

Interview: UDF National Executive - Cheryl Carolus, Murphy Morobi, Mohammed Vally

Q: Let me just ask you first for your official titles-what shall I call you ?  
You're Murphy Morobi - what title do you have with UDF ?

A: I'm with the Transvaal Regional Executive as a Secretary for rural areas...  
( and standing in as the National Publicity Secretary at the moment ).

Q: You're official title ?

CC: I'm Cheryl Carolus and I am assisting at head office, also in the absence of  
our two national officers.

Q: And what do you normally do..?

CC: I was one of the secretaries last year <sup>and I was</sup> on the UWO executive, when I was seconded  
to H.O.

MV: I'm MV, General Secretary for the Transvaal region.

Q: And are all 3 of you doing full-time UDF work ?

A: Yes.

Q: What kind of work did you do before this ?

MV: I was a teacher some years back in what they call Indian schools, and then  
I was dismissed at the end of 1982. Since UDF was lauched I've been working  
full-time for UDF.

Q: You were dismissed in connection with what ?

MV: Basically my political activities.

Q: What did you teach ?

MV: Maths.

Q: And what kind of job had you held before ?

CC: I was also a teacher at one point, same story as Vally, dismissed because of  
political activities. I then worked for a church group called the Churches  
Urban Planning Commission. Since then I stopped working there to work full-  
time on the UDF when I was elected the Western Cape Secretary.

A: What area of Cape Town are you from ?

CC: From Cape Town....more specifically than that, Athlone - Silvertown.

Q: And did you grew up in Lens ?

MM: Yes, well I haven't had any profession in my lifetime and I dont think I'll  
have one at this point in time. I've been in prison for about six years and



and then worked as a trade unionist for about one year, and at the founding of UDF I was then active in UDF. That is my occupation - the UDF.

Q: Are you from Soweto ?

MM: Yes, I'm from Soweto...

Q: Which part ?

MM: Born there, grew up there - in Orlando, eastern Soweto.

Q: Where you in the case with Terror, the SASO trial ?

MM: No, I was in another case arising out of the '76 uprising - the SSRC case - I was one of the accused in the trial and I was sent to prison for 7 years. I went to Robben Island and was released in 1982.

Q: I'd like you each to say something about your political evolution - if you were involved in Soweto '76, how you viewed whites and their role in the struggle perhaps 8 or 9 years ago and how your views might have changed. I once did a long interview with Terror and he talked a whole lot about how his views changed for a lot of reasons - a lot of really interesting details, like Tony Holiday and Harry Mushabela's case while his case was up, the role of the white and the black, being on the island and just what had changed. So I was wondering if you could talk about - just briefly - if I were to say to you did you always think whites had a role - did that change from the 70's to the 80's ?

MM: My position as regards the position of whites in the struggle in the 70's is that I would say that to a large extent it is the result of I think what I would consider as being a myopic outlook in so far as the situation is concerned. The historical state in which we were at that time was a state where in fact we were cut off from our history, the history of struggle, as to what went on before us. When I got involved in politics it was at the level of the students movements, the South African Students Movement which was essentially BC, and growing up in that tradition where we dealt with the struggle only on the level of what matters at that point in time, we had that original evasion for any contact with white people. I think that was a result of that historical gap that was created, but as one developed and got more curious and began to read more my perception began to change, specially around '76<sup>rd</sup> even at the height of the '76 uprisings I would never consider myself as having been a very staunch and absolute nationalist in perspective - even in '76 one had the kind of approach where I was in the position to look at somebody and not to regard colour as a predominant aspect. For instance, one of the people I was involved with at this time was Dr. Beyers Naude, Cedric Mason, who basically are whites in the church. One had constant contact with them - I think that contact with people like those was quite an experience for one to realise that one could deal with people of other colour as people with whom you could share the same views and opinions on issues. Even in '76 within BC itself, there were different strands

of thought - some people would have been extreme vis à vis their position re whites and some would have been more accomodating, not for the sake of being lackeys as such but as a pragmatic appraisal of the situation and a recognition of the fact that one doesn't have to be black to be revolutionary just as one doesn't have to be white to be reactionary, it can work both ways. Prison to me became in fact, the most dramatic period for my conception of our struggle and lots of my views were changed by the experience of being exposed to other people who had been involved in struggle for a long time. So when that was shared and brought down the line it could markedly change one's views and approach to the struggle in SA.

Q: You mean the big figures, the leaders actually spoke to you about non-racialism or you saw it in their history... or what exactly ?

MM: It was a combination of both, I mean reading from books and being in contact with people who have been in the struggle even before the days of BC. They in fact brought down upon us the tradition of struggle we had been missing in the 70's and then the realisation dawned amongst lots of us that the gap that had been created with the banning of people's organisations in the 60's and the apparent demise of the Congress movement in the 60's created that vacuum where, certain ideas, in my mind, would actually date back to before the Congress Alliance, had actually re-emerged, albeit in a new form, as ideas that came up being as a result of the 60's student movement in America, the Black Power Movement - that came to have an effect on the SA scene. That became the ideas of the day that caught on like wildfire, little realising that as history develops, those ideas would run their course and become obsolete and new ideas ..... or not even new ideas, but a re-discovery of where we stood in history at the time, that those ideas came up. So, I think correctly lots of us took our ideas from that tradition and I think that is why the UDF has become so popular today and is going to develop so strongly because it has been able to come to terms with our history.

Q: Do you want to speak about your views on this..? Did they change over time & why ?

CC: Well, Murphy has spoken for lots of us... but I started off in the 70's in a group which was known as a multi-racial group, that is before they redefined non-racialism - called the National Youth Action Group - that was the time of the formation of SASO and the BC organisations and it was essentially a high school movement. We then decided to form the South African Black Scholars Association which was largely in the wetern Cape but had links with the SA Students Movement, of which Murphy has spoken, - the breakaway was around a lot of discussion about white dominating and all the kind of questions that people still raise today and still accuse groupings of UDF of. I think that

at that point in time, for a lot of people their first experience in SA is in terms of race. One only comes to realise that there are other implications as you develop politically. I think that with regards to my involvement in the BC movement, I'm like a lot of other people, I'm not apologetic that I did get involved in the BC movement. As Murphy has said, the BC movement has filled quite a big gap that was left by the banning of the people's organisations in the 60's and the whole state of emergency and jailing of leadership figures. At that point, the only national grouping which had some political cohesion was a group like NUSAS and that's why people shifted such a lot to an emphasis on re-interpreting our history, sort of re-asserting ourselves. I would say that the BC movement was largely, in retrospect of course, a cultural movement - a lot of its emphasis being on the past, and almost a glorification of the past, where there was some realisation of its shortcomings on purely a racial outlook in SA. An alternative economic system was posited which was called African Communalism, which referred back to our past and with a lot of questions of dress and how people relate to each other. But, of course, it didn't take into account the fact that SA was a highly industrialised country and that there was no way that one could revert to the kind of systems which one had earlier. I think that the important thing about it was that a lot of the questions were around issues of being black and being proud of it, redefining oneself and coming to terms with yourself and your history. I think that for me, just those kinds of things made quite an important basis for my development beyond the stage of BC. Something else worth saying is that BC, at that time, was defined as a means to an end - it was interpreted as not being in opposition to what had existed before. For example, people accepted the role of the ANC, the role of the Freedom Charter, accepted that people like Nelson Mandela, the Rivonia trialists, people in exile were in fact our political leadership and that we were building on a tradition like that - and I think that's an important distinction between what the BC movement is today and what it was in those days. I said that it laid the basis and one started questioning the limitations of, for eg., how the economic exploitation of people fits in with an outlook which, in retrospect, is largely cultural. There was the question of the Black Alliance which was formed with people like Inkatha and the Labour Party - and of course our struggle intensified and the lines became drawn a lot clearer one became capable of realising the limitations of a grouping like Inkatha which is not trying to build a national consciousness but rather an ethnic consciousness, and just what that meant in terms of our struggle in the long-term. We started questioning a lot of those things - of course the Labour Party then apparently had a different kind of role but there were still those kind of limitations even in so far as the Labour Party was concerned. Then of course '76 happened and I think that it was what is classically referred to as a watershed in our history, and I think a lot of us started realising that in a sense it was a culmination of a particular period in our struggle and one cannot discount the important role that BC had played there. I think

maybe another thing is that because it is largely a cultural thing, it was the kind of thing which appealed largely to intellectuals, which was why you found that the BC movement wasn't really rooted in the community and was strongest in the educational institutions. But that doesn't necessarily mean that there was anything seriously wrong if one considers that it was a particular period where one saw our people for the first time taking to the streets in defence of what they felt were their rights. But I was at the UWC at the time and we started thinking of how one actually takes what was happening then beyond where we were and in fact advance our struggle - it was quite clear to us that you couldn't go back to Afro's and wearing ----- and saying <sup>in a</sup> very sexist way 'black man you're on your own now', you know. So we started grappling with a lot of things, like the whole question of the economy came up again, of course, round '76 because a lot of the reasons why people took to the streets were linked to those kinds of things closely - people's day to day living and the fact that they couldn't cope. Then ..then I was detained for a while and in '77 there was quite a serious rift in the BC movement where people were actually questioning the ideology of the BC movement and there was, as I said, very serious differences about the role of BC and how one should go on. There was ..I don't know if one will still be able to get access to somebody like Diliza M who was the last President of SASO at the time, his address to the General Student Council - will sort of indicate that we had progress beyond the BC movement. Then of course the government banned the BC movements in '77. We then, in our very limited outlook on life, decided that.....I personally that I should now get into 'class' and I started reading Capital and I waded through two volumes before I realised that I was not going to understand class struggle by reading Capital! But then I think we started seriously looking into our past, approaching questions of national, democratic struggle, how we view the participation of the different classes, how we view the participation of different racial groups in a racially divided society like SA. We started reading things like the Freedom Charter, analysing it - now the Charter before had always been a <sup>fairly</sup> symbolic document to us, <sup>our</sup> people had gone to Kliptown and it was admirable that the people had drawn it up. I went gone into too much detail between '77 - I think the next point was 1980 again with the student boycott when we had a far more systematic approach, certainly in the western Cape where I was. And that gave birth, <sup>then</sup> from a student basis - a school boycott, going over into the community and, as I say my version will be very tainted by a regional perspective, largely western Cape, where we had a red meat boycott and a very successful bus boycott. Then we started building links with the trade union movement through things like the red meat boycott, in '79 there was a Fattis & Monis boycott as well where the student movement worked directly under the supervision of the trade union movement. I think then

we started building Civic Organisations - out of 1980 we saw emerging for the first time really solid youth structures and it was in that context that the Freedom Charter started to acquire a new sort of meaning for us. When one started looking at the demands of the Charter, the sort of guidelines for organising and the guidelines in terms of conducting the struggle acquired a lot more meaning for us because you started taking up people's demands, you started involving democratic structures. I think beyond that point, we developed a fairly clearer perspective.....I won't go into the UDF thing coz I'm sure you will speak more about that later ...but that's basically how I arrived at the sharpened vision of the national democratic struggle in SA.

A: So it was along those theoretical lines...not to be too simplistic..but just because I was mentioning this thing of whites,- was there ever any point that the issue that it should be blacks only became less and less relevant ? Were there any personal reasons that you had a new view on the role of whites ?

CC: I think, That Murphy has in part stated that some of us had <sup>a</sup> sort of contact with whites- it was still a fairly limited view on the role of whites and it was through the development of one's perspective that the problem in SA is not just simply, as Murphy said, that all blacks are good or all whites bad, that as one's perspective on issues like class and <sup>now</sup> the racial aspect forms part of the whole class thing, the fact that we are building a nation out of one that is fairly fragmented, that SA has never really been a nation and that , like it or not, we are all South Africans and we are going to have to shape a future in this country together . The lines had to be drawn in terms of those who are with the people - those who support the people's demands, working class demands - those who would see themselves as working under that sort of leadership, as opposed to those who are in Inkatha or the Labour Party who will clearly see themselves <sup>working</sup> in terms of the framework laid down by the state. As I said from '76 onward, when one started grappling with education Questions, I was at an education institution at the time, and you start questioning what sort of education do you want - and you look at white education and you realise that in fact what whites are getting is not what we want but whites also stand to gain by democratising our country. The whole question of who will benefit from change - we say that even whites, that is despite the fact that they seem to be getting the cream of the crop in SA, and they are , there's no question about that, but that they too will benefit from liberation because their education will improve. So if it is in their interests to in fact throw in their lot with black students in SA in terms of fighting for change on the educational front, similarly , if you look at it with a kind of class perspective , one would say that most whites are not working class - but when one looks at the question of the working class and those people one can change

inside the country, we say that a new social and economic order inside the country would in fact benefit other classes as well. And for that reason one ~~wants~~ to insure that you win over those classes and convince them that it is in their interest as well to fight for change in this country.

MM: I think that another important thing to add is when she mentioned the fact that '76 was a watershed in our history, I want to clearly illustrate that by taking two examples :- firstly SASO itself and on the other hand NUSAS - SASO has been an offshoot of NUSAS, a breakaway from NUSAS. But one sees as a result of '76 a marked shift even within the two organisations themselves - on the one hand NUSAS had in its theme, I don't remember the theme for '76, but it was a theme that they for '76 which was contradictory to what the situation in the country was. That in itself brought some re-awakening on the part of NUSAS on the extent to which they been out of touch of the situation. - and we see within SASO a much more dynamic appraisal of what the situation of contemporary SA was taking place within SASO, and also questioning their previous dogmas within the BC movement whereby from '77 and onwards, if one looks at all the presidents of SASO one realises they are <sup>nearly all becoming</sup> part and parcel of the non-racial movement in the struggle. And within SASO itself, with -in BC, there was a growing rift between SASO and BPC because when one talks of SASO you are talking of largely the student constituency. People who are in a position to lay their hands of literature, on books, who'd be able to do some kind of research, limited as it would be, in our ethnic colleges. - and they did manage to do that. And at that time a new approach was beginning to appear in SASP which would appear to be quite contradictory..... I mean as a development from the previous BC position. On the other hand, from NUSAS you see a development out of that liberal approach which had been there wherein '76 & '77 within the whites students movement they held that it is not enough to say that Bantu education must change, even what they have as white education is in itself not adequate and they have to fight against that, which we thought to be a very significant development because they were putting across the idea that entrenches superiority. So what was clear was that they were shifting from that chauvinistic and paternalistic approach to the struggle which is typical of liberals in most situations. And that has been the kind of trend that one sees where previously two groups have split and drifted apart - we see in '76 during the momentum there seems to be this once again coming together - hence we find today with AZASO and NUSAS both of them have come to a point of upholding the principles enshrined in the Freedom Charter which has been a significant shift. And that ... you know it has not been for us to read from books about the tradition but even our own experiences as to what was happening within white ranks themselves as a result of the reality of SA which was imposing itself upon people's minds and thoughts and people coming to reconsider their positions. Hence I think '76 was a watershed in our history

where a lot of shifting, re-alignment of forces took place and my own belief is that the decision to ban the BC movement taken by the government in '77 was not largely because of them being held responsible for the '76 uprising - my interpretation is that the government or the state had been in a position where it was able to monitor the developments within the BC movements. So the development of this non-racial trend which was taking place which would have been a rekindling of those traditions which they sought to destroy all along - and seeing that manifesting itself through SASO which would have meant the entire BC fold more or less, the state had to move in and this is how I interpret Oct. '77, the banning of BC at that point as a response of the state towards what they saw as this growing phenomenon in the BC movement of a shift back towards the traditions of the '50 s. That is why, even after the banning, they couldn't stop the shift because it was a historical move that was taking place. Hence even within the entire fold we have now the UDF and so on... which I think has been that shift from '76 onwards.

Q: Did you have a position on one of the BC organisations,?an official capacity ?

MM: Yes, I was on the executive of the SA Students Movements which was at high school level as a BC orientated student organisation. I was also a member of The BPC in '75 and the National Youth Organisation which was a youth organisation, also BC.

Q: Do you want to give a perspective on how you saw that change taking place ?

MV: I think, you know, most of our development is more or less along similar lines and I don't want to go on just saying the same old things... I think that, particularly with Cheryl, there is a similar kind of development... Maybe I should just mention a few things. - during the period '76 & '77 I was at Durban Westville University, sort of ethnic university, and during that period I had served on the SASO executive of that time. In '77 when SASO was banned I was active office bearer at the branch level within the organisation. I'd agree with the point that Murphy had made that had SASO not been banned there's absolutely no doubt in my mind that it would have been an affiliate of UDF at this point in time. We must remember that SASO was the primary BC organisation during that period. It was mainly after the banning of SASO that we had begun to move towards a more non-racial position. I think a number of factors had contributed: one, after the banning of the organisations we needed to look more seriously at how we can organise people and ensure that the state cannot destroy our structures as easily as they had in '77 - so the one major weakness that we had recognised was that the BC movement was based amongst the students,



amongst certain sections of the youth and other sort of educated or professional people and that we had very little contact with the masses of our people as such. That our organisations don't actively involve our people - that was the one major criticism we had made of ourselves, as such, and we needed to look at how to overcome that. A second point is that there were two trends within the BC movement; those who believed that the BC movement emerged out of nothing, that it stood on its own, that it was not part of historical developments and rejected, even scorned, the traditional movements of our people and our history. Whereas, the other trend said that we need to see ourselves as part of a struggle which has been going on for many centuries now - we need to see ourselves as part of what was happening in the 1950's, part of the Congress Alliance all of those kinds of things. What we found was that without that kind of historical analysis we would be unable to move ahead and forward correctly because it also meant we would be unable to communicate with our people - the people did not know us, they knew Nelson Mandela, you know.... The community which I come from, the so-called Indian community, people did not know SASO, BPC - they knew the Transvaal Indian Congress, for example. If we were to organise effectively the masses of our people, we needed to understand their own culture of resistance, we needed to understand who the leaders were, what their background was as such and we began a whole process of examination there and it was in that process that we began to understand the importance and the role of the Freedom Charter. Of course, one of the <sup>important</sup> clauses of the Freedom Charter is that SA belongs to all who live in it, that all those who believe in the clauses of the Charter and who fight for national liberation shall fight side by side. This is where, for the first time, we began to realise that we cannot adopt the approach that the struggle is only for blacks, and what we learnt from that tradition is that in the main it is black people - it is coloured, Indian and Africa people who are going to be conducting and waging the struggle, however, there are white individuals and there always were and there are even presently, who are as committed as black revolutionary activists, as such. Through historical analysis we learnt of the role that people like Bram Fischer, Denis Goldberg.. had played in the liberation movement. So that was the other very significant factor that we needed to look at. Thirdly, I think Cheryl explained how we began to look at the whole question of social analysis - it was not good enough, in our youth and in the '76 & '77 period, there was some kind of hatred of white people in a sense because of our experience, because of the fact that we were living in group areas, because we had to attend ethnic schools and just everything was second-rate and those kinds of things.... But that wasn't good enough and the whole ... I mean that apart from national oppression that there was class exploitation that our people were suffering. An important role that apartheid was playing, apart from providing for white supremacy, was that of

allowing for the super-exploitation of our people, allowing for particularly multi-national concerns as the foreign investors to extract maximum profits from our people because apartheid provided no security, no safety for our people...there was no collective bargaining at that time, nothing of that sort, and that that is the whole thing and we needed to understand that. Through that process we began to define the enemy more clearly - it is not just the average white person who walks around the street but was a much more complex issue when one looks at who the enemy is. At the same time, I think one must point out that while there was this movement within black organisations, that within the white sector there was a re-emergence of white democratic people.....you know, throughout the 60's and 70's one had the sort of liberal protest, the sort of ...you know ...the odd white person with somekind of a guilt feeling standing around with a black guy in the street and that kind of stuff. But one had the emergence of truly democratic white people and that was also through their own experience, through the break with SASO, through the effect the 76 uprisings had....those kinds of things, and a contact, an inter-communication between some of these people and ourselves - I think all of that contributed to the non-racial position which some of us hold today.

MM: It is quite important to note, also, the roles that some of them would have played if one goes back and look into the trade union movement as we see it today in the country, and we realise that white activists or white intellectuals have played quite an important role have played quite an important role in the stimulation of trade union activity among black workers in our country. Like NUSAS had that group..what do they call it... ( CC:- Wages Comm. ) ..that is right, I mean from those groupings and from the Durban strikes of '73 right up to '77 and thereafter one would realise that there has been that growing trend amongst them to get involved in much more, in fact essential activities that are related to blacks rather than lapsing into philanthropic activities which liberalism would tend to proliferate in most instances. And we think all that interaction in itself would bring a new realisation in people as to what people, even if they are not black, could do in terms of assisting or could contribute towards enhancing the struggle <sup>of blacks</sup> in SA. So I think that to me was also quite an important development to realise that people other than us could get involved in such acts.

CC: I just want to say something which I think is quite odd.....I think that that <sup>what</sup> Murphy is speaking about where you find whites getting involved in the trade union movement quite a lot has had some kind of funny effects which seem to have effected our struggle today as well. I think that whilst with the BC movement we see a lot of blacks moving and placing a lot of emphasis on the question of race, we find that the whites tend to develop in the other direction with the

with the sole emphasis on class and I think that kind of thinking.. that somewhere along the line we started moving closer towards each other as well, with some of those whites who were involved in the trade union movement and who only saw workers as the important constituency in which to mobilise people for change. We still find that today in a bizarre way, like you find people vociferously clinging to the BC ideology, some of these white intellectuals tend to place all of the emphasis on the question of class...I just thought it was worth mentioning and maybe we can go into it .....

M : This a development which is also in keeping with the level of social development in a particular instance, you know, where you see this re-alignment of forces taking place -- where one would see the development of a conservative or traditionalist element on the one hand and the development also of an extremist, leftist position on the other. All those who might be like myself, we'd be regarded as centrists or, you know, some kind of.... there was some term that was used to describe the UDF by some people in the BC fold recently, or about a year ago, to say that UDF is a pot-pourri. That to me is just a purist argument which is being waged and which is not really in keeping with the present situation and what it demands of those who are involved in the resolution of the apartheid problem - so you find all these tendencies but in the process you'll find that stream that will be an embodiment, in fact, of both aspects which will be, in my view, the correct appraisal and approach because history shows that extremism never really resolves issues of problems, it can only lead to either the prolongation of racism on the one hand, and or you could have extremism on the other which would lead to Pol Puts Kampuchea. So those are some of the elements that one finds, that in any struggle there would tend to be that kind of development.

Q: And how does this.. the mention of this extremism relate to the whites in terms of not going too far with a race or class analysis, understanding that there are components of both ?

MV: What we are saying is that as you had most of the <sup>intellectual</sup> whites involved in initiating trade union activity amongst black workers, you find that developing amongst them because of the specific field which people are involved in, the tendency to regard that as the sole area that needs to be concentrated on to bring about change. You find that those people, because they'll be looking at the BC stalwart as being a nationalist and fanatic grouping that just seeks to destroy whites and that protectionist atmosphere develops amongst them and they see the only solution out as being the concentration on the class struggle - because then it means the class struggle would tend to tone down this racial animosity and it would make them feel better. On the other hand, on the black side of it you would find the development of a strong Africanist or black traditionalist perspective which

would see the involvement of those others as being interference, because we seek to maintain ourselves as pure and see anything else, <sup>Other than black</sup> as being a threat to our unity, then we would tend to coagulate and form one unit and want to protect ourselves from them. But in the process what happens, because we are involved with a dynamic concept or process here, what would happen would be that there would be that gradual interaction and realisation of the fact that neither position is correct, that neither position does not in fact bring us nearer to a solution, and for the resolution of apartheid we need a combination of both. That will in fact be the correct approach and one need not stress the one above the other because if one does you'll tend to be extreme on way or the other, you see.

Q: Can we look at a vision of the future.... we've talked about what the past has been and the evolution.....I'm just interested in how you envision the future of SA. Zimbabwe has promoted reconciliation by letting whites retain their privilege and there has been a lot of discussion about what that really means and if its a good idea. How do you envision the reconciliation in SA in the future? Do you think there'll be accommodation even to white privilege necessary to maintain production - that whole argument that Samora Machel made to Robert Mugabe in 1981 by saying, you know, don't let the whites run away, even though we lost a lot of reactionaries we didn't need it to really destroy the economy overnight and no economy that's trying to build socialism, or whatever it's trying to do, can really afford that .....Anyway I've raised a lot of questions, but I'm interested in looking at that future vision. Is that talked about... do people talk about it, or are they too busy....struggling?

M: I think the question of the <sup>future</sup> vision of SA is ... I mean what we would tend to refrain from doing is to engage ourselves in predictions about the future. But what we do believe is that we prepare the future in the present and that is one of the big, in fact, arguments why we believe that the non-racial approach to our struggle is quite important. What we see is the destruction of the SA nation here by apartheid policies, and what we believe is that for the building of a new SA, a new South Africanism that does not have to wait for liberation whenever that will come, but that has to be a process that has to be begun whilst we are engaged in struggle. The fact that we have white comrades who fight side by side with us and that builds and develops among us that commonness that we hope to see in a future SA. As to whether at the end of it we will have reconciliation or whatever, I think that will be determined by the course that our struggle will take. But not that we should leave everything to chance, it is important that we make a conscious effort on our part to ensure that we do not end with a disaster as and when the people govern in this country - and when we talk of the people, the people who have found themselves in the process of struggle as being the people of SA, and I think that there are

many of our organisations as such will be talking of black and white, and of the important part of privilege here. As we know presently whites in SA are withdrawing into their shells precisely because they see, they have a fear of losing whatever privilege they have - and no doubt about it, I mean, whatever an objective observer of the SA situation would say there is no way an equitable system or society can come out of SA without a relinquishing of some of these privileges which most of the whites have, privileges which in any case nobody could claim they have a legitimate right to be having. We think that it's a question of soft-peddalling or taking a hard position on that one, because for us to be able ..... because what the struggle does is raise expectations of people, as one has perhaps with the Zimbabwean experience - perhaps people are looking forward to a bright new Zimbabwe at the end with an equitable distribution of whatever resources there are and so on. But there still is that shell which is white privilege and still needs to be broken. Now, the question is how to destroy that, how does one do that without necessarily reverting or plunging the country into...or having us been seen as being repressive, as being insensitive or inconsiderate of people's views and feelings, you know, or taking things away from people who should be having what they will say belongs to them. But here I think the overall consideration of the majority of our people will have to take account at this point, I mean for whatever changes has to come, they have to take account that for us to bring a new social system about in SA that can't be done unless in fact we actually have to tamper with those privileges which they have - that is why when one looks at the Freedom Charter on the clause that has to do with economy, it talks of the nationalisation of monopoly industries. That in itself we think it is something which addresses itself both to the question of imperial domination of foreign capital in the country and also to the fact that we need to develop our own national economy, I mean, that would not be dependent on foreign economies, and which would also be able to sustain itself with its own initiative. So I think that taking that into account it would be an effort towards streamlining our production relations up to a point where we would be able to distribute equitably the resources that are there. But as to the precise mechanisms of that, it would be very difficult to tell at this point - but one could more or less tell from the way we are engaged in struggle what we seek to do; we seek to develop a South Africanism that would at the point of take-over not give us problems of having to consider people on the basis of colour, and we have to begin building that now in struggle.

CC: I think that what Murphy has said is quite important about the question where we don't see ourselves organising up to the one point where we have liberation and then we start the period of reconstruction. I think that what is also useful to quote is something from the UDF declaration, which is the basis on which

organisations came into the Front.-It says, " We the freedom-loving people of SA say with one voice to the whole world that we cherish the vision of a united democratic SA based on the will of the people. We will strive for unity of all people through united action against the evils of apartheid.....etc ..and in our march to a free and just SA we are guided by these noble ideals, we stand for the creation of a true democracy in which all South Africans will participate in the government of our country, stand for a single, non-racial, unfragmented SA, a SA free of bantustans and Group Areas. We say that all forms of oppression and exploitation must end." Those things are quite important, particularly if we say we are now busy building a new SA, and I think all those questions with regard to white securities and white privileges and the fact that they would have to come to terms with a few home truths is particularly important - because that is why at this point we feel it is important to mobilise whites, to get them to understand what the causes of oppression are in this country, to get them committed to democratic principles. The only way we're going to do it is similarly with the blacks - there're also blacks in this country who have certain privileges, the whole tri-cameral system poses a bit of a problem for those who believe that all blacks by virtue of the colour of their skin qualify as democrats or they have the monopoly of the struggle for democracy in SA. We cannot deny that there are a lot of black people in SA who have as many privileges as some whites would have - they can send their children to private schools, they can send their children overseas for education, they have businesses, they exploit people who work in their houses or businesses which they own - and I think the question of ensuring that people see that it is in their interests to participate in extra-parliamentary politics would be the same for whites as it is for blacks who share a similar class position as whites in SA. The question of whether after change we would allow for certain privileges - we say no. We are speaking about a democratic SA, we are speaking about exploitation and exploitation must end as Murphy said, the benefits that accrue to the white population in SA is because of the super-exploitation of the majority of people inside this country. In this process, as Murphy vividly outlined, they would have to forfeit, that they would to understand that they would have to forfeit those things - those things can only come about if at this point we win a substantial number of whites over into our struggle to understand the principles of democracy, the principles of egalitarianism and those kinds of things..

Q: OK, there are a couple of points I'd like to raise questions on...I don't even know if this is worth commenting on... but I just want to ask it. The idea that when the offer to Mandela and to all people inside prisons went out and the fact that some whites took it and none of the important black leaders did. Was that anything that people discussed and said .. these whites.....

CC: I think that in this case you're referring specifically to Denis Goldberg, Yes it has been discussed... I think that our feelings were that there were certain subjective conditions which..and we have to say they were personal weaknesses - the position taken up by somebody like Denis Goldberg, obviously we feel its politically incorrect. We also feel its quite tragic and it must have been quite difficult for someone like Denis Goldberg, and we feel particularly sad about that because we feel that he certainly must be feeling very bad about it - just some of the conditions that people have outlined...; firstly, someone like Denis has never had the kind of benefit that people like Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu have on the Island where they have a kind of strength - we must remember that Denis Goldberg was at that point the only person serving a life sentence in Pretoria Central. Then there are certain personal factors...like his family life was...and the kind of support system from that family set-up was very different to someone like Nelson Mandela with a wife like Winnie and his children and those kinds of things. We are also quite impressed by the fact that Denis never tried to justify on political grounds the reasons why he went out. He in fact stated that the position held by Nelson Mandela and those others are the correct ones, politically it is correct, there is no way one can in fact justify taking up an offer like that. But he explained that it was because of the human factor involved, and I think that we cannot be callous, we are involved in a struggle which essentially involves people and as long as people don't attempt to justify politically <sup>moves</sup> which politically are incorrect. I think that we still have respect for Denis - we feel sad that he has been forced by personal subjective factors to take a stand like that because we feel that he will have to live with it for the rest of his life. But if he needed that kind of personal space to in fact reconstruct his own personal life without trying to make political mileage or justification and thereby annihilating the stand taken by Nelson Mandela - all we can say is that we are sad but we are still proud. We cannot discount the fact that for us to pronounce on this and to condemn it in somebody who spent 22 years in jail, who has made quite a lot of sacrifices against all odds being a white South African, we feel that nobody in this country and certainly not on the basis of the colour of his skin has the right to condemn a person who has sacrificed so much already.

Q: But do you hear comments from the black community... did it <sup>be</sup> come an issue where you'd hear people say... how <sup>can</sup> you talk about non-racialism... look at this. I mean she's made a very good explanation but is.....

MM: To tell the truth it never made a very big impact.... I think because a week or two before that a number of Africans accepted the offer as well - that in itself made it one of those things that happen when people are in prison and it may have been an issue in activist circles where people need to discuss and make an

assessment of what it means. I would say that there is a much greater understanding of the personal circumstances and difficulties that Denis was in...you know, and it hasn't really affected the position of white activists in the Front.

Q: OK, I guess the last thing I'll say on this, although you're terrific - I could go on and on but I won't take up your time, is just to say .. you spoke initially about the history and how important it is for blacks to know that history, to understand non-racialism and that that gap was a problem...I mean, do you think this idea of someone like me trying to find out about this issue is a valid exercise, is important..or would you say..people are being killed in Uitenhage and all over the country and this is a bit of an intellectual digression. I mean do you see this having a validity to look into non-racialism and explore it in a kind of historical, intellectual endeavour.

MM: Well, I personally think its very important, I have read your book "None But Ourselves" which was one of the few books at that time which became available on the Zimbabwean situation and which in itself was quite an interesting expose of the things going on during the war for liberation in Zimbabwe. So if one recognises the power of the pen and literary works on these matters and documentation and recording of some of these important aspects of struggle, and specially because it will help in bringing clarity to a much broader audience than what we could - one could never at any point undermine the importance of such works. Even amongst our own activists we are encouraging people to begin to write and record these experiences - you know, we are dealing with a state that has tried to destroy any kind of history and reference to our past with the hope that they will dominate the scene with media and literature that is more in the interest of apartheid. As long as we think that it'll be an exercise that will serve to broaden people's views and spread and disseminate ideas and opinions - that is finally in our interests as well.

CG: I think its important because as we've said, we are in the process of building a nation in SA, we are in the process of re-defining our history, re-developing a particular approach to our country and the documentation of this can assist people because the Southern African struggle has always had a particular complexion to it - that of colonizer and the colonised, those being exploited and those doing the exploiting, always seen in a black white thing. I think that at this point in time the SA scene has changed considerably, that the Nationalist govt. has lost a lot of support - to the right wing on the one hand which they seem to be able to contend with to some degree, and on the other hand we notice a growing number of people that support the democratic movement in SA - like, for instance, in Cape Town if we have meetings in white areas which are specifically aimed at whites, we found that on one occasion we had 4,000 people at that meeting - not students, the



the ordinary people who would normally have gone to the PFP. For us, we feel that that this is an important development in our country - particularly given the kinds of problems which had been experienced in a country like Zimbabwe on the question of whites and the whole privilege number. For that reason it is important to document that because we feel that there is a growing shift and a growing legitimization of the extra-parliamentary politics - that in fact a lot of whites are beginning to shed some of their fears in terms of the ability of extra-parliamentary politics led largely by the African working class people. That before there was a lot of suspicion about that, but today we find that people are realising that the alternatives offered by that grouping seems to far outweigh those offered by the white Nationalist govt, More and more we see that people are willing to, if not necessarily throw in their weight, at least see or begin to consider the possibility of becoming part of a nation which is largely African and largely working class people as well - so for that reason I would say it is important to do that in terms of recording our history, a true history in our country.

Q: OK, there is a way that this whole conflict has been presented in the press, that there are these 2 organisations seemingly equal in support who have different ideas and they are attacking each other and its led to this terrible violence. Do you agree with the way its been presented in the press.....do you think that is what's going on...or do you have a different analysis ?

MM: Well we totally disagree with the view in the press about the kind of status that is being accorded these 2 organisations - we think that is fairly erroneous. On the basis that when we talk of the UDF we're talking of an alliance of 100's of organisations some of which will be in fact about 2-3 times as big as AZAPO's total membership. So what one has here is a situation where <sup>there are</sup> some conflicts and feuds between AZAPO and one of the affiliates of the UDF, and what has been happening is that the press has interpreted that as a conflict between AZAPO and UDF. One option we had was to stay out of it and leave those affiliates to work it out with AZAPO, but because we realised this whole thing is developing up to a point where not only is it a question of a conflict between that affiliate and AZAPO, but that agents provocateurs and state agents have begun to play a role in this issue, we have found it important that we, as UDF, become involved in trying to bring a solution to this problem. (We feel that agent provocateurs are state agents who get into these things because) after what happened in Uitenhage (the SA govt. has been hardpressed to try and project the conflict in the country as not a conflict between the people and the govt. policy - but as a conflict between blacks and blacks. As P.W. Botha put it in a statemment last Saturday, the conflict in SA is between blacks who believe in revolution and those who believe in the govt's evolutionary method of change, which we think is a

complete mis-representation and we think that the state has an interest in the projection of some imagined conflict between blacks against blacks and we think this is what's been happening.) Otherwise how does one explain a situation where offices of the UDF associated newspaper in Oudtshoorn, out in the Karoo, have been attacked and <sup>petrol</sup> bombed - a town which has not been known for any AZAPO presence whatsoever and there would have been no need <sup>for anybody</sup> to be in conflict with AZAPO in that area but our offices were attacked. Clearly it was meant to have us believe it was AZAPO and at all times us in the UDF have refused to accept that AZAPO are responsible for all these <sup>acts</sup> - but we think that AZAPO are playing into the hands of the govt. because they have been the first to come up to the newspapers to accuse the UDF of being responsible for these things. We have tried to be as mature <sup>as responsible</sup> as possible, not to have our conflict being carried and resolved thro newspapers but to have direct communication with them in the hope that we will be able to solve this problem.

My: Well... what we <sup>believe</sup> in the UDF, is that the projection of this conflict has been so one-sided and we believe that there is some amount of orchestration in this as an effort towards ushering in the demise of the UDF - which can only be in the interests of the state in SA. Hence, for instance, the projection has always been that it is UDF that is attacking AZAPO and the fact that there have over 85 UDF homes attacked in recent times is not being reported on and the fact that we have been burying UDF activists, like Nduza, where a whole family was burned after a petrol bomb attack on their home, and their daughter who was pregnant at the time died and was buried was a COSAS member - one of our affiliates. That has not been given coverage, and though it has not been given coverage we in UDF would not find it in our interests to start making a lot of noise about it and accusing AZAPO of being responsible - because if we did we would in effect be doing what the state wants us to do, we would be doing public relations for the state in its position on the conflict being interpreted as blacks versus blacks. Therefore, we believe that <sup>the projection that</sup> if people have been involved in some skirmish or fight and they have been wearing UDF T-shirts and therefore by inference those people are made members of the UDF, that is incorrect and a dangerous conclusion to arrive at and we reject that kind of approach which says that people wearing UDF T-shirts are UDF members. Equally, people wearing AZAPO T-shirts will refuse to accept that those people are AZAPO members simply on the basis of an eye witness account that people have been seen with AZAPO T-shirts throwing petrol bombs at UDF homes. This has been our position and we have been able to communicate this even to AZAPO itself. WE have even in our records sent an open letter to AZAPO asking them to respond on this development and come forward so that we can have a meeting to try to resolve this problem so we could have a common understanding of what this problem is.. But up to this

moment it seems AZAPO hasn't shown any interest in responding to that - which would bring us closer to a conclusion that they seem to derive pleasure or some benefits from what is happening, and that would be quite tragic if that were so.

Q: Why do you talk about this agent provocateur possibility .... is there any evidence that there are people who are thugs, who are paid to do this ?

MM: We have this from our previous experience in the Vaal Triangle last year, when one of the affiliates in the Vaal - the COSAS - had a problem to try and clear up its reputation which has become somewhat tarnished when clearly elements who could not have been students had been engaged in activities which in the eyes of press would have been seeing COSAS teachers and others doing a destructive act - they would have seen it as a COSAS member or a COSAS person getting involved in intimidation, if it was intimidation. This, to us, is unacceptable and it is on the basis of that experience that we know that... I mean... acquiring a UDF T-shirt or a COSAS T-shirt is not an impossible thing, even acquiring an AZAPO T-shirt anybody could do that because we sell them and we don't want credentials from people who buy them.... it is clearly an indication these kind of insignia of organisations could be abused is much more great. If we were dealing with a state which is not even ashamed to concede that the campaign against Boesak, the allegations against Boesak were in fact orchestrated by the hope of getting rid of him as an opponent of apartheid. <sup>the security police in</sup> It is therefore clear that we are dealing with a govt, which has seen fit that they would have what has become known in newspapers as a 'dirty tricks' dept. - this is what we attribute this to finally.

910

Q: OK, I think that's very well done...I just want to ask..the big thing in the paper yesterday about the white woman being attacked....this is possibly might be something played up in the press..and I'm sure in certain white communities there's, you know,....'swart gevaar' looms again. Could you give any comment, any analysis on that?

MM: Well, I don't think we would like to give any separate thing on this... separate from what has been happening in the townships. This is separate to what happened in the Vaal last year and a white baby died and there was so much noise about it <sup>in the newspapers</sup> as if it is the one biggest death that has happened in SA. Our feeling about it is that we are saying that this kind of death and destruction will continue for as long as the govt. continues with the kind of policies it is pursuing and refuses to address itself to the concrete problems people are having.

CC: I think that the death or injury of any person, be they black or white, is

equally important to us. We certainly don't enjoy the situation where more and more people are being killed, but as Murphy has said, we have warned this govt. that this is what would happen - we'd sent an open letter to the P.M. before the constitution was even accepted or became law - where we predicted that this kind of conflict was going to continue. Every single day the SADF are killing people in the townships who happen to be black, similarly people's cars get stoned because of what happens to people <sup>in the township situations,</sup> because of the forcing of community councils onto people and we feel that it should get equal importance with the number of black people who do get killed inside the country. Whether they are black or white, our sentiments are exactly the same - the loss of life saddens us. We want to make an earnest appeal again to the govt. to stop foisting this constitution on us, because as long as that continues this kind of situation is going to happen.

Q: Just to finish up I feel I have to ask something about the dis-investment thing because there's so much happening overseas but there isn't continuous comments from people inside the country. How do you respond to these reports, these alleged surveys that say blacks don't want disinvestment because then its going to hurt the economy and blacks will suffer and there are surveys too that show blacks saying no we want our jobs, we don't want disinvestmant?

MM: Well, our position on that one has been that we think there's been some introduction of a moralistic argument around the question of disinvestment, and it's amazing, or amusing at best, to us to realise that after such a long time some of these people are becoming moralists now whereas we've had hundreds of years of foreign investment in SA. What one needs to see is to how less suffering has been experienced by blacks during that period, but what we do know is that over 20 million people have been forcefully removed from their homes, from their settlements with foreign investments in SA. We do know that the bantustan system has been strengthened during that period of foreign investment in SA and they have not been able to do anything about it. What we do know is that the super-profits that they have and their disire to stay on in SA is born out of the fact that SA provides a very cheap source of labour for them to be able to carry on thier enterprises - and we do know that, for all their talk of black suffereing, if Zimbabwe tomorrow could present itself as a good area for investment they would in no time move out of SA and forget about the fact that blacks will suffer because then they will have a profit margin 10 X more than in SA. So we are not prepared to buy that story and we think that such surveys are conducted with a view to getting the desired answers.

CC: Also, one should remember why there seems to be such a silence on the question of disinvestment from inside SA is because it is illegal for anybody to call

for disinvestment in terms of the security laws inside this country and that has effectively silenced people from taking a position on this. Just to elaborate on something which Murphy has said - the extent to which these multi-nationals collaborate with the most opprressive part of SA, like the bantustans system, the Ciskei has now been declared a tax haven and we find that a number of these people quickly rushed off to the Ciskei. They also function according to the free market system - when you have people locked into the Ciskei who have no access to any other industries to bargain for their labour you find that, it is possible there, according to the free market system, to in fact pay people a pittance because people have no access to any other place to go and sell their labour. So in fact this is just to re-inforce how these people collaborate with bantustan govts.

Q: I'd just like to ask one more question, and that (tape blanks out here)

CC: Ja, I think that in terms of state strategy its very obvious that they have to, in a very marked way, change its old kragdadigheid strategies. On the one hand we see they're tampering with the influx control and pass laws - but for us its very simple- the pass laws inside SA are unreformable, the simple fact of the matter is that the pass laws must go and the bantustan system must go. So no amount of tampering around with the right of Africans to be in white areas and black areas is going to change that situation. We feel that whites and blacks in SA should be able to move around freely in the country of their birth and a few changes here and there for a small section of people really is not going to alter the anger of the people in the country - its not going to resolve the conflict. Secondly, one sees at a far more sophisticated level .... ja, it's maybe a sophistication of a fairly old strategy of divide and rule, which is illustrated by ,for eg., the AZAPO conflict. We've seen how in other circumstance they've tried to play the UDF up against other groupings on other areas and we think that kind of thing is going to increase and gain prominence in SA politics where they try to substantially undermine the role of a movement like UDF which undoubtedly has the support of the majority of the people in SA, as has been witnessed through our campaigns. We will see that certain marginal groups will be played up at the expence of the UDF, the focus they will try to shift far more in terms of black people fighting black people - playing right into the old sort of myths around Africa and change in Africa and majority rule in Africa, and we feel as the Front we'll have to be mindful of that -we've seen what the SA govt. has done in places like Mozambique with the MNR , we've seen in Angola with UNITA - and one has to accede that as our struggle intensifies, and as our people's march towards freedom becomes more and more of a reality, the govt. is going to try and resort to those kinds of things to try and divide our people as much as possible because that is the only way they have been surviving for the past 300

years.

Q: Can you make a statement on how you see the future in terms of how the govt's going to try and control the increasing level of resistance ?

MM: Well..I think Cheryl has just said it all, but on the other hand the govt. will not only concentrate on the division of internal forces and resistance. I think what the govt. is developing is a tendency to try even to divide international opinion on SA because of the important role that kind of opinion comes on the resolution of apartheid in SA. As we can see in the present play -up the South Africans are giving to this kind of black and black confrontation which they've been trying to project to try and shift people's attention from the real issue, and people to begin to see the problem of SA as being a problem of civilization against backwardness in Africa in which they would be holding themselves as a bastion of western civilization, and on that basis try and make an appeal that they should be given support - ~~that~~ is one thing they'll be doing at the international level to try and maintain themselves. On the other, the divisions they may try and promote amongst opposition groups inside the country - what we see is that there is an attempt by them to in fact broaden their base, you see, as it is being seen by their attempts they are trying to make to suggest that they are moving away from apartheid by their adjustments to the immorality act and to this movement of black persons - which bill or which law would provide that Africans could have movement from one urban area to another. That is those African s whom they consider as urban Africans and any other Africans outside those urban areas would not be considered a SA citizen - and they'll be doing that now with an attempt to further strengthen the divisions between urban and rural blacks, and whilst they'll be maintaing their bantustan system they'll be trying to develop a crop of blacks that would want to see themselves as different from the blacks in rural areas. That, in fact, we think is an exercise in futility because given the rise in resisance and our own determination to oranise and mobilise people against this govt. attempt - I think what we are seeing is a situation where they will increasingly be growing dissension and in fact, a struggle against this govts. attempts and we refuse to be hoodwinked into believing that changes are taking place. It may work with maybe with people outside SA, but <sup>not</sup> for blacks in SA who, even if they have section 10 rights, still have to contend with racism in its crudest form ~~and~~ I think we are headed for what in fact I see as a long struggle ahead of us and I think it will still continue. As for reforms themselves, from our opposition we have been able to show them up for what they are and to show that nothing has changed in SA and nothing will change until a govt. of the people takes over.

Q: Wouldn't you stand to benefit from those ? Do you have section 10 rights ?

MM: Myself, because I was born i n Soweto and grew up there....I have section 10

rights. But I'm in fact not considered a South African - if one checks my identity I'm registered as a Tswana. So if the govt, wanted they could in fact tomorrow just throw me out and send me to Bophutatswana because I'm Tswana speaking and by virtue of that fact, in terms of the homelands consolidation act or whatever, by virtue of the fact that one would have that kind of connection with a bantustan that is sufficient reason to make one a citizen of a bantustan. But because I was born in Johannesburg I have what they call a privelege to be in the white area. So it is those things precisely we are fighting about, that even these changes to the movements of blacks, it has to do with what they term privelege to move from one area to another - we are talking about the rights of people now, we don't want priveleges, we think its our right to stay where we have to stay.

Q: That's it ...I just want to really quickly ask you this because I know.....then I'll pack up and ask you a couple of questions off the record. Would you just say something about the women's issue - do you think white and black women have anything more in common than their differences.?Do you think that there's anything that unites in terms of the women's issues across race...or is that issue not a relevant one ?

CC: I think there certainly is a lot of reasons why women in <sup>South</sup> Africa should be organising as women. As in most countries we have an unequal economic system - you find that women play a particularly important role in upholding that society. Maybe one particular eg. applicable to white women on SA - if you look at the whole militarisation question, you look at the army and the campaign against conscription and one just realises that women are socialised to form an important part of that infrastructure which sort of keeps the boys at the border and going to the border, the whole sort of war mentality. The question of women being at home looking after the children, being faithful, knitting socks for Boetie on the boreder - and that in fact is an important part in terms of keeping the whole war psychology going - and we know how SA depends on the army , the extent to which the army fits into the whole SA scene , the extent to which SA depends on militarisation as a minority regime. So back to the question of women being part of.....we know that in unequal economic systems people are exploited on the basis of race, very similarly people are exploited on the basis of sex for eg. To look at the whole bantustan system again - how that exploits the whole question of sex. The fact that women are reared in a way that makes them think that their place is at home is important because it means that the women are locked into the bantustans. They are the first people who are forcibly removed from so-called squatter camps because they are not considered to be economically ..or as labour units they are not considered to be viable. It means that they are sent to the

to look after their children  
 to the bantustans, who will in turn go to the mines once their fathers die. They will in fact keep the very simple economy of the bantustan going, and in fact see some justification in that role of staying at home with the children while the husband goes out to work. We look at the questions of how women get paid far less than men, and not in a sort of bourgeois feminist way, but one can actually see how they can get exactly the same kind of labour for half the price going. In that kind of way they exploit people, they use the fact that you are a woman in much the same way they would use the fact that you are black not white to underpay you. We feel that women, on that kind of basis, their particular role in SA and the kind of psychology created around upholding an unequal system, that women across colour bars have a lot in common to organise in seeking for a just SA - and there's no way that there can be change in a country if half the population is not part of forming that change and in fact benefit from that change, and women in SA form 51 % of the population.

Q: And just with the whole non-racial aspect ....do you white women have a particular role to play? I mean do you think you can see that feminism issue...or women's rights ever transcending the race?

CC: I think that from my organisation's point of view we see women as a particular sector involved in our fight for national liberation, In the same way that you see students organising themselves around particular issues that effect their education, we would see women organising themselves - but not separately. Because firstly, women's oppression will not come to an end unless there is complete national liberation in the country and we don't see the 2 processes as separate - and for that reason we would see women organising themselves as women as forming part of the national democratic struggle in our country.