vorster.

I am quite prepared to suffer the flak I have already experienced for being associated in this way with Chief Matanzima and Transkei, as long as I know that our brothers and sisters in the Transkei were likely to get back to the same fold with us and, for example, become South African citizens once again.

No person of any sound mind except politically bankrupt political nobodies trying to climb into eminence at my expense and those who are jealous of my political power here and abroad, can say that I am of the same ilk as the leaders of the so-called independent states. These two categories of detractors have been at this game ever since this initiative with Transkei began. Again, let me repeat that I do not mind if the price I am paying politically for this means that Transkeians will again be allowed to get back into the South African fold. Are there any prospects of this while they are 'independent' is the question I ask myself.

From the above there is no evidence so far that this will happen in the foreseeable future. The point is whether we should in fact dismantle something that has served us so well as this Alliance, particularly on a concrete issue such as the efforts of Mr. P.W. Botha to strip a million Black people of KaNgwane and Ingwavuma of their South African citizenship. Had we not had this Alliance, it is possible that we could not have presented such a united front as we presented at the height of the Ingwavuma debacle. At that time, none of our brothers who are with us in this new initiative gave us even moral support, let alone material support, except two. In fact, the Prime Minister of the Transkei, Chief George Matanzima, congratulated Mr. Botha for trying to excise Ingwavuma and KaNgwane and make our brothers and sisters in those areas Swazi citizens, just with a stroke of a pen. So far, the Prime Minister of the Transkei has shown no remorse about what he said on these excisions by way of withdrawing those words.

I am not at all trying to be difficult. I am just sharing the dilemma I am facing in these matters and as a democrat, I will value your guidance as to what to do. I want to go into depth in sharing my perspectives on the issue and hope that you will share yours with me.



As I have already indicated, as members of SABA we face a most critical period in South African political history. It is not a period which is critical because there is flux and change and we do not know what is going to happen; it is critical because the status quo is being entrenched in the constitution and we know exactly what is going to happen. I shall deal with wider issues in my address for the public meeting, and I will therefore tonight limit my remarks in this closed session to the issues which surround the nature of SABA and about which we should seek clarity amongst ourselves, as I have already indicated.

Apart from what I have already said, I want to observe at the outset of tonight's discussion that I do not see any need for SABA to change its nature or its objectives. The reasons which brought us together in the first place are more valid now than ever before. I want to talk about how to pursue those objectives in the current circumstances, and not about changing them. We have accepted the Statement of Belief as a consensus document and the objectives which are contained in it remain the objectives we pursue together. The fact that the Labour Party is no longer with us will not alter history; it will only alter the Labour Party itself as it is led through the labyrinth of political intrigue by its political nose to be ever further away from the real action at the core of the struggle for liberation in this country. Whatever Mr. Rajbansi decides to do, he does outside of SABA. You all know how much I have regretted this in the past and I regret it more so now. Whatever the National People's Party decides to do, SABA will remain intact and it will still be faced with its commitments and we will still seek to discharge those commitments. I believe our joint commitment to the objectives of the Statement of Belief will in the end prove to be durable and constructive. Rather than be stampeded into precipitous and vacillating action, we should stand firm in our conviction that SABA had a valid political purpose and that this valid political purpose remains. I am, however, locked into a dilemma and I would like tonight to explain this dilemma to you and to seek your joint wisdom on it about it.

SABA has been an association of Black organisations drawn together by the common ground which exists between us and which should exist between all the forces engaged in the struggle for liberation in this country. Our association with each other in SABA has not meant the loss of identity of our respective organisations, it has been an enhancement of that identity. We have each pursued our own organisational objectives and we have each continued to strengthen SABA with each and every gain we have made on our individual political platforms. As you know, I have been for a long time disappointed that more Black organisations have not seen fit to throw their lot in with us. The Statement of Belief on which we partly found our joint commitment is not a document which many other Black organisations would find problematic. On my own side, and on the side of the leadership of INKATHA, we have always regarded it as important in the South African situation to make the kind of political breakthroughs which would expand SABA's base and



why SABA could not have been accepted as the political forum for the kind of development and debate which has taken place in the meeting of leaders and yet I could dare not say this at these meetings as Chairman of this Alliance. I have always espoused the principles and values which go hand in hand with constituency politics. I do not pay lip service to the ordinary Black people of South Africa. I do not believe there is wisdom beyond their collective wisdom which will endure and achieve real things. I think it would be fatal for those involved in the talks which led to the proposals to hastily form a new organisation which is beyond just a forum which we use on an ad hoc basis. I have appealed to those who have been involved in these talks to moderate their pace, and in committee move only to the point where we have something to present to the people. I am embarrassed because this suggestion could not be fully supported by all, as I have indicated. Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima feels that he as a head of state he could not, for example, address a rally in Soweto with me. I can only be politically embarrassed by establishing political alliances with leaders who are not in a position to go the ordinary people of South Africa and seek a mandate from them. I am embarrassed because some of the leaders who have been involved in these talks have up to now spurned SABA, for reasons they have never advanced.

Forming another organisation other than just a forum would be tantamount to sweeping SABA under the political carpet. The sweeping of SABA under the political carpet would also be tantamount to telling the Indian and Coloured communities that they are politically redundant. I do not believe that the struggle for liberation is a purely African struggle and I have never behaved in any way to spurn the Indian and Coloured contribution to the Black responsibility in the struggle. There is only one future in South Africa and that is a Black-White future. We would not have formed a Black Alliance if we were not prohibited by law to recruit Whites into the Alliance.

I really do seek your wisdom in this dilemma in which I find myself. I am not a political leader who changes horses midstream and the handshake of friendship to me is the commencement of something enduring. I do not pick up and drop people for the sake of expediency, and I do not believe one has to sacrifice political honour and I do not believe we have to be scattered every time the National Party makes a constitutional sneeze.

I present these thoughts to you as simply as I can with the request that we tease them out in the political context we now find ourselves in. The dominating factor in this political context for me is that the new constitution denationalises 22 million Africans in the first place and in the second place renders every White, Coloured and Indian incapable of working legitimately and constitutionally for a single united South Africa. The new constitution delegitimises democratic opposition to apartheid by Africans in 87 per cent of the country. I have never yet acted outside of a mandate from the people; those who denigrate me may dispute this until they are blue in the face but it is one of the political facts of this country. I find in the



make it ever more representative of Black political organisations. While we have pursued this objective, we have not set out to proselytise or to cajole. That I believe would have been counterproductive. We have seen too many false declarations of unity and I have always acted on the assumption that the slow growth of SABA giving rise to an expanding base of solidarity would be better than a more rapid expansion of SABA's membership in which we would only have had a fragile and useless association which would vanish like mist at the drop of a hat.

When the South African Government published the details of its new constitutional proposals and Dr. Phatudi and Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima made overtures to me to join in with them to work for a federation of Black South African 'states' as an expression of our joint rejection of the new constitution, I responded with cautious enthusiasm. I responded with caution because I perceived real dangers in establishing an exclusively Black organisation and because I see the real challenge facing us as the challenge of bringing about a National Convention at which every political group in the country, and all the race groups of the country, would jointly decide on the future. I therefore saw dangers in a racialistic response to the constitution and I saw dangers in jumping the consultation gun and producing a cut and dried alternative to the present situation. Within these two determinants of caution, there was the added perception that it was not politically right for us to do our own thing as Africans as a reaction to White political moves. The formation of a federation of Black African states out of the so-called independent and non-independent homelands would not be acceptable to the majority of people in my own constituency and Black South Africa generally. The real struggle challenge in the struggle for liberation as I see it is the challenge to work democratically through non-violent means to achieve one South Africa. The formation of a Black federation of states which was originally muted may have merit in some directions but on balance politics which confirms a Black block on the periphery of central White South Africa, so-called is to me problematic. I therefore reacted with caution.

I also, however, reacted with enthusiasm because any move towards Black solidarity should be encouraged and if the approaches of Dr. Phatudi and Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima could contribute towards the healing of the political rift between Black leaders which was produced by the initial acceptance of so-called independence by Transkei and Bophuthatswana, and compounded when Venda and Ciskei followed suit, then I should welcome the initiative. The dilemma which is now beginning to emerge for me is that the original initiatives and the dialogue which followed in a series of meetings barely separated by months, appear to be crystallising towards the formation of another distinct organisation. We must not be seen here to be sabotaging any Black unity initiative, but I am somehow uneasy. I need your wisdom on this dilemma.

I am also embarrassed because there is no organisational reason whatsoever



new constitution no room to manoeuvre whatsoever and I find in it an insurmountable obstacle inhibiting negotiations about our future. The new constitution establishes the kind of State in South Africa which must be dismantled. It polarises South Africa and is a prescription for conflict and ultimately for violence. In these circumstances, I must deepen my commitment to the people and resolve even more determinedly to work democratically and pursue the objectives they want. I believe there will be a shock reaction to a White rejection of their fellow countrymen if the referendum produces a majority 'Yes' vote. I believe there will be a radicalisation of Black opinion and a hardening of Black attitudes. In these circumstances, SABA needs to work out its future stances and should work for a people's mandate as to where we go from here after the White 'Yes' vote on the 2nd of November.

Thus when I look at the dilemma I face in the circumstances before us, I am genuinely perplexed and I would greatly value your insights and perceptions of how SABA should respond to the circumstances which are the components of my dilemma. I am not being egotistical because I fully recognise that all of us who come together in SABA face a radically altered situation in which we have to pursue the same objectives which we set out to pursue. I am also aware that we are waiting for the Coloured community's response to the Labour Party betrayal of our common purpose, and I am aware that my Asian brothers have their own problems. In some respects, your dilemmas are deeper than mine because the new constitution may prove to be disruptive in your constituencies, whereas it will consolidate my own constituency. The same applies to my brother, Mr. Mabuza; his constituency can only be strengthened instead of disintegrating.

The statement by Mr. Pen Kotze in Johannesburg has been to me political manna for those of us who have repeatedly pointed out the fraudulence of the involvement of our Coloured and Indian brothers in the tricameral parliamentary system. It shows how double-faced the Nats are. He has issued a strong statement about Indians living in the 'white' areas of Johannesburg. Mr. Pen Kotze is reported to have said that "the situation can no longer be tolerated ... drastic measures will be introduced ... no leniency" and finally he said: "These people didn't live in the sky before they came to Mayfair. They can go back where they came from."

I have read strong reactions from both the Reverend Hendrickse and Mr. David Curry on what Mr. Pen Kotze said. There have been similar reactions from Mr. Rajbansi. Mr. Curry said that the Group Areas Act was the biggest single threat to good relations between the Coloured community and the Government. We agree with Mr. Curry. In my political ineptitude I thought that they had in their negotiating participation in the tricameral parliament reached agreement on such major issues as the Group Areas Act and its possible scrapping, with Mr. P.W. Botha. The statement could not have stressed the entrenchment of the status quo better, than proving to us Africans, Coloureds



and Indians that even under the new constitutional proposals, Mr. P.W. Botha has ensured that we shall remain 'kaffirs', 'Hotnots' and 'coolies' confined to their ghettos. Do they trust a government which can in this day and age be so insulting and so callous. The Reverend Hendrickse threatened to pull out of the tricameral parliamentary participation if the Coloured and Indian people in Mayfair are removed. Why doesn't the Reverend Hendrickse withdraw now from participation, with any hope of ever retrieving his credibility amongst all of us as his brothers. What further evidence does the Reverend Hendrickse or Mr. Rajbansi need to prove to them that the government of Mr. P.W. Botha is committed to the entrenchment of apartheid as they have in fact stated. Mr. Hendrick Schoeman's statement in Durban was clear enough on this issue.

We are not saying these things merely to adopt the "I told you so" attitude in a cheap sort of way to gloat over the political waywardness of our brothers in the Labour Party. We are telling them that they can still do an about turn and retrieve most of their lost credibility. We would embrace them back into the wagon of the liberation struggle as brothers who were misguided. It would be wise to do this before they contaminate themselves with going into their particular apartheid chambers in the tricameral parliament. Accepting separate chambers in this parliament does in principle amount to the endorsement of the apartheid ideology of which the Group Areas Act is but one aspect.

God is wonderful that Mr. Pen Kotze has let the cat out of the bag even before Whites vote on November the 2nd. No White voter can now tell us that he or she did not know what they were voting for on November 2nd. The cat is now out of the bag, no one can claim that he or she did not know what animal there was in Mr. P.W. Botha's political bags.

We in this Alliance should be strengthened in our resolve to fight against apartheid whether it be independence, so-called, or the tricameral parliament. All these things are tools Mr. P.W. Botha is committed to use in implementing classical apartheid. Strength to your arms, my brothers and sisters. AMANDLA!

---