

AK2117/J2.3

C24

REPORT BY ANTI-PC DELEGATION - Ben Cax
ON JDF CONFERENCE (Dec. 1985)

- Compiled by
- 1) Prof. I. Mohamed
 - 2) Mr G. Du Plessis
 - 3) Mr S. Jardine
 - 4) Mrs A. Mulligan
 - 5) Marcus Moses
 - 6) Elvis Daniels

A. BUS JOURNEY TO Port Elizabeth

- 1) Discussion on participation in referendum elections
- besides TTC + Anti-PC delegates,
few other delegates had discussed
the issue in their organisations.

hence

- issue of mandate was raised
ie whether delegates could actually
commit their organisations to a
decision at the conference.

+

- point was made that majority
of conference would be APPARENT
MAJORITY not reflecting REAL
MAJORITY OF JDF MEMBERSHIP.

it was noticeable that several comrades had been
persuaded by arguments FOR participation.

2) Discussion on conscription issue

again, very little discussion had occurred on this issue. Some points made included the following:

- (a) cannot go into racist army & going to jail is unproductive so will have to leave country
- (b) (a) will only apply to activists & is not a feasible mass option
- (c) if (a) occurs, organisation inside country will be drained of young activists.
- (d) going to jail may be heroic but it implies being removed from society (& \therefore activity) for several years. Again, it is not necessarily a mass option
- (e) WE MUST ORGANISE MASS RESISTANCE TO CONSCRIPTION.
 - politicised can be appealed to on political basis.
 - mass of young people, even though not politicised, & hence not in a position to reject SADF on political grounds) nevertheless fear concept of war, i.e. being maimed & killed \therefore there is basis from which to organise them. (note: should be careful when exploiting this fear not to move

people away from preparedness to fight & die FOR LIBERATION!

(f) We must start now to plant seeds of defiance because in heat of campaign repression will be heavy

Also!

We must start making our mass organisations less dependent on young activists

(g) one of organisational options is anti-conscription committee ~~based~~ based in church/mosques

B:

FRIDAY 16/12/83

1) Arrived in P.E. at ~ 15h30, rest of day spent finalising accommodation arrangements

2) Great problem was lack of opportunity to meet ~~other~~ comrades from other regions.

3) Some comrades commented on fact that some of us had to sleep in a church hall in a WHITE SUBURB instead of in homes in A TOWNSHIP. some points made were:
— no effort must be spared to

accommodate delegates in township,
even if we have to sleep under
kitchen table. In our case, at
least ~60 families would have
had time to converse with a VDF
activist.

Also!!!

- in this way people in the townships
would get used to sheltering strange
"revolutionaries".

4) Discussions on referendums continued late into
the night.

afternoon session DISCUSSION ON "i" + "c" REFERENDUM

(Note: Frank Chikona's letter never read at conference)

When procedure was announced, we realised that we would not have an opportunity to express our viewpoint to the whole conference, only in the discussion groups. This was a problem since, as mentioned previously, numerous delegates had not discussed the issue. When our documents were confiscated (the document reflecting a total Anti-PC viewpoint) it was a ~~severe~~ blow to our cause.

The afternoon started with a regional caucus. In transvaal delegation; Amos Masondo was elected to present the report. This excluded any arguments for or against participation. The ~~wording~~^{wording} of the report was approved by delegation.

This discussion ended in a division about whether it would not have been better to have 2 people presenting the report, one arguing for & the other against participation.

One of the delegates proposed a resolution that all organisations will be bound by the decision of the conference. This resolution was opposed. Unfortunately the

C.

SAT. 17/12/83

morning session

- 1) presidential report
- 2) secretarial report etc

group discussions

- UDF as a front ^{rel. betw. 1st level} _{works + UDF + what should they see}
- how to strengthen it
- comm. council elections - how can campaign be carried forward.

- groups too big
- time too short

At this stage, Prof. Mohamed & Elvis had discussions \bar{c} NEC members about Anti-PC document which was found technically problematic. All copies were watermarked.

- 1) problem if press acquired copy because would exaggerate division
- 2) "paper" did not go through proper channels via. via tul dog

Prof. M. explained to NEC origin of document.

After the report it was decided to give each of the divided regions an extra 10 mins to motivate: 5 mins for + 5 mins against

for Tol. Amoz Calhala motivated case for participation, Prof. M. motivated case against.

Problem about TIC & DIC reaction + "non-use" comment about from N. Pahod) Ms board also spoke briefly against participation.

Then NATAL WED UP ANOTHER 10 mins to motivate its case.

the point is that in terms of time, the case for participation enjoyed an overwhelming advantage.

Then we broke for group discussions

- case for participation was well articulated. ^{of large} number of people who motivated their case in very consistent manner

- boycott position was not prepared consistently, many advocates of boycott ~~participation~~ were confronted & argued for participation at WAFS-LEACE

discussion ended in conflict. The resolution was withdrawn, & re-introduced by another TIC delegate. The atmosphere was totally not conducive to discussion. The second motion was allowed to fade.

(Note: int. now to discuss whether organisations affiliation is permanently bound to whichever "UPF" does)

Eric motion presented his paper then we convened for the large open session, ^{not a delegation} ~~all~~ reported 100% agreement about participation, & proceeded for their allotted 10 mins. to motivate for participation.

Cape N. ^{Cape} ~~all~~ reported majority support for participation.

Border region reported 100% rejection of participation.

W. Cape was divided \approx a ratio of 4 organisations ^{against} participation vs ~~against~~ 3 for participation.

DB was 100% for participation.

E. Cape was divided.

T.V.I. was divided.

from govt. discussions, following options

- 1) Boycott
- 2) participate
- 3) flexibility of tactics for diff. organisations

also: that discussion had reached level of conflict & we should concentrate on keeping UDF intact.

After report back, straw vote was taken:
FOR PARTICIPATION

transvaal	13	AGAINST
E. Cape	6	1 Castele
OB		
W. Cape	35	37 Caste
border region		
N. Cape		
Natal		

overall result: 55 45

because of close vote, commission was created.
recommended 1) that issue be taken back to regions for discussion, decisions then communicated to NEC which will make final decision.

- 2) diff. regions/organisations be allowed flexibility of tactic

MILICA SIGNATURE CAMPAIGN

- Was launched (Jan. → May '84)
- signatures will not be presented to any group/authority YET.

CONSCRIPTION

paper not presented ∴ of time problem

TUR BACK TO JAB

- 1) tension + suspicion betw. delegates of opposing viewpoints
- 2) greater no. of people voicing boycott positions.

Collection Number: AK2117

DELMAS TREASON TRIAL 1985 - 1989

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: **Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand**

Location: **Johannesburg**

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of the collection records and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.