

IKWEZI

£ 1.40p.

A BLACK LIBERATION JOURNAL OF SOUTH AFRICAN
AND SOUTHERN AFRICAN POLITICAL ANALYSIS

NUMBER 16

MARCH 1981



**SUPPORT THE ABORIGINAL
STRUGGLE AGAINST GENOCIDE
IN AUSTRALIA. BOYCOTT THE
BRISBANE COMMONWEALTH
GAMES.**

**PAC Reorganises. Pokela Becomes New
Chairman. APRP Returns to PAC.**

AZAPO Conference Papers.

**ALSO: PAC DOKUMENT ON POLITICAL EDU-
CATION; SIGNIFICANCE OF SHARPEVILLE UPRI-
SING; AZAPO DEBATE OVER RACE & CLASS;
BLACK WORKERS STRUGGLE AND NATIONAL
LIBERATION; ROLE OF THE MISSIONARIES IN
THE CONQUEST OF SOUTH AFRICA; ETC.**

Contents

Support the Aboriginal's Struggle Against Genocide	p. 1
The Relationship Between Black Workers & National Liberation Struggles	p. 2
Unity & Determination of PAC Cadres Bring About Important Changes	p. 3
The AZAPO Debate Over Race and Class	p. 6
Brief Notes	p. 7
PAC Document on Political Education	p. 10
Significance of Sharpeville Uprising By David Dube	p. 15
An Azanian Marxist-Leninist Speaks	p. 19
Papers From the AZAPO Conference	
1. Black Consciousness as a Driving Force	p. 25
2. Black Working Class Struggles	p. 28
3. Education and Liberation	p. 29
4. Why AZAPO Rejects a National Convention	p. 32
Dynamics of Black Thinking	p. 33
Role of the Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa:	
Part II	p. 36
The Aboriginal Struggle for Land Rights	p. 49

AFKI
322.42096
I26
no 19-21

Support IKWEZI

Help IKWEZI Financially

Help with Subscribers and Sustainers \$ 40 A Year

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Yearly Subscriptions: Pound St. 4 Annually. Airmail Pound St. 1.50p plus. Otherwise all overseas subscriptions are sent surface mail. If remitting in foreign currency please add equivalent of 50p to cover bank charges. Bulk purchase discount upto 40%. Monies must be paid by the time of next issue. ADDRESS: 8-11 Victoria Centre, Nottingham, England.

Address in Sweden: IKWEZI, Box 5398, 10245 Stockholm, SWEDEN. Bankgiro 164 7536; Bank Account 5222 - 20 088 40. Postgiro 69 16 94 - 4 Skandinaviska Ebskilda Banken.

Support the Aboriginal Struggle Against Genocide. Boycott the Brisbane Olympic Games.

This issue goes out of its way to lay stress on the struggle of the Aborigines of Australia for democratic and national (land) rights in a country they have occupied for 40,000 years. Ever since Captain Cook and his motley gang of thieves and rogues arrived in Botany Bay bringing with them the magnificent gifts of Western civilisation, –and in the true historic traditions of their forbears in the United States, Canada, South America, West Indies, etc. –began to exterminate the indigenous inhabitants in the name of Christ and the Holy Ghost in the most brutal and callous manner, the Aboriginal peoples have been fighting a desperate struggle for survival against GENOCIDE. The odds against them have been heavy since our palefaced Bible rooting Christian civilisers took them for rabbits and shot them like rabbits, i.e. when they were not poisoning their wells, supplying them with smallpox infected blankets and resorting to other means of death and destruction that the colonising Christian imagination is so capable of in its feverish desire to civilise the ungodly heathen. While they were completely exterminated in Tasmania they survived on the mainland, a testament to their courage and determination to fight back.

Today their little known struggle goes on unabated. Their plight in "lucky" Australia is worse than ever, as described on page 49.

As a minority reduced by mass murder and conscious acts of genocide to a mere 200,000 amidst a population of fifteen million white Australians, international support is crucially important to their struggle. Nothing could embarrass the thick hides of the Australian government more.

The Third World –and Africa can give a lead –needs to give particular material solidarity to the Aboriginal cause. It will help to focus on their plight and contribute immensely to their struggle for democracy and national rights. A boycott of the Commonwealth Games to be held in Brisbane, Queensland, in 1982 is one way of ensuring this.

The Aborigines constitute a separate nation with a distinct culture, history, customs, tradition, language and they have the right to territorial sovereignty. Their struggle for land rights is threatened by imperialist combines (the so-called multi-nationals) from the West and Japan, acting in collaboration with the Australian federal governments, principally the neo-fascist Queensland Government of Bjelke-Petersen.

These imperialist combines attempt to drive them from their sacred grounds they have occupied for thousands of years. The imperialist combines are in a mad search for mineral resources in which the Aboriginal land is rich.

We live in a world full of causes relating to economic, social, political oppression. But none deserve it more than the Aboriginal peoples who literally face genocide. An indication of these genocidal policies, now assuming a sophisticated form, is the recently public awareness that Aboriginal women are secretly sterilised during operations or when they enter hospital to deliver their first babies –first brought to light by the white body, Community Aid and ignored when Black leaders like Garey Foley or Shorty O'Neill clamoured about it.

The Aborigines ask us not for our patronising sympathy. They have been fighting valiantly and heroically against formidable forces as the recent Noonkanbah land rights struggle testify. We can help by bringing their struggle into international focus and embarrass the Australian Government. This is what a boycott of the Brisbane Commonwealth Games will achieve. The Black nations of the world have a duty to stand up for their nationals in the Western countries where they are subjected to racial discrimination. When the arrest and fate as so much of a single American or British brings howls of protest from the government of these countries (as the recent hostage question in Iran revealed) while these Western governments have been plundering the Third World for centuries and treat their nationals in their own countries with contempt the Black nations must make it clear that they expect their nationals to be treated equally. Oppression of Black peoples by whites is a principal aspect of the national question all over the world. It is a product of the history of the imperialist West. The Aborigines are part of the Third World.

Other solidarity movements can help by forming boycott committees and propagandising for the boycott in various ways.

(For further information contact North Queensland Land Council, Box 1429, Cairns, Queensland, Australia).

**SUPPORT THE ABORIGINAL STRUGGLE
FOR DEMOCRATIC AND NATIONAL
(LAND) RIGHTS!
BOYCOTT THE BRISBANE COMMON-
WEALTH GAMES 1982!
FORM BOYCOTT COMMITTEES!**

The Relationship Between The Black Workers Struggle And The National Liberation Struggle

The current upsurge of the workers struggle is creating a great deal of confusion amongst Azanian revolutionaries and leading to all kinds of ultra leftist notions about socialism. Statements from various organisations run to the conclusion that because of the workers struggles the situation is ripe for socialism, and that the current struggle must be led by the workers being in the vanguard. Azanian petit bourgeois Marxism has always led to ultra left forms of thinking very often taking the form of some kind of Trotskyite notion that the struggle is an immediate one for socialism because we have a relatively high number of workers.

These erroneous views must be corrected. It is very important to note that the present phase of our struggle is for self-determination and national independence against colonialism and imperialism. This is a national struggle and its contents is expressed through the demands of the national democratic revolution. The national aspect of the struggle relates to the struggle of the indigenous inhabitants of the country, the Africans, regaining their country against white settler foreign colonial domination. This aspect of the struggle can also be described as a struggle for self-determination by the African peoples. In this struggle the Africans are joined fully by the so-called "Coloureds" and the Indian peoples who are also deprived of any political rights and whose future lay in the building of the future Azanian nation. The national struggle unites all the African and Black peoples in the country against settler colonialism and imperialism who wish to maintain the system of white colonial domination. This is a political struggle. This struggle for national rights combines with the day to day struggle for democratic rights which is denied to Black peoples in every sphere of human activity. The current struggle of the students for the abolishment of the Bantu Education Act which aims to give the Black student an inferior form of education, and the struggle of the Black workers for trade union rights and for better wages are all struggles for democratic rights. Neither aspects of these struggles can advance beyond the winning of certain reformist concessions because of the fascist nature of the colonial regime. The colonial bourgeois state cannot give equality to the Black peoples and workers because these demands are revolutionary and make deep inroads into the privileges enjoyed by the white colonial

bourgeois and the white people as a whole who can be regarded as a vast army of labour aristocracy or even as a privileged petit bourgeois class. Black workers can only be given equal wages as white workers if the wages of the white workers themselves are depressed. This is the white workers and white peoples will never allow and they will make sure that a government is instituted in the country which will ensure that this will never take place. The contradiction between the colonial bourgeois and the white people is based precisely on this question. So elementary democratic rights are in themselves revolutionary demands in the Azanian situation. Therefore the aims and objectives of the national democratic revolution can only be achieved through revolutionary armed struggle.

These twin objectives, the national struggle and the democratic struggles can be led with the greatest success through the instrumentality of a national movement that unites all the various classes and strata of Black peoples around it. In the Azanian situation this is the Pan Africanist Congress, forming an alliance with all the other tendencies of the Black nationalist tendency, especially the Black Consciousness Movement.

But the national struggle must also be guided by revolutionary theory. Only the proletariat in our modern world has a revolutionary theory. Only the proletariat is the revolutionary class in society. Only the proletariat has the highest interests in the revolutionary transformation of society. Many Azanian revolutionaries are confused over the whole question of nationalism and the race problem. By concentrating on the struggle against white racialism they fail to see the essence of the national struggle of which the struggle against white racialism is an aspect. The main aspect of the national struggle is the end of white settler colonialist domination, the restitution of the country and the land to the indigenous peoples, the African peoples, and the building of a new Azanian nation. The only solution to this is the overthrow of the white colonial state. This is in itself a revolutionary demand. That is why the so-called "Freedom Charter" by denying the colonial essence of the Azanian situation paves the way for incorporation into the colonial state of the Black majority and the maintenance of white colonial rule.

The current workers struggle is an aspect of the struggle for democratic rights in the econo-

mic field. It cannot be regarded as the main struggle. The main struggle is the main aspect of the national struggle which we have described above and the democratic demands over a whole number of demands relating to economic, social, political, cultural rights. These are set out in a Political Programme describing the contents of the national democratic revolution and which guides the actions of the national movement.

Because Black workers are in upsurge in Azania we should not rush to the conclusion that their struggles are the most important aspect of the revolution and that the struggle is ripe for socialism. Of course working class leadership is necessary. But the working class is not the only class that is oppressed in Azanian society. The entire Black peoples in Azanian society, with the exception of a few collaborationist elements are oppressed. The working class, because it is the most revolutionary class in society must know how to organise the rest of the Black masses, and especially the peasantry and the petit bourgeois behind it and build the mighty force of a united Black peoples that can overthrow the colonial state and pave the way for the transition to socialism. It must know how to lead the national struggle and the national democratic revolution. This is a political question. It is a question of the political leadership of the nation-

nal democratic revolution by the working class through its vanguard Marxist-Leninist Party. The national movement fights on various fronts involving democratic rights of which workers rights are an aspect. But these workers struggles are important because it awakens them to their historic mission in leading the political struggle of the Black peoples for national and social emancipation.

It is wrong to get excited about the workers struggle and to confuse this as automatically leading to the struggle for socialism or speak and act as if the workers are the only element in the struggle and others are unimportant. The main issue is to lead the national democratic revolution based on specific demands and encompassing a programme that involves a number of issues and which mobilises the entire Black peoples under the leadership of the working class through its Marxist-Leninist Party. It is only through its Marxist-Leninist Party that the working class from being a class in itself becomes a class for itself and utilises its revolutionary ideology, Marxism-Leninism for the liberation of society, because the working class cannot liberate itself without liberating the whole of society.

Petit bourgeois Azanian Marxism must become clear on this question and not run into all kinds of ultra leftist positions.

Unity and Determination of PAC Cadres bring about Important Changes

Radical and important changes at the last meeting of the Central Committee of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania held in January last shows that the organisation is well on its way towards re-organisation and re-structuring that portends well for its future. Among the major changes was the election of John Pokela as chairman. He is a founder member of the PAC and a close colleague of Sobukwe. He came out of the country to assume this important position.

An event of great significance was the return of the T. M. Ntantala group that formed the APRP after their expulsion from the PAC at the Arusha Conference, to the fold of the PAC. The return of the former APRP members means the recognition of the Arusha Conference for the farce that it was. It is to be hoped that the talents and abilities of these members and particularly its leading elements will be properly deployed.

Another significant decision was the appointment of a six man Committee to attend to the preparations for the next PAC Conference. This will ensure that there will be a properly constituted PAC conference for the first time in the history of the movement in exile which will reflect the genuine interests of the organisation and its rank and file. Three members of the cadre forces are on the Committee. This is also of great importance as for the first time a proper relationship is being established between the leadership and the cadre forces, based on unity, trust and confidence. In one bold stroke the PAC has made qualitative advances.

The PAC cadre forces must be congratulated for these very significant changes. It was their resolute struggle against Leballo and his clique that cleared the way for these changes. Their struggle was mainly responsible for the expulsion of Leballo and his clique which was the major hurdle in the re-organisation of the PAC.

The Struggle Of The Cadre Forces

The PAC cadre forces made a major effort to purge the organisation of opportunism and to set it on a revolutionary path. Their document criticising and analysing long standing malpractices in the organisation is a mature and responsible document outlining what should be done. It was a necessary first shot dealing with the current situation and making practical proposals to correct these malpractices, far removed from generalised rhetoric. The current cadre movement has two strong aspects to it. One it is represented by a strong and powerful base that can be effective given the determination and the unity. And secondly it is a movement that is now rooted in struggle and has scored some significant victories against opportunist elements in the Central Committee. The main problem of the PAC lay with certain opportunist elements within the Central Committee and the cadre shafts were directed mainly against these elements in an effort to get a PAC leadership that is not only accountable to the rank and file but is also worthy of the name revolutionary in terms of prosecuting the struggle on the highest levels. This cadre movements has its roots in the influx of youth into the organisation following the Soweto uprising. They challenged and galvanised the old leadership, and while a section of it was temporarily deceived by Leballo's rhetoric, another section pursued the struggle on a much more mature level. They were able to learn from the mistakes of their colleagues and it was mainly through their instrumentality that Leballo was removed from the leadership of the PAC and finally expelled from the PAC. The old leadership in fact was quite amenable to the idea of Leballo returning to resume his duties after a six months "holiday" lapse. Since then the cadres have not only drawn up the document mentioned above severely criticising the Central Committee but they also insisted on the removal of D. D. D. Mantshonsho and Elias Ntloedibe from the Central Committee. Their aim is nothing more than principled unity in the organisation but also its total re-organisation and prevention of the kind of malpractices that took place in the past. With this objective in mind they are aiming to have the kind of Conference sometime this year which will result in a completely re-vitalised PAC. The seriousness and determination of the cadre movement means that the PAC is now well on its way to becoming the vanguard national liberation movement which is its historic mission. There is nothing that can stop their drive to overcome the opportunism within the PAC. The opportunist

elements are quite afraid of them and all their attempts to divide them have failed miserably. The long struggle to overcome opportunism in the PAC is now drawing to a close as the opportunists stand exposed. The PAC has had a chequered history ever since its exile days in the struggle against opportunism and a much deeper analysis is needed than that which emanates from the cadres. This is a task that will have to be undertaken if we are to avoid these mistakes occurring again. This movement was bound to occur in any case as the struggle back home intensifies and the opportunists are not able to meet the demands of the struggle. The cadre movement are not led by opportunist self seekers themselves. The movement is sincerely concerned in seeing the PAC led by a responsible leadership so that it can also move ahead with its tasks at this crucial stage of the struggle. It is only natural that they are bound to make mistakes taking into account their youthfulness. But thus far they have shown considerable political skill and maturity. They certainly have shown that they are not to be messed around. The courage and determination of the cadre forces has now paved the way for all those sincere and genuine elements in the PAC to return to the organisation and participate in its re-organisation as a necessary first step in the exile movement playing its due role with regard to the external struggle.

Destructive Legacy Of Leballoism: Organised Disorganisation

This is not to say that all the problems of the PAC are solved. The destructive legacy of Leballo and Leballoism will take some time overcoming. We must now move full steam ahead with the total reorganisation of the PAC based on ideological and political unity.

What are some of the major characteristics of Leballoism that afflicted the PAC for 20 years and almost destroyed it.

Pre-eminently it was organised disorganisation and an anarchistic style of work. The greater the chaos and disarray the happier were the Leballoists which suited them very well. Under the cover of revolutionary rhetoric this ad hoc style of work maintained them in power. It also protected their particular clichism where people were promoted on to the Central Committee because they were good lackeys. It is to be hoped that in the future Central Committee members will be selected solely on the basis of their political integrity and ability and with the sanction of the majority of the members of the PAC. Appointments must not be made on the basis of one man's recommendation. This disorganised

disorganisation that made ineffective the finest resolutions taken by the Central Committee was also the consequence of the lack of a correct political programme defining the nature of the struggle and based on correct tactics and strategy. It is to be hoped that this will be updated to meet the exigencies of the struggle.

Struggle Between Left And Right

The drawing up a PAC Political Programme also poses some key problems as the history of the PAC-in-exile shows that there has always been a two-line struggle between Left and Right in the organisation with the Right invariably winning out, mainly because the Left always lacked an effective strategy and policies which in any case can be the only guarantee of their success in any situation. The history of the PAC is the history of most nationalist organisations in the Third World. At the outset most national liberation organisations start off from a nationalist position. But experience and political development soon moves them towards radical left positions. This has also been the experience of the PAC. The struggle between Left and Right inside the PAC took place over the "New Road to Revolution", a document that defined the Azanian struggle from a rigorous Marxist viewpoint. The Right eventually scored a victory (which has now turned out to be a Pyrrhic victory) over the Left at the Arusha Conference which led to the expulsion of a section of the PAC. The Left's Programme too of attempting to seriously launch armed struggle was sabotaged in Swaziland by Leballo and his supporters in the Central Committee. Thus after first having destroyed the Left's attempt to launch armed struggle the opportunists next accused them of having failed to launch armed struggle and got them expelled from the PAC. The facts of the two line struggle also reveals that the right wing elements have been involved with imperialist forces centring around the question of monies. On the leadership level the PAC has always had a problem with the narrowly nationalistic anti-communist types. It is from this point of view that the Basic Documents need to be updated in terms of giving a more precise definition to the relationship between race (the national struggle) and class. (The Right is more able and apt in occupying key positions in the PAC, and unfortunately also we have the additional problem that left-wing opportunism in the history of the two-line struggle in the PAC has the tendency to mouth revolutionary Marxist slogans while in actual practice taking up right wing positions at crucial moments). (The Left also tends to be dogmatic and sectarian – as is

typical of the entire Azanian petit bourgeois Left – and often handles contradictions incorrectly). But any PAC Programme has not only to take up correct ideological positions but it must also be able to make a correct analysis of the situation and formulate correct tactics and strategy for the political and military struggle.

Democratic Centralism In PAC

The organised disorganisation also prevented the proper functioning of democratic centralism in both its aspects – centralism and democracy. The lack of centralism meant that there was no overall policies guiding the work of the PAC, so that the part was not related to the whole. This encouraged a situation of personal empire building where the prestige of the organisation and its resources were used more to build a particular individual rather than meeting the objective needs of the struggle and revolution. Representatives abroad were particularly guilty of this. In future all work undertaken on behalf of the PAC must be made accountable to the Central Committee and the rank and file members.

The question of democracy within the PAC is in itself a very serious question and one which is not always easy to achieve under the difficult conditions of exile since the organisation is cut off from its mass base. The question is just how are the C.C. members of the movement going to be made accountable to the rank and file. Who comprises the rank and file in exile. And equally important how can the leadership indeed reflect the mass base, so that there is no contradiction and divorce between the leadership and the rank and file as has been all these years and which has been the principal cause of the revolutionary decline of the PAC-in-exile. There are of course a large number of PAC members abroad but many of them have atrophied over the years, many are of dubious political character, and there are no meaningful branches abroad. There is also the significant question of the quality of the leadership. The one significant base from which democracy can be imposed and the quality of the leadership maintained is the cadre base in Dar Es Salaam. Almost invariably the cadre forces are closer to the needs of the struggle and the revolution than the leadership.

Need For New Constitutional Guidances

Related to the kind of Leballoist organised disorganisation is the important issue of constitutional guidances for the work of the PAC in exile, a point which was made by the cadre document. Obviously the old constitution as embodied in the Basic Documents, while befitting the internal conditions, restricts the work of the

exile movement. Without proper constitutional guidances all manner of arbitrary actions can be taken and disruption caused as was the wont of Leballo in his exercise of Clause 14 b.

These are some of the problems to which we feel the PAC must urgently address itself as it begins the process of re-organisation and restructuring involving the entire PAC membership.

The AZAPO Debate over Race and Class

The relationship between race and class has always been a confused issue in Azanian politics. Confusion has been brought on this question mainly because Azanian revolutionaries are understandably concerned with the psychological dimensions of white racist oppression. This affects their day to day thinking. They do not see the essence behind white racialism, and regard it as a moral question emanating from the sick thinking of the white man. Once the white man changes his ways we would then have an ideal non-racial society.

From a Marxist-Leninist point of view we know that racialism is part of bourgeois ideology. Ideology is the sum total of ideas, concepts, values, etc. which regulates the outlook of a society. White racialism is built on the concept that Blacks are inferior, stupid, lazy, dirty, etc. It effectively separates them from any meaningful social contact with Blacks except on a master-servant basis, and makes them insensitive to their sufferings and their needs. It is in fact used as a means of social control.

The Birth Of White Racialism

Why were whites effectively separated from Blacks in this kind of way. How did they come to be separated. In the early years it was related to the fact, that whites came as colonizers and conquerors. They came to enslave and take the land (which was the chief source of wealth and production) away from the indigenous peoples. But when the modern industrial state was set up this colonial heritage was used to serve the purposes of the modern bourgeois state, which came into existence after the discovery of gold and diamonds. British Imperialism having defeated the claims of the Boers to the land and to their particular feudal mode of production which did not suit the needs of the rising colonial bourgeois state began to use the whites against the Blacks. Imperialist superexploitation meant that the Africans had to be kept at the barest survival level of human existence. This superexploitation also enabled the colonial bourgeois and Imperialism to bribe the white workers and people to serve their oppressive

ends. While the colonial bourgeois controlled the state through its representatives in Parliament from the white population came the Civil Servants, administrative personnel, police and Army manpower. Racialism was used as the dividing factor. The whole myth of white racialism was used to serve colonial and imperialist ends. And the whole essential nature of imperialist exploitation and oppression was covered up as racist exploitation. The entire white community became a privileged section under racist laws serving colonial and imperialist exploitation. Thus racial exploitation is another form of class exploitation and it cannot be separated from it. To do so would be to hide the real nature and purposes of white racialism. White racialism then became part of bourgeois ideology and therefore part of the superstructure serving class ends. In other words it continued to serve a system of exploitation based first on colonial deprivation of the indigenous inhabitants of the land and their country to serve the ends of imperialist superexploitation as cheap labour. The new bourgeois industrial state continued the colonial heritage of exploiting the Black peoples. This is how white racialism is sustained in the country.

Of course while white racialism is related to colonial and imperialist exploitation and oppression and is directly linked to it, it must also be remembered that as an ideological accretion of colonialism and imperialism it also has a life of its own and the white man is imprisoned by a racist mentality inasmuch the Black man is often imprisoned by a "colonial mentality". White racialism has become a thing in itself and even if the colonial and imperialist structures were dismantled tomorrow through a revolution white racist attitudes amongst the white peoples would still prevail.

The Role Of White Racialism In Colonial And Imperialist Exploitation

Marxist-Leninists look at the question of white racialism from the point of view of productive relations. The essential point about relation of productions in Azania is that the whites as a whole constitute a privileged class while the

Blacks are viciously oppressed. The relation of production maintains a system where the whites have a vested interest in maintaining the system of economic exploitation. Productive relations are class relations. Hence racial relations between Blacks and whites are essentially class relations. Therefore the national struggle is a form of class struggle because it aims not only to put an end to the vicious racialist laws that deny Blacks their democratic rights but it also aims to put an end to colonial and imperialist exploitation without which white racialism and its racist laws cannot exist. On the other hand it is quite possible — as a section of the Nationalist government is presently attempting — to put an end to the racialist laws while maintaining the essential nature of the colonial and bourgeois state. This is a neo-colonial type situation against which we have to watch out. For this reason we must not fall into the trap of describing our struggle as an anti-apartheid struggle or talk even of a racialist war. The anti-apartheid strategy involves us with problems on the level of the superstructure, the removal of certain laws but it does not guarantee us the revolutionary dismantling of the colonial state, and the end to imperialist oppression. The talk about a race war also serves similar ends.

There is another erroneous concept connected with the misinterpretation of race to class. This is the notion that our struggle is merely one

for land and country. The struggle for land and country can be correctly defined politically as the struggle for self-determination by the indigenous African peoples. This self-determination takes the political form of having the right to set up the kind of government that reflects the wishes of the majority of its peoples which naturally in the conditions of our country means a Black majority government. In this initial form democracy is self-determination exercised in the country. The land question in the concrete conditions of Azania today means the expropriation of the rich white capitalist farmers, and its re-distribution amongst the landless African peasantry. The land question involves the question of the change in the mode of production from a colonial-capitalist one to a socialist one for land distribution amongst the landless peasantry cannot be undertaken under the conditions of capitalism. We must not confuse the change in the mode of production involving land from a colonial/capitalist one with the needs of political democracy. The question of the land is the question of a productive force. Country (which involves the question of political democracy) signifies our national home of which we have been dispossessed, and in which we can only enjoy our freedom and happiness on the basis of our democratic rights as Africans with our own customs, traditions language, etc.

BRIEF NOTES:

John Pokela, new Chairman of PAC; Russian Roulette in Mozambique; Soviet Infiltration of WCR; Whither Isandhlawana; No Support for ANC in S.A.; London BCM in Exile; Reagan, Namibia and El Salvador

JOHN POKELA, NEW CHAIRMAN OF PAC

John Pokela, the new chairman of the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania is 57 years old. He was born in Hershel in the Transkei, and received his higher education at Hilltown College in the Ciskei where he met Robert Sobukwe who was already then a radical politician. They *matriculated together after which they went to Fort Hare University, the only African University in the country at the time. They graduated in 1947 and it was during this period that the Youth League of the African National Congress adopted its militant Programme of Action, which heralded the rise of the Africanists. They taught together as teachers in the Transvaal — during which period they paid the fees of Mokoena, former Central Committee member of*

the PAC, expelled at the Arusha Conference, but now back in the PAC. Sobukwe was later expelled from the school he was employed because of his involvement in the Defiance Campaign in 1952. He later obtained the post of Professor of African languages at Witwatersrand University.

When the PAC was formed on April 6 1959 after many stormy years of struggle in the ANC Youth League Pokela was a leading founder member. He was kidnapped from Lesotho in 1966 by the South African Police and taken to South Africa where he was charged with terrorism and sentenced to spend 12 years on Robben Island. He was released in 1978.

Pokela's chairmanship of the PAC brings great hopes of the revival of the PAC after a stormy period.

RUSSIAN ROULETTE IN MOZAMBIQUE

The recent statement that two Soviet warships have been sent down to Mozambique in terms of the Friendship Treaty signed with the Mozambique government about three years ago shows the new emphasis that the social imperialists are placing on the struggle in Azania. After all the Soviet Union could have sent Mozambique warships under more appropriate conditions. It is a known fact that during the war of liberation waged by FRELIMO Soviet assistance to Mozambique was quite scanty.

The question is why is the Soviet Union making this particular show of force now. One reason would be to show that it is prepared to stand by the ANC and that it has the military muscle to stand up to South Africa, which is generally presented in ANC-CP propaganda as a great force that cannot be easily tampered with.

But more importantly the Soviet hegemonial global designs fit in with its aggression in Afghanistan, a military intervention which is aimed principally at controlling the oil resources and the oil routes that are vital to the West European countries. South Africa is vital in this respect as some of the major oil routes important to the West European countries pass through South Africa. But this attempt to bring South Africa under its control fits in with the kind of intrusions that the Soviet Union is making in Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf. South Africa is a vital country for social-imperialism. It enables her to control also the mineral resources upon which the West European countries are so dependent.

It must now be a known fact that the Soviet Union's form of penetration is to take advantage of local conflicts and national liberation struggles against imperialism in pursuit of its imperialist ambitions. The cause of the struggle against racialism in South Africa is one which the Soviet Union would dearly like to exploit. As an observer said some time ago South Africa is the best advertisement for the cause of Moscow in the Southern African region.

SOVIET INFILTRATION OF WCR

The World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism (PCR) announced its 1980 grants in August last year, and surprise and concern were expressed globally at some important omissions, most notably the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania among others.

This omission led to many questions being raised about the reasons for the PCR decision,

and how such a situation and change of face had eventuated. To those who sought answers it soon became apparent that the blame lay at the feet of one particular individual – Prexy Nesbitt.

Prexy Nesbitt, an Afro-American and former member of the Communist Party –USA, had been recruited to the staff of the PCR early in 1980 as research officer dealing with African movements. ABOSA understands that he had been recommended for the post by the ANC. Certainly Prexy as a member of the CP –USA had close ties and affinity with the South African Communist Party (SACP) which is closely tied to the ANC of South Africa.

Following Nesbitt's appointment to the PCR job this year, he travelled widely in Africa talking to the liberation movements, attending consultations in Nairobi and Amsterdam with liberation leaders and also in July talking to PAC Committee members in Lesotho and Dar Es Salaam.

Yet when the PCR grants were announced, it was stated in Geneva that the PCR were not clear about changes in the PAC, and thus the grant was withheld. After so many meetings and such close contacts with leading PAC personnel, it is hard to understand why such misgivings, if they ever existed, were not cleared up in Prexy's discussion with the PAC.

For the ANC and other Moscow aligned parties, Prexy has done his job well, and his actions complement those of other Soviet factions and acolytes who campaign for the sole recognition of the ANC at the United Nations and Organisation of African Unity, and whose objectives are not justice and representation for the mass of African people in Azania, but hegemony for the Soviet Union in a strategically important area of the world.

–Reprinted from ABOSA Brief No 4 (a paper of the Australasian Bureau on Southern Africa) November 1980

WHITHER ISANDHLAWANA

„Isandhlawana“ which purports to be a revolutionary Journal of the Azanian struggle has in a recent statement on the international situation made some hair-raising pronouncements about the situation in Cambodia, Afghanistan and Poland, where Soviet menace and aggression is completely ignored and where all the blame is laid on the U.S. But let „Isandhlawana“ speak for itself: „... there are similar moves in Cambodia where the Pol Pot regime has offered its

services to the U.S. and with the pro-imperialist Chinese Communist Party leadership, and the military alliance is engaged in a hysterical anti-communist crusade against progressive forces in the region. Imperialism is taking advantage of the crisis in Poland, created by the outbreak of the workers demands to drag Poland into the imperialist fold . . . However the surprising low level of class consciousness of Polish workers has created a breeding ground for hardcore anti-communist elements . . . Indeed the CIA labor project, AFL-CIO, has already been used to channel secret funds to Solidarity and there are also plans to acquire printing machinery for Solidarity. They are trying to divert the true nature of the Polish workers struggles."

On the question of Afghanistan „Isandhlawana“ takes up a similar position. The enemy is U.S. Imperialism trying to create an imaginary Soviet danger!

We wonder where „Isandhlawana“ gets its facts from – it certainly must be „Pravda“ or the Tass News Agency.

What disturbs us is not the patent ridiculousness of what „Isandhlawana“ has to say but what has happened to it that it talks such an absurd political language. It is a known fact that in its desperation for finances Azanian organisations abroad let themselves open to all kinds of infiltration. Could it be after the statement by the Soviet spy arrested in South Africa recently that the ANC has little support inside the country, that the Soviets – in an effort also not to repeat their mistake in Zimbabwe where they supported the wrong horse – are trying to make inroads into the Black nationalist organisations related to the Black Consciousness Movement which is the mass organisation inside Azania.

NO SUPPORT FOR ANC IN S.A.

The Soviet spy recently arrested in South Africa stated recently that the ANC of South Africa had little support in the country. He should know since he was a firm ANC supporter and no doubt went into the country to ascertain what was happening, a sure sign too that the social-imperialists are already busy laying their plans to bring South Africa under their control. In terms of their geopolitics South Africa is a key country in their efforts to control the oil supplies of Western Europe and bring it under its control. Possibly the Soviet Union does not wish to make the same mistake that they did in Zimbabwe where they supported the losers.

LONDON BCM IN EXILE

The BCM Conference held about a year ago raised hopes that the large numbers of BCM members who had come out in exile would organise themselves and play a useful role in the international struggle against colonialist and imperialist domination in Azania. The BCM Conference itself was very successful and had very lively debates on a number of crucial issues affecting our struggle.

But unfortunately the BCM became infiltrated by opportunist elements, exile has been whose relevance to the struggle is beyond any doubt. Key positions were captured by these politically bankrupt elements who in true fashion began expelling people and whole constituent organisations of the BCM like SAYCO who were told, quite unceremoniously, that unless they joined the BCM they would be expelled.

Azanian exile politics in London and abroad in general is a state of disaster. The current state of the BCM in London proves this beyond any doubt.

REAGAN, NAMIBIA AND EL SALVADOR

For sheer dull-wittedness the newly elected Reagan administration would romp home as exemplified in the person of Dick Clark, No. 3 in the administration who does not know the name of the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe. Thank God, at least, he knows that it exists. While we might be able to commemorate Reagan in Madame Tussaud as a prime example of ruling class idiocy the fact is that social imperialism is only too eager to use the buffoonery of his regime to its advantage. While the Reagan administration was brought in to take a tougher line against Soviet expansionism the fact is that he is taking all kinds of reactionary positions that can only play into the hands of the social-imperialists. On Namibia, South Korea and El Salvador he has displayed an intransigently reactionary attitude against their just demands. We have little doubt a reason for the failure of the Namibian talks was that the South African racists could rely on the support of the Reagan administration. The Carter administration had a bit of a different strategy although not fully worked out. At least he wanted his neo-colonial dictators to trim down some of their oppressiveness under the guise of human rights. He was prepared to make some concessions to national liberation struggles as in Nicaragua when he did not support the fascist Somoza regime. His counterpart has moved in the opposite direction. In countries where U.S. Imperialism is the

main enemy this pushes the liberation fighters into the waiting arms of the Soviet Union. While so many leftists and progressives hardly take the social imperialists to be a greater danger than the U.S. this is inviting trouble. What do we do too when the Reagan administration supports right wing regimes that oppress the peoples as in El Salvador and when we find that the Soviet Union is also supporting these national liberation movements with its own ulterior motives in mind. Do we throw up our arms in despair and say that we cannot support the guerrilla movements because they are in cahoots with the Soviet Union and we regard social imperialism as the greater danger. Obviously our slogan should be: both superpowers out. There can be no question of building up momentum against one superpower when another superpower is doing everything to keep a reactionary regime in power. While we struggle against U.S. imperialism we must at the same time make sure that social imperialism is not trying to come in through the back door.

The U.S. administrations are in a state of confusion as to how to deal with the great upheavals in the Third World and the threat of social imperialism to its own hegemony. Its relative decline as an imperialist power is related to these twin issues. But these are the two great issues of our time for which revolutionaries and imperialists and social imperialists have different answers.

PAC Document on Political Education

The organisational mandate of our Party was set out in 1959 by our late leader, Mangaliso Sobukwe, when he stated: „We do not want a blind following. We want an intelligent, informed and politically educated membership. We require a full-time information service, full time organisers and, above all, well run offices. We do not want indisciplined branches mushrooming all over the country. We need funds to maintain the necessary contact, discipline and coordination.“

The starting point of our political education is to understand the nature of our struggle and its ultimate objectives as set out in (i) our national mandate as seen by our Party, (ii) the organisational line of our Party, (iii) the vanguard nature of our Party's tasks (iv) the constituted authority of our Party and (v) the principled norms of the movement of National Liberation, self-determination and social emancipation. We

The Kampuchea Connection by C.M. Gomes (Grassroots, London), Pounds 2.75

This is a thoroughly documented and careful analysis of the reasons for the worldwide propaganda campaign against Democratic Kampuchea. The direct and simple style of presentation of the specific historical and economic realities underlying the conflict of classes and nations makes understanding easy for the reader who knows little about Southeast Asia.

Both the KGB and the CIA, and their agents, have been active against the people of independent Kampuchea —manufacturing “evidence”, concocting myths, and suppressing the truth. *The Kampuchea Connection* demonstrates in a concrete and highly important case how influential phoney “eye-witness accounts” and media images are, as well as appeals to white-racism. It warns us how social imperialism and imperialism deal with peoples who defy their fire-power, and try to determine their own destiny. This work of anti-imperialist analysis, by an experienced Third World writer, shows how important it is for peoples of all oppressed nations to support the heroic resistance of the Kampuchean people. Suffering hunger and disease, caused by the Vietnamese invasion, they have yet blocked the social imperialist take-over of Southeast Asia.

cannot deceive ourselves about any and all of these issues.

The present purpose of our political education is to lay the foundation for rebuilding our Party in such a way that opportunists, careerists and agent provocateurs cannot break it.

Internally our Party must be strong in three areas of organisation, namely, (i) education, (ii) the press and (iii) the struggle against opportunism. Only then will it be able to occupy a vanguard position in the struggle.

The National Mandate

The first characteristic of a genuine party of revolution is knowledge of the laws of motion and revolution. The second is that Party members must make their contribution to the struggle as an organised body that carries out the objectives of our people as enunciated in their National mandate. The third is that members must

consider the Party as the highest form of National and class association and the instrument for serving the material and spiritual interests of our people. The fourth is that the party must be the embodiment of the unity of will and iron discipline of the revolutionary classes of our people. The fifth characteristic is that its members must guard against factionalism in all its manifestations.

There will always be elements who join what promises to be a revolutionary organisation in order to smuggle into it a spirit of hesitancy and uncertainty to confuse and divide such an organisation, hence, the sixth characteristic is that the political and organisational line of the Party must be binding on all. That is the only reliable test of loyalty.

In the process of building a revolutionary Party political education is the main task. It is typical of the domination of opportunism in leadership to prevent or divert the ideological education of oppressed and exploited peoples or to water down its revolutionary content. This deprives the movement of both direction and organisation. Elite forms of leadership do not want ordinary members of the Party to seek and find solutions to problems of struggle on their own without fiddling and fumbling, which leaves no room for preachers and promoters of revolution.

The role of the Party press is equally important. Its principal role is not only to carry out systematic and thorough agitation and exposure, but to promote and stimulate revolutionary thinking in the movement and nation. It must deal with both national and international issues. It must be the collective organism of our internal and external constituency and must spearhead the raising of national and class consciousness among the people. The Party press must enable its members to watch out for and to comment upon national and international political events and to devise appropriate methods of influencing such events or response to them in an intelligent and revolutionary manner.

The distributive activities of the press are capable of enabling the Party to establish a nucleus or network of agents who will in time form the skeleton of the organisation we need for the revolution.

Opportunism

In respect of opportunism in leadership it is imperative that the Party should ruthlessly struggle against the injection of dogmatism into the liberation movement. This comes in two forms, narrow nationalism and red-baiting.

One of the first things political education should do is to clearly define the important role of nationalism in the struggle as well as its limitations. It is also typical of revisionism to sow diversionist and collaborationist ideas into the movement and we must constantly and ceaselessly expose this.

We can say, in conclusion, that only through the political education of our Party and people in the scientific theory on human affairs and the consistent use of a revolutionary press for political exposure can we combat opportunism in leadership and in the liberation movement. The maturing of a politically conscious nation under the oppression and exploitation of imperialism inevitably brings out two wings of the National bourgeoisie – the nationalist and comprador – and so the emergence of National leadership corresponds to that class position in relation to imperialism and social imperialism. The one aims at a programme to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution by wiping out the remnants of ethnic and feudalistic relations, while the other one wants only to replace the colonialists.

This is the position that we call a *South African exceptionalism* and explains the social practice of the right wing of the movement and expresses the viewpoint of the comprador bourgeois, the role of *African controlling Africans* for imperialism, in other words, the invisible application of Neo-colonialism in the black community. Who, indeed, can control the *raging savage* from murdering and butchering the whites, as Bram Fischer warned, than the black comprador bourgeois? And he must be coopted into the imperialist camp through the liberal agents who are indeed the front for imperialism in the black community. And its acceptance must naturally mean the end of the National elite to unite against imperialism.

This situation could only be retrieved by black workers asserting themselves in an independent manner. The only form hitherto open to them is the one they gave inherited from history – the racial form – but now the content has changed. Imperialism is no longer merely oppressing the individual through colonialism, but is exploiting the nation and the class.

In the sixties, especially between 1964 and 1969 the national liberation movement floundered, the leadership was either disoriented or bought off. The black student movement reactivated the political struggle and became the base for the revolutionary movement. The platform of the process of re-awakening and re-activation

must be the fight of the black workers for a decisive role in the resistance movement as well as the recognition of the responsibility of leadership in relation to the aspirations and expectations of the exploited urban poor and the deprived rural poor in the historical necessity to link the resistance with the struggle of the colonial poor of the world in the international front against imperialism. That whole struggle must be linked, in our case, to the difficult task of building a genuine party of the revolution.

Three reactionary Tendencies

There are three tendencies we wish to examine briefly in the resistance movement of our people, the ethnic homeland policy of the racist regime, the multi-racial liberalism of the Freedom-Charter and Social Democracy which poses as an alternative to capitalism and communism.

The only question we want to draw attention to here is that the so called independent ethnic homelands have no separate economic system from that of racist South Africa and can only gain ethnic autonomy. The dominant classes in the ethnic areas are the ethnic and comprador bourgeoisie, who are a historical necessity for the continued existence of the system. Imperialism provides its comprador agents with a commodity market. But they have no goods to sell and they sell human labour units, in other words, they sell the people in those areas to imperialism, and therefore depend upon the imperialists for their subsistence, salvation and survival. As the struggles grow, so will this class of persons, because imperialism needs it to control black labour. And it will grow into the puppet bureaucracy, the labour aristocracy and the reactionary armed forces.

The tendency of multi-racial liberalism falls into this category in a more sophisticated manner than the ethnic comprador bourgeoisie. The entire content of the Freedom Charter, which we called the charter of slavery, embodies, not the principle of national independence or the right of self-determination for the oppressed, but the right to cultural autonomy. It accords the oppressed national groups the right to have their own cultural institutions while the dominating whites retain all national political power in their own hands. That document cunningly conceals the chauvinistic designs of the white middle class in the SACP as expressed by Rebecca Bunting in Moscow in 1928. Who will *guarantee* the equality of whites in an independent nature republic? The political cat of the CPSA had at last been let out of the bag, and according to

Harry Haywood, it was a mangy, chauvinist creature.

The tendency of social democracy distinguishes itself as a reformist movement which openly denies the social revolution and scientific socialism. It has failed dismally to turn the class struggle into class peace and co-existence, which are in reality the myth for winning over bourgeois power with the aim of building socialism as one revisionist chieftain stated not so long ago that „the peaceful road to socialism aimed at advanced democracy to avoid violence.“

It is important that our political education should be based upon a definite ideological world outlook so that our Party ceases to be a storehouse of various and even divergent political views and that its members should cease to be what Stalin called a conglomeration of political windbags.

Personnel Security

One of the key functions of political education is in the field of personnel security upon which depends the continued existence of our organisation. We cannot adopt an attitude of callous indifference or unconcern for the people we recruit into the revolution. We are obliged to assemble the scattered forces of the revolution for genuine armed struggle. One of the main platforms of this exercise is to make a clear distinction between those who mean serious business and preachers of revolution because each one has both an objective and a material interest it serves. The life of a revolutionary cadre is a precious jewel which cannot be picked up in the street or trifled with.

The decisive factor of our cadre policy and the unity of our party is the attitude our members take towards the political line of the revolution. It is only when we cooperate to execute the tasks of the given time and place that we become capable of achieving success in our work. That success is carried forward to higher levels as more advanced tasks are planned and carried out successfully, and in this way the value of principled discipline and systematic order is appreciated. Relative security and personal ease of mind are necessary to the success of our performance.

Intelligence

There are two main considerations in launching an armed struggle, namely, the security of the cadres of the revolution and the protection of local populations. The political platform of the exercise is to end colonial rule and to enable the people to restore and pursue their social de-

velopment which was stopped by, or had been subordinated to, military suppression and colonial rule.

The physical problem that leadership should solve ideologically is that of arms. The masses of the people may be unwilling to respond to the clarion call to arms where the price of failure is too high and the chances of success are too low. For the present the numerical difference between the trained cadres and the reactionary armed forces is too enormous. The defenders of the colonial status quo form a relatively united block that is sometimes called "granite" while the political fighters are politically fragmented and lack a united leadership.

These are not the only disadvantages. The national liberation movement seems to be unable to visualise the amount of political and military power that should be built up to tackle the enemy seriously. The task of building up parallel organisations underground and trying to liquidate the regime's intelligence networks among the people, seems to be beyond their grasp. This is clearly seen in the manner in which the cadres of the revolution are disrupted fairly easily and weakened by petty internal struggle combined with the habitual weaknesses of those operating away from the home base.

Any talk of underground warfare raises the question of the *revolutionary potential* of the resistance movement, taking into account, the elementary factors of war in the country. The enemy bullies us and can only continue to bully us because of the unorganised state of our affairs.

This is the ideological foundation for our intelligence services and if we have any revolutionary potential this is the time and place to show of what stuff we are made.

Propaganda

The general orientation of our propaganda and the image we want to build is as follows:

- 1) Our primary task is to unify and to revolutionise our party so as to enable it to occupy a vanguard position in our revolution;
- 2) Our secondary task is to unify the Liberation Movement of our country, so that we can speak with the same voice and act in unison on all matters of the revolution;
- 3) Our third task is to unify our revolutionary people under the leadership of the Liberation Movement of our country, so that we can effectively isolate the enemy and thoroughly defeat him;
- 4) The fourth task is to enhance the integrity of

our Liberation Movement and to guard with our lives the honour of the title of member of our Party.

These are our cardinal internal tasks. Our external tasks are as follows:

- 5) We have no mandate to explain apartheid in our propaganda. Our task is to mobilise opinion against racism and fascism and to organise and lead our people towards its overthrow;
- 6) We have no reason to bemoan the plight of the oppressed people in our country or to seek sympathy as innocent victims. While we seek moral and material support from friends of our revolution, our primary task is to educate our people and lead their efforts to change their conditions of life for the better. We lay emphasis on this aspect;
- 7) In speaking against apartheid, our task is to repudiate it ideologically without rancour or racialism. Race and colour are not the problem that is facing us in our country. We believe only in the human race, and colour of the skin counts for nothing. The fact that oppression is physically associated with the whiteman is only incidental. Racism is one aspect of the aggressive nature of capitalism;
- 8) Propaganda must be substantially true to be believed and to enhance the integrity and ingenuity of our Liberation Movement. We have a just cause and must uphold the principles of revolutionary justice, which must be seen to be done.

All these are elementary matters which we all understand. They are being emphasised for the simple reason that we do not always all observe them and this often has a damaging effect in our relationships internally and externally.

We all know the famous saying that if there is to be revolution there must be a revolutionary party. It is the desire of all of us that our party should be revolutionary in the true sense. When we talk of a party we do not just refer to its name, but to the members and leading cadres who must, as a rule, fulfil the tasks for which the party was founded in the first place.

Party Leadership

The principal task of a political party is to give competent leadership to the struggles of the oppressed and exploited people in whose name it claims to speak. Its leaders can best do this by guiding, directing, teaching the people, pointing out the crises in their conditions of life, leading them to find solutions to their social problems and to organise their social life in their own interests.

The historic task of leadership consists in the ability to organise the people, rouse them to action, set them definite tasks to pursue, and mobilise them to carry out those tasks. Systematic organisation and iron discipline are the most important means essential to the pursuit of the tasks of a revolutionary movement. Those who are interested in the effective solution of the social problems of our people can be identified by their concern for the methods employed in the pursuit of the tasks of liberation. Anyone who is not particular about the methods a revolutionary movement uses cannot be seriously interested in the solution of complex problems.

It is essential therefore that a revolutionary party must be strong in its overall structure, from top to bottom; in its committees at all levels, and in its specialised departments. The strength of the party must lie in its ideological and organisational unity, which means briefly, the ability of its members to discuss freely and to *decide all party affairs, put forward ideas on all matters of concern to the revolution, and to devise and uphold democratic procedures and traditions of the party which must be binding to all.* A revolutionary party must not only be strong in its political line. It must be strong in putting that line into practice. This is what constitutes the party's historical responsibility. It is this by which mankind and the revolution judges us. This is why members of such a party must follow a common discipline and a common morality. We cannot afford to violate that historical responsibility.

We all expect our party to be a unified whole. But its leaders, cadres and general members do not have a uniform grasp of things. Some are quick to understand, some are slow and take longer to do so, while yet others fail to grasp things and cannot easily cope with new tasks and new situations. Any yet others mentally refuse to leave the beaten track. Raising the level of understanding of all these persons is the basic method of uniting them. We can easily make the distinction between those who are keen to learn and those who resist development and obstruct progress, and accordingly develop the good points and find a way of making up for weaknesses in our political consciousness.

On Discipline

It is impossible to have a revolutionary party without a revolutionary nucleus of individuals which believes in revolutionary principles and is dedicated to their pursuit. Three main problems are a stumbling-block to the revolutionisation of political militants. First is *individualism*

which manifests itself in three main tendencies, namely, (i) subjectivism which looks at matters one-sidedly, taking the part for the whole; (ii) dogmatism which bases itself on words and phrases taken out of books and quoted out of context, and (iii) empiricism which rejects objective reality and follows narrow personal experiences.

The second is *indiscipline* which can be identified in three main tendencies, first the bad habit of being arrogant and conceited in the relations with others, secondly, the bad practice of saying one thing and doing the opposite, and thirdly, the bad idea of putting self-interest before everything else and always proceeding from egoism. We have already indicated the imperative need for an ideologically united party whose members, in their individual actions, are solemnly bound together by the revolutionary principles of a common morality and a common discipline. In a revolutionary collective nobody acts as he likes. *Our struggle demands loyalty to the collective, and that loyalty cannot be forthcoming without self-discipline.*

The third is *disunity* which is brought about by conflicting interests. It is undeniable that in every society correct ideas exist side by side with wrong ones. This is much more so in a revolutionary collective where, if organisational unity is to be maintained, relations cannot stem from individual interests or personal likes and dislikes. We proceed from the fact that unity is strength and cannot be replaced. The unity we want is that of the battlefield which must help us to achieve our historic mission of building a new society in our country. We cannot do this unless and until we ourselves have been moulded into new types of dedicated men who are servants of the people and not their masters; men who place the interests of the people first and foremost; men who have cultivated sound and healthy personal attitudes and habits of mind; men who have a correct attitude towards all work without considering rank, burden or conditions; men who work together for a common end in line with a common plan of action. Such unity cannot be created in one day or once for all time. It must be built up gradually in the face of odds and obstacles.

It is the duty of all of us to realise that our struggle cannot be led by default. In political struggle men must consider themselves responsible for their own competence and for the high standard of performance that their work requires. They must increasingly work as members of a responsible team organised around the specific task in hand. They must be able to work to-

gether consciously and voluntarily according to the logic of the situation and the demands of the task in hand. The task of introducing systematic order into our work is to use the contribution of every man as a building block for joint performance.

Our immediate and urgent task is to assure

that our revolution will take place; that it will continue to its logical conclusion, and that we have a revolutionary force capable of carrying out, effectively and efficiently, the complex problems that are associated with a long and brutal revolution. Everyone of us is welcome to be an integral part of such a force, and must be so willingly and consciously.

Significance of Sharpeville Uprising

“BLACK MONDAY” – March 21st 1960 is an unforgettable day in the history of the African Revolution and of the Azanian Revolution in particular. It was on that day that the Pan Africanist Congress led by Mangaliso Robert Sobukwe organised a positive action campaign against the hated pass laws in South Africa. The racist government of Dr. Hendrick F. Verwoerd opposed that monumental campaign by unleashing reactionary violence on the oppressed and nationally dispossessed people of Azania.

Passes suspended for 17 days

His police under orders shot and killed 83 Black people and wounded 365 at Sharpeville and Langa. Several PAC leaders were arrested. Among these were Mangaliso Sobukwe, Zephaniah Mothopeng, George Siwisa, Mlamli Makwetu, John Phokela and many others. The state of emergency was declared throughout the racist Republic. Even leaders of organisations that had not participated in this campaign were arrested. These were organisations such as the Congress of Democrats, the Liberal Party, the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress. Altogether 1569 people were detained.

The shooting of Africans by the racists angered not only the freedom-loving people of the world, but the Africans themselves inside Azania. They continued demonstrations against the pass laws throughout the country. In some areas they burnt down government buildings, stoned European cars, set fire to beerhalls. In fact, on the 30th of March – 9 days after the Sharpeville shootings, 60000 people met at Caledon Square police station in Capetown demanding the release of their leaders. Helicopters and the show of force proved hopeless to intimidate them. To diffuse the most explosive situation Verwoerd's Government suspended the pass laws for 17 days. That was a glittering victory for the masses of Azania. It was the most humiliating thing the Boers had ever been forced to do – considering how nazi-intoxicated the Broederbond Government of Verwoerd was. Verwoerd knew

nothing else but to “keep the kaffir in his place.”

Damage To South African Economy

Sharpeville dealt devastating blows to the economy of South Africa. For the first quarter of 1960 alone capitalisation value of shares quoted on the stock exchange dropped by Pounds 600000000. In one day alone on March 30th, the total market capitalisation was slashed down by Pounds 100000000. The South African Bank Reserves sank to their lowest level ever. Had it not been for the United States of American Banks which provided financial aid to the tune of Pounds 100000000 to boost the then shattered economy of South Africa, Azania might have been born in the early sixties is very much to the amazement of everyone.

The atmosphere in the country was tense. The investors were worried. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry handed a memorandum to the Government. In it they said among other things:

“The immediate cost has been loss of life, loss of production, general unrest, and diversion of part of our manpower for military service. Far more serious is the loss of confidence among investors in South Africa abroad, resulting in the withdrawal of capital and cancellation of business projects that were under favourable consideration; the potential loss of people through emigration and reduced immigration, and the damage that the economy sustains as a result of mounting international disapproval of the policies followed in South Africa, which are widely believed to have caused the present crisis.”

The Shooting of Dr. Verwoerd

This unprecedented loss of money and damage to the South African economy led to an attempted assassination on Dr. Verwoerd himself. As one African journalist has put it, “The shooting in an attempted assassination of Dr. Verwoerd was the most propitious and accurate weather signal for the era ushered in by Sharpe-

ville. The incident took place at the height of 1960 crisis on April 9, when Dr. Verwoerd was addressing a big crowd at the opening of the Union Exposition at the show-ground in Johannesburg.

Although unplanned, the incident was politically motivated and was inspired by the PAC positive action campaign. On his own account David Pratt, a wealthy farmer said he was driven to desperation by the Prime Minister's shiftlessness in his granite apartheid attitude in the showground speech which took no notice of the tremendous harm done to the country's economy by the policies which had led to the Sharpeville crisis."

Sharpeville Nearly Brought a Change of Government

The country was on the verge of anarchy and chaos. The Boers found themselves handling a crisis of unprecedented magnitude which they later called the "Poqo menace". They were completely taken by surprise. It was not that the African people had suddenly awakened. It was that they had suddenly got a leadership that touched the right button that struck a chord of response in their hearts. That massive response shook South Africa to its foundation as never before.

It was not out of idle talk when Lewis Nkosi a reputable African journalist wrote later about the PAC leader, Sobukwe and the Sharpeville campaign and said: "In March 1960, Robert Sobukwe, President of the Pan Africanist Congress helped orchestrate a crisis that panicked the South African Government and nearly brought about the kind of political anarchy which all too often makes possible transference of power overnight . . . At the age of 36 Sobukwe has a rare distinction of having scared Dr. Verwoerd's Government out of its wits. As anybody knows by now, the South African Government does not scare easy."

Let me also point out that it was as a result of the Sharpeville campaign that South Africa was kicked out of the Commonwealth. Can we imagine what the Commonwealth would have been like with the racists in it? What would they have said in Lusaka in August 1979 when the freedom of Zimbabwe was discussed? The very fact of their presence in Lusaka would have been a terrible smell in the nostrils of Africa. *Sharpeville made it possible for Dr. Kwame Nkrumah to lead a campaign to have South Africa kicked out of the Commonwealth.*

Sharpeville Uprising Unique

Between 1919 and 1960 there were 21 massacres of Africans besides Sharpeville and Tanga. In 1920 members of a religious sect led by Enoch Mgijime were massacred when they refused to be moved from the land they occupied. In 1946 miners in Johannesburg on strike were killed. The strike was organised by J.B.Marks. Other massacres of Africans occurred in Witzishoek, Sikhukhuniland, Pondoland and many other places. But Sharpeville was a unique uprising in that its ultimate aim was seizure of political power for the indigenous African people in the Blackman's country and establishment of an Africanist Socialist democracy.

The response by the African people clearly showed that they recognised the new spirit and line of struggle that had been introduced. It was not concessions that were needed. It was not the abolition of racialism and introduction of a multi-racial society. The issue was the restoration of the land to the owners, self-determination on the basis of African majority rule and the establishment of a non-racial socialist society.

Overnight, Sharpeville showed the way. It injected a new confidence in the African. It taught the importance of self-reliance. It showed him that he was his own liberator. Others could help him. But he was to bear the brunt of his own liberation. The illiterates and semi-illiterates that Sobukwe had said were the key, the core and cornerstone of the Azanian Revolution had demonstrated that given the correct leadership they could reverse the 300 years of their national dispossession and humiliation.

Sobukwe In The Racist Court

Sobukwe and his colleagues could now speak uncompromisingly on the question of the liberation of the Africans. Crawling and begging the Whites was over.

When the magistrate delivered his 135 minutes judgement on the PAC leaders, he said that the evidence had shown that the Pan Africanist Congress had its ultimate object the overthrow of white supremacy. "Not only was it your object to fill the jails, but you intended to paralyse trade, industry and the economy of the country, in order to force the Government to change the laws."

But Sobukwe as spokesman for his colleagues answered. "Your worship, it will be remembered that when this case began we refused to plead, because we felt no moral obligation whatsoever to obey laws which are made exclu-

sively by a white minority . . . But I would like to quote what was said by somebody before that an unjust law cannot be justly applied . . . We believe in one race only - the human race to which we all belong. The history of that race is a long struggle against all restrictions, physical, mental and spiritual. We would have betrayed the human race to which we all belong if we had not done our share. We are glad to have made our contribution.

We stand for equal rights for *all individuals*. But the whites have to accept allegiance to Africa first; once a truly non-racial democracy exists in South Africa, all individuals, whatever their colour or race, will be accepted as Africans . . .

As individuals we do not count; we are but the tools of history, which will always find new tools. We are not afraid of the consequences of our actions and it is not our intention to plead for mercy. Thank you, Your Worship."

That was the spirit that led to Sharpeville. In an attempt to stamp out the spirit of African nationalism and self-determination, Verwoerd's Government banned the Pan Africanist Congress and later made a law called the "Sobukwe Clause".

Sharpeville gave birth to the armed struggle

By 1963 the country was infested with what Johannes B. Vorster then Minister of Justice called the "Poqo menace". Police stations *manned by European police* were being stormed. On the 4th of February 1963 at Mbashe Bridge 5 Europeans were reported killed with homemade bombs. Police stations such as Pearl were attacked. The country was being threatened by the Mau Mau type of struggle for liberation. European police and soldiers, informers and Bantustan agents were being fought and killed with Pangas and other home-made weapons.

Vorster had to work 24 hours a day in his determination "to break the back of Poqo-PAC" - which is the embodiment of the spirit that led to Sharpeville. He resorted to torture such as could have been experienced only in Nazi-Germany. He recognised the leadership of PAC under Sobukwe as pace-setter.

In fact, several members of PAC such as Isaac Mthimunya, Samuel Chibane, Philimon Tefu, John Nkosi, Jaftha Masemola and Dinaka Melepe were the first political prisoners to be sentenced to life imprisonment on Robben Island. Leaders of other organisations found these gallant sons of the soil there in 1964. These include Nelson Mandela who was impri-

soned on Robben Island in 1964 after the "Rivonia Trial". And these PAC prisoners together with Mandela of the ANC are still on Robben Island serving their life prison sentences.

Yes, Sharpeville changed the political situation in South Africa. After Sharpeville South Africa was never the same and will never be the same again until the day of liberation.

PAC Guerillas on Their Way to Battle

In the middle of 1968 in widely scattered areas of Outshoon, Laingsburg, Graaf Reinet and Victoria West several people were arrested for furthering the aims of the banned Pan Africanist Congress in South Africa. It seems the arrests in these places were connected with the infiltration of PAC guerillas through Mozambique.

On the 2nd of July 1968 the *STAR* newspaper in Johannesburg reported: "Portuguese security forces were caught in a murderous cross-fire as they charged fleeing members of the Pan Africanist Congress of South Africa, according to first-on-the-spot report account of the action in which three policemen were killed near Villa Pery last week . . ." This was near Sibasa in Northern Transvaal.

Sharpeville A Historical Watershed

Sharpeville is a glittering milestone in the history of the Azanian Revolution. It was out of keen observation and correct analysis of events about Sharpeville when a daily newspaper in Tanzania said in an editorial, "There is no gain-saying the fact that when the annals of the liberation of Southern Africa and Azania (South Africa) in particular, come to be written, Sharpeville will assume the prominence of a historical watershed. For the incident demonstrated the courage of Azanians in pursuit of their rights; it demonstrated the lengths to which they were prepared to go in sacrifice. But even more importantly it showed the limits of peaceful negotiation. Ultimately what the massacre of Sharpeville demonstrated was the utter viciousness of the South African fascists, and the need for new forms of struggle against the regime if the Azanian liberation was to be attained."

The International Community Honours Sharpeville

The significance of Sharpeville has also been recognised by the entire international community. On the 2nd of December 1968, the General Assembly of the United Nations by Resolution 2396 (XXIII) adopted that the 21st of March each year be commemorated as the Internatio-

nal Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

The disciples of the martyrs of Sharpeville (the Pan Africanist Congress) are recognised by the OAU (Organisation of African Unity). The Pan Africanist Congress together with the African National Congress has an observer status at the United Nations.

Inside Azania the entire Black Consciousness Movement which wrote indelibly *Soweto* on the page of the Azanian revolution on the 16th of June 1976 observes *March 21st as Heroes' Day*. It was not surprising when on the 21st of March 1979, a South African newspaper reported, "*Soweto Mourns Sharpeville Victims.*" "Soweto" derived inspiration from "Sharpeville". That is why when the Azanian Peoples' Organisation and the Azanian Students Organisation (AZASO) declared June 16th as National Day of Freedom, the disciples of the Sharpeville martyrs and the people of Azania happily accepted this another revolutionary day in the annals of struggle in Azania.

The very name Azania is inspired by the Sharpeville spirit –the spirit of self-determination and of African majority rule. The Azanian revolutionaries reject the colonial and racist name "South Africa" with the utter contempt it deserves.

Sharpeville Initiated Biko Into Politics

The significance of Sharpeville is seen throughout Azania. For instance, how was Steve Bantu Biko, a renowned leader, martyr and hero of Azania initiated into politics that led him to abandon his medical career.?

Gail M. Gerhart in his book *Black Power in South Africa – The Evolution of An Ideology* says, "Born in 1947 in King Williamstown in the eastern Cape, the son of a Government-employed clerk, Biko's initiation into politics had come as a teenager in 1963 when his older brother, a student at Lovedale High School, was arrested as a suspected POQO (PAC) activist and jailed for nine months . . ."

In July 1966 he attended the NUSAS annual conference as an observer, and in 1967 he participated as a Wentworth delegate at the July conference which saw bitter reactions from black students when Rhodes University, the host institution, prohibited mixed accommodation or eating places at the conference site . . ."

This of course, later led to the formation of SASO. SASO was banned together with other organisations affiliated to the Black Consciousness Movement in 1977. But AZASO (Azanian

Students Organisation) was formed in 1979. Thus the struggle from Sharpeville continues and has taken new forms of struggle including the armed form which was once an "anathema" to the old multi-racial leadership.

Sharpeville Promoted the Doctrine of Self-Determination

Since Sharpeville the struggle has intensified. Revolutionary violence which was eschewed before Sharpeville is now accepted. Before Sharpeville the doctrine of "multi-racialism" was so prevalent that African nationalism, self-determination, African majority rule were equated with "racialism", "drive the white man to the sea!"

This was, of course, rubbish because nowhere in Africa was a whiteman ever driven to the sea after African majority rule. The Azanian Revolution was being deliberately distorted by Europeans and their "civilised boys" in order to confuse the land question and hide the historical fact of the usurped sovereignty in Azania and thus delay the long over-due liberation of Azania.

The struggle sparked off by Sharpeville and catapulted to a higher intensity by Soweto continues unabated. Just before the death of Mangaliso Sobukwe –the man whose movement organised the campaign which led to Sharpeville, a long trial took place in South Africa. It is now famously known as "*Bethel Trial of the 18*".

Reporting this trial on the 1st of July 1979, the *Sunday Times* (South Africa) said, *South Africa's Biggest Terror Trial, and the longest in the country's judicial history*, wound up this week when 16 Pan Africanist Congress supporters were jailed for underground activities. . . . The statistics of the trial have set their own records –it has taken 165 court sitting days, 5 200 pages of evidence and argument were recorded, and 86 co-conspirators were involved, including the late Mr. Robert Sobukwe, the leader of the PAC . . .

Almost the entire trial including the marathon 21-hour judgement was held in camera . . . the men on trial aged between 20 and 66.

From the outset, when hearing began 19 months ago, the dignified figure of the South African leader of the PAC, Zeph Mothopeng captured the focus of attention. When asked to plead to the charges he said from the dock: "I do not recognise the right of this court to try me."

BOSS Fears the Spirit of Sharpeville

The assassination of David Sibeko is believed to have been largely the work of the most sophi-

sticated spying ring of the South African Government – BOSS or BONS. In 1977 the racists discovered that PAC had not only infiltrated some of its guerillas into South Africa. But that in the country-side these guerillas had not only been organising peasants and politicising them, but that they had trained them in the use of arms right inside South Africa.

The assassination of Sibeko who was the ablest Foreign Affairs Secretary to ever represent the PAC at the United Nations, was an attempt to quench the spirit that was ushered in by Sharpeville. But the objectives for which the Sharpeville martyrs and others died shall triumph. No force on earth can quench the spirit of Sharpeville. The spirit of the martyrs of

Sharpeville is irresistible and irreversible. The spirit will be there until the birth of Azania along with the birth of Zimbabwe and Namibia. But for the spirit of Sharpeville to triumph soon, there is a need for the formation of a united front for the liberation of Azania consisting of *all* Azanian liberation movements which have a contradiction with the enemy. This is a must for the speedy savers of the National Democratic Revolution in Azania. Those who have been misled by the myth of "authenticity" and super power politics must take care. Three years of a united front in Zimbabwe achieved far more for the people of Zimbabwe than 17 years of the myth of "authenticity".

An Azanian Marxist-Leninist Speaks

These views were sent to us by an Azanian Marxist-Leninist, covering a number of topics from a Marxist-Leninist point of view.

On the Two-Phase Revolution

The aims of the National Democratic Revolution can never be fully realised if the revolution goes only as far as trying to resolve the national contradictions. In order for them to be fully realised, the revolution needs to go on to the social phase, where its main tasks would be to resolve the social contradictions prevailing. History has demonstrated beyond any doubt that the gains of the National Democratic Revolution stand to be reversed if the revolution is halted at the national stage.

If the revolution does not go uninterruptedly to the next phase, that of the socialist struggle, then the benefits brought about by the victories of the first phase, the national one, shall not be fully realised. Why is this so? It is because the great victories of the national democratic revolution do not necessarily preclude the return of imperialism by other means. It is only when the revolutionary struggle of the masses goes on to the socialist phase that the chances of imperialist repenetration are diminished. It becomes obvious then, that the struggle against imperialism is, ultimately, a struggle for socialism, for imperialism can never be totally banished by the national revolution. Let all nationalist revolutionaries understand this, for, in the final analysis, their struggle shall be a futile one if it is envisaged as merely a nationalist struggle.

To the extent that a given national struggle is

anti-colonial, it is not necessarily anti-capitalist. But, insofar as it is anti-imperialist, it is certainly anti-capitalist, for it is only by destroying the capitalist system in the country that the imperialist system can be ended.

On the National Democratic Revolution in Azania

The National Question in Azania can only be successfully resolved through the vehicle of the revolutionary national democratic war. Why is our war said to be revolutionary, national and democratic? Our war is said to be revolutionary in that it is a war of the masses. And as such it can only be fought by mobilising the masses and relying on them.

It is national in that it is going to be against the invasion and occupation force of settler-colonialism. It shall be waged to repossess the country and the land and also to restore the sacred rights of national sovereignty and self-determination. The war shall be democratic in that it shall be based on the democratic leadership of the workers and peasants.

On the Historical Necessity of the Democratic Revolution

A clear study of world history indicates that the democratic revolution is a necessary stage for any (and all) societies. Before 1917, such revolutions had been undertaken under the leadership of the bourgeoisie and were bourgeois revolutions. But in this era, the era of proletarian revolution, ushered in by the Russian proletarian revolution of 1917, such revolutions can

only be undertaken under the leadership of the proletariat. In the present world situation, a situation characterised by the exploitation and oppression of weaker nations by the imperialist powers, such revolutions take on a new dimension, namely a nationalist one. In this case the proletariat mobilises and leads the oppressed nation in a national democratic revolution, whose main task is to end imperialist domination and, in some cases, colonial domination as well and, in the process, regain the lost democratic rights of independence and self-determination. Of course the attainment of these rights does not necessitate the ending of the revolution. Due to the fact that these successes can be easily reversed by imperialism and that true and "permanent" democracy can only be realised in a classless society (which can only be reached through a long struggle undertaken on the highest level), it becomes necessary to continue the revolution to the socialist phase. This phase is possible, because, of the successful conclusion of the first phase, namely the national and democratic one, the proletariat shall have destroyed the old state and its place created its own. This state is the instrument it shall use for the socialist struggle.

On Class Dictatorship

The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is better understood or better illustrated by the dictatorship of the bourgeois and the dictatorship of the aristocracy and monarchy. It involves understanding that the state is a class instrument and therefore whatever class is in power it uses the state for its own ends; hence the dictatorship. Of course, a given dictatorship at a certain time in history is democratic.

Which is why for a time bourgeois rule was recognised to be democratic and just. The dictatorship only became unacceptable when it was overtaken by historical progress, when it stagnated, when, instead of being a means to advance mankind, it became a means to retrogression. A time when all our socio-economic problems can only be solved by giving over the reins of state to the proletariat, which would institute its own dictatorship.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the continuation of the class struggle under other forms" (Lenin). But since other classes before the proletariat have had their own dictatorships, then Lenin's statement can be paraphrased thus: the dictatorship of a class is the continuation of the class struggle under other forms. The problem here arises from the fact that in using the concept of the dictatorship of a class, it is

usually used in reference to the dictatorship of the proletariat, thus obscuring its applicability to all class rule. This resulted in the equation of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat with the despotic dictatorship of the bourgeois under fascism and social-fascism.

On the Continuation of the Class Struggle under Socialism

In a country where a socialist revolution is taking place it does not mean that there is no longer any class struggle, that the class struggle has been ended. On the contrary, it means that the class struggle has intensified, that it is now carried on the highest plane. The proletariat, through its vanguard, the Communist Party, has wrested the state from its enemy, the bourgeois, and it is using this state to ruthlessly force through its progressive programme with the resultant suppression of the bourgeois (and its supporters). On the other hand the former ruling class, the bourgeois, is also using all its powers, employing all its dirty tricks, to try and usurp power from the proletariat. Any relaxation, any lowering of the guard by the proletarian vanguard in such circumstances, under the guise that the class struggle is over, constitutes a betrayal of the proletarian revolution, because any such neglect shall give the bourgeois its long-awaited moment. Then it shall strike a deadly blow, a blow which shall signal the end of the proletarian dictatorship and the restoration of the old, reactionary bourgeois dictatorship. Such was the case in Russia (and in other former socialist countries).

"... that is why we are forced with a new and higher form of struggle against the bourgeois, the struggle against the very simple task of further expropriating the capitalists to the much more complicated and difficult tasks of creating conditions in which it will be impossible for a new bourgeois to arise" (Lenin). For those who argue that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be overthrown, as Chairman Mao and numerous others after him have shown has happened in Russia, should take note of the above extract from Lenin's work. For Lenin to talk of creating conditions which will preclude the rise of a new bourgeois shows that even he considered it possible for a new bourgeois to arise in a socialist country as it has done in Russia. And these conditions can only be created by carrying the revolution into the cultural sphere. This represents Stalin's main failure. Lenin had recognised the need for a cultural revolution, but when Stalin took over he emphasised the other aspect of the proletarian dictatorship, namely the use of force which, incidentally, Lenin had

pointed out that in itself did not constitute the essence nor was it the main constituent of proletarian dictatorship.

On the Zimbabwean State and Revolution

The state in Zimbabwe is decidedly bourgeois and controlled by the national bourgeois and remnants of settler-colonialism. The main political party ZANU(PF) is supposedly committed to socialism, to socialist reconstruction. But it is a well known Marxist-Leninist truth that the present state in Zimbabwe cannot be used by this party to undertake this task. For this to have been possible the Zimbabwean Revolution should have completely destroyed the old settler colonial state and replaced it with a people's democratic state. Now, this state could have been used for socialist reconstruction as it is a form of proletarian state. But, then, due to circumstances beyond ZANU (PF)'s control (at the time of the Lancaster House Conference) the situation did not work out like that. What, then should ZANU (PF) do in order to carry out its avowed tasks? ZANU (PF) shall have to mobilise the Zimbabwean masses in a continuation of the revolution and undertake the destruction of the present state and institute a proletarian dictatorship in the form of a people's democracy. But the problem is compounded by the fact that ZANU (PF) is part of and has a major share in the state it should destroy. It means, then, that ZANU (PF) needs to renounce its position and participation in the present state first, and then proceed to destroy it. On the ruins of this state, ZANU (PF) shall be able to build a state that it shall use for its socialist reconstruction. Of course this does not mean that I am against the present strategy of ZANU (PF) but I am merely pointing out what I think they shall ultimately have to do.

On Social-Imperialism

Whereas the U.S. has become an imperialist superpower primarily through political and economic penetration and exploitation of the weaker nations, the economically weaker Russian superpower undertakes imperialist expansion through political and military action. Besides presenting itself as the natural ally of the Third World countries, the Russian superpower exploits „conflict situations“ by sending in armaments, advisors and even troops –usually those of a surrogate, not its own. In those places where the Russian superpower has interests and which have no conflict situation which she can exploit, and also in the absence of other means

of penetration she creates such conflicts which then gives her an excuse to send troops or those of its surrogates, as she did in Kampuchea. The struggle in Azania is not only primarily against the settler-colonialist but also against the neo-colonial threat represented by the „internal“ puppets (Butulezi, etc.) and external puppets (ANC, etc.).

On International Conferences

We are aware, we are convinced that the numerous international meetings and conferences between the imperialists and their supporters will not produce solutions to our political and socio-economic problems. But we are also aware that the masses of the world have not yet reached that stage (in consciousness) where they would turn their backs on such futile attempts at solving our problems and embark on revolution, the only way these problems can be solved, once and for all. We have a task before us to convince the masses that these conferences cannot produce solutions, that in order to solve these enormous problems the masses themselves would have to take over power and use this power to force through their programs. We should use all means available to us to accomodate this task. If and when the enemy provides us with these means we should not hesitate.

On Reformism

In revolutionary politics reformism is identical with reaction. While it might be tactical for revolutionaries to work with reformists, liberals for some time, they know that sooner or later in the course of the struggle, they shall turn upon these reformists.

On the Question of “Driving the Whites into the Sea”

When we are accused of wanting to “drive the whites into the sea” we wish to assure the whites and international community that this is certainly not our intention. Why do we have to be so apologetic? What wonderful things have the whites done to deserve to stay in Azania? Certainly, there shall be no place in Azania for all those whites who shall work for the maintenance or restoration of the colonial / racist order. These whites will have to be “driven into the sea”. Only those whites who shall turn their backs on Europe and declare their loyalty to and show unqualified support for the African People's Republic which shall be proclaimed, shall have the right to remain.

Who leads the national revolution?

As Chairman Mao said, we are now in the era of proletarian revolutions. Even the national

democratic revolution and it should not be confused with an "ordinary" national revolution, which is a bourgeois revolution. As they are not firmly rooted in the masses, "ordinary" national revolutions run the greatest danger of being reversed. These revolutions, in an era of proletarian power, are a reflection of how the bourgeois elements of oppressed nations are prepared to step into the shoes of the imperialist / colonialist oppressor and continue the exploitation of the mass of workers and peasants. In Azania, the squabbles with the liberation movement, let alone the outright treachery of the quislings, have demonstrated that without their own vanguard the masses will merely help to elevate the local bourgeois elements to a position where they will also partake in their exploitation.

Third World Marxist-Leninists are also Nationalists

In the era of imperialism true revolutionaries in the Third World are also nationalists. Marxist-Leninists in the Third World who are not nationalists, who are against nationalism, that the national democratic revolution is also a but objectively are in the imperialist camp.

The Azanian State

The first task of any and all revolutionaries is to seize state power, and then use the power of the state to make social revolution. It is the same with the Azanian Revolution. We have to wrest the state from the hands of the present rulers and then use this instrument to advance our revolution. This is what happened during the Russian Revolution of October 1917. But this was a social revolution, carried out by the proletariat of a sovereign nation. This is not the case in Azania. We are still building the Azanian nation. We still have to consolidate our nation and its culture. We still have to secure its sovereignty. These are our first tasks.

We have determined that we will achieve these goals through armed revolution. As the goals indicate, the nature and character of the revolution has to be national and democratic. As only the proletariat of an independent nation can carry out a successful social revolution, it means that the national democratic revolution is also a very important phase of our revolution, especially since it is also a nation building revolution. But Marxist-Leninists know that the attainment of national independence and national liberation does not mean that all the contradictions have been resolved. In principle this revo-

lution is one that puts the national bourgeois into power. But once the bourgeois is in power, it will refuse to give way for the proletariat to take over the reins of state, and also by the very nature of its limited goals, the bourgeois can only make a partial revolution.

The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeois (and imperialism) would still remain. This contradiction can only be resolved by the socialist revolution, conducted by the proletariat through its vanguard, the Communist Party. The proletariat, therefore, should lead from the outset to ensure that the revolution continues uninterrupted beyond the national phase into the social one; to ensure that it is not put into a position where it can be refused power. Only with the Proletariat in the leadership can our revolution be completed.

The Azanian Proletariat

This is a period of world history when the proletariat should be in power. But the bourgeois prevented this by usurping power from the proletariat.

The situation in Azania is not isolated from the international situation. It follows, therefore, that even in Azania the proletariat should be in power. But Azania has the additional problem that it is still a colonial country. This means that the country still has to attain independence. World historical experience has shown that the proletariat can gain state power only by conducting a violent revolution. The Azanian proletariat, therefore, has to conduct a violent revolution in order to gain its power. But how does the Azanian proletariat conduct such a revolution in a colonial country? By conducting a two phase revolution, the first phase being that of attaining independence for Azania nation, and the second phase being that for socialism. The black proletariat is not the only class that wants independence and national liberation. All the sections of black society want it. All of these classes, therefore, should fight alongside the proletariat, always recognising the role history has assigned to the Black proletariat, the role of leading and guiding the national democratic revolution (using its vanguard the Communist Party of Azania). The proletariat should not allow the bourgeois classes to use it to get into power. This black proletarian led revolution, the national democratic revolution, shall be conducted along strictly national/racial lines. Since the white proletariat are part of the white national/racial entity, it follows that they will fall on the other side of the dividing line, the side that is opposed to the black proletariat and

its allies. Moreover, due to the bribes it gets from the ruling class, the white proletariat is a staunch supporter of the status quo. Since this stand is a betrayal of its own class interests and since it is counter-progressive, this class, the white proletariat, is, at the moment, reactionary.

The advance of the national democratic revolution shall increasingly haul the white proletariat out of the reactionary abyss into which it has fallen, so that, in the socialist phase of the revolution, the black and white members of the proletariat shall be able to advance together as a true Azanian proletariat.

Marx and Marxism

Marx did not invent Marxism but rather Marxist writings were a result of his concrete analysis of the concrete situation, using dialectical and historical materialism as his tools of analysis. Marx did not, for instance, invent classes or class struggle, but what he did was to make a detailed and scientific analysis of this social phenomena. Since the material basis for resolving the contradictions (which gave rise to the struggle of the classes) had already been created, he was able to perceive that this struggle could only be successfully resolved by carrying it to its highest level, that of the socialist revolution. Since the historical tendency was to resolve these contradictions, and since these contradictions could not be resolved within the framework of classes, he was able to perceive that the end result of this struggle (in all its phases, including the Socialist revolution) would be the highest form of society, a classless society, and since the state was a phenomena of the class struggle (a class instrument), the conclusion of this struggle would also result in the abolition of the state. In this way, Marxism and the Marxist way of analysis became the basis tools of analysis in all subsequent epochs.

Marx died in 1883 and history did not stop with his death. Nearly a century of history has passed since his demise. What has been happening in the world in all this time? In other words is there any scope for making concrete analysis of concrete situations. And, moreover, who, in the absence of Marx, was/is to make this analysis. To answer the first question. Capitalism became internationalised and, as a result of the contradictions amongst the international capitalist countries we had two great wars. Apart from these we have had socialist revolutions, some of which have reverted to reaction, we have had/are still having wars of national liberation. To answer the second question. Different revo-

lutionaries in different times in this era (Lenin and Mao) have undertaken this task and they were successful in identifying imperialism in all its successive stages. But Lenin and Mao are no more. Rather than trying to resurrect these revolutionary classics, as some people seem to be doing in Marx's case, we need to produce successors (to these classics of their calibre or more). In other words, as the history of the revolution has demonstrated there is a need always for a concrete analysis of the concrete situation prevailing.

The Main Contradictions Today

Marx determined that man's freedom shall come from liberating the lowest strata of society, the working class. In this way the urgent task of the revolution became that of worker's liberation and so made the struggle of the working class against the bourgeois the motive force of history. But this conclusion was the result of an analysis of society on a national scale (i.e. a nation taken in isolation) albeit that this was the case with all the societies of the advanced nations. But today the centre of contradictions has been shifted from a national to an international context as a result of the advanced nation's subjugation of the vast majority of the less advanced nations for their own exploitative ends. How, then, is the question of man's liberation resolved in this context? As, on a world scale, the oppressed nations, from the most exploited section of world society and consequently, its lowest strata, their resistance to this exploitation is most acute. Since the total and complete liberation of these nations constitutes the greatest blow that can be struck against imperialism, national liberation becomes the most urgent and immediate task of the revolution for man's freedom and the national liberation struggle becomes the motive force of history. After all the struggle centres around the main contradiction at any time and the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations is the main one today. Of course, this does not mean that the class struggle has been abandoned, as some people try to make out, but, on the contrary, the national liberation struggle is still part of the class struggle.

In this situation what should be the role of the proletariat in the imperialist countries? It is true that with the advent of exploitation on a world scale, and so with the shifting with the centres of contradictions, the workers of the imperialist countries threw in their lot with their bourgeois. Today, due to the influence exerted by the national liberation movement on them,

they are reawakening to the call of the revolution. These workers should support the national liberation struggles, especially since the victories of these struggles shall prove the weakening of their bourgeois, and they should simultaneously intensify their struggles in their respective countries. In other words, these workers should form an alliance between their struggles and the struggles for independence and national liberation waged by the oppressed nations. This should entail a recognition by the workers of the imperialist countries that for the oppressed nations the national struggles for independence and national liberation are a necessary prelude to their peoples revolutions for freedom and peace.

The Concept of Democracy

The concept of democracy, like other concepts such as morality, is not universal and absolute. It is also subjected to the concept of classes and the class struggle i.e. no two classes have the same view of it. Each class interprets democracy in its own peculiar way. It follows, therefore, that a particular world view of democracy is restricted to a particular epoch in the history of mankind, i.e. to the period when the class which holds that view (of democracy) is in power. That class's decline and the ascendancy of another one is also the disappearance of the particular view and the emergence and the prevalence of a new understanding of democracy, i.e. the view of the class which is dominating at the time. Thus, during bourgeois rule, we have a bourgeois conception of democracy prevailing in the world.

Today a period when the proletariat, supported by the peasants, should be in power, we have a proletarian conception of democracy. In the former case we have bourgeois democracy and in the latter we have proletarian democracy, the most dynamic of all the democracies since, with its progress, it will ultimately reach a stage where it is democracy for all the people. It is with the abolishment of classes, i.e. only in a classless society that the concept of democracy will acquire a universal meaning. It is only in a classless society that people will have the same view of democracy and it is only in such a society that all will benefit from democracy.

The peoples of the world enjoyed democratic rights only until the bourgeois revolutionary movement had spent itself and it was time for the class which was leading this movement – the bourgeois – to make way for the class which would lead in the next phase, a phase which while it is progressing will at the same time be

abolishing the need for class leadership. With the refusal of the bourgeois to make way, the movement lost its dynamic driving force and it fell into stagnation. With time the character and nature of the movement came to be reactionary, and under the conditions which came to prevail, it was impossible to maintain democracy. In fact, the very act of the bourgeois, i.e. of denying the working class its rightful place at the helm, which, in essence, had been a denial to humanity of its right to progress (as this denial to the working class had been counter-progressive) this act had been a fatal blow to democracy. All that remained was for the bourgeois to prepare the grave of and to bury democracy. The laws which the bourgeois enacted after this, whether "good" or "bad" were but shovelfuls of sand thrown into the grave of democracy. For, after this critical period, it was inevitable that the rule of the bourgeois would increasingly become undemocratic. This would be necessitated by the fact that with the passage of time under the illegal rule of the bourgeois the workers and other allied classes would increasingly become dissatisfied. At some point in time this dissatisfaction would reach a stage where the bourgeois would be forced to abolish or end all remaining democratic processes, i.e. it would be forced to become completely dictatorial. The bourgeois as a whole today is dictatorial. Whichever form this dictatorship takes, whether it is a dictatorship of one man, or a group of men (party) or of several parties, as in some countries (e.g. U.S. dictatorship of the Democratic and Republican parties). In fact, I think, these are two components of the same party, allowed to function as two parties for the sake of presenting a "democratic" front, its dictatorship remains the same. For all these forms of dictatorship are in the interests of one and the same class, the bourgeois. As the time for the bourgeois to rule democratically has passed the continued rule of this class cannot be democratic and therefore for us to return to democracy we will have to put the workers into power.

On War

War is a continuation of politics by other means, and it is only resorted to after all other means have failed to advance the politics in question. While bourgeois rule was democratic, there was no need for war, since the then existing processes were able to serve their purpose, i.e. that of advancing the politics of the nascent working class. But with the end of democracy, occasioned by the bourgeois refusal to abide by the democratic rule of human development it

became increasingly necessary for the proletariat to turn to that other means of political advancement, that of war.

In those countries where parliamentary freedoms seems to exist, countries like France and Italy, where there are legal "Communist" Parties this is because these CP's are as reactionary as the ruling parties. In other words these parties are not proletarian, but they are bourgeois

parties and they continue to exist under the guise of being leaders of the proletariat. Given the present world situation, if these parties were real Communist Parties, their respective governments would long have outlawed them with such a situation, they would have been compelled to carry out insurrection. Their failure to mobilise the revolutionary working class in violent revolution against the bourgeois is irrefutable proof of their reactionary nature.

PAPERS FROM THE AZAPO CONFERENCE:

1. Black Consciousness as a Driving Force

by Khangale Makhado

Black Consciousness sees the South African society as divided into two distinct groups, one of the oppressors and the other comprising the *oppressed*. Whites are the oppressor group whilst Blacks are the oppressed. Very simple indeed. There is no other group. In South Africa therefore one is either on the side of the oppressor or on the side of the oppressed. Black Consciousness is a realization by the Black man of the need to rally together with his brothers around the cause of their operation and to operate as a group in order to rid themselves of the shackles that bind them to perpetual servitude. B.C. seeks to instil the Black community with a new-found pride in themselves, their efforts, their value system, their culture, their religion and their point of view to life.

It seeks to heighten their consciousness of problems related to their oppression, exploitation and dehumanisation whilst at the same time exploring the various options open to Black people's liberation. The "consciousness" we speak about is a political one, different from the biological one. It is the consciousness that demands that people, after taking stock of their plight and problems, determined take appropriate steps to pull themselves out of the morass of exploitation and oppression. An oppressed people that look for more remedies for their oppression in individual problems, cannot be said to be conscious in the political sense.

Black Consciousness asserts that Black liberation can only be brought about by Blacks themselves and nobody else. It therefore exhorts Blacks to close their ranks, solidify their unity and by so doing realise the power they can only wield as a group. It urges them to strive for reliance upon their own efforts and resources as much as possible where their struggle for libera-

tion is concerned. Hence the slogan: "Black man, you are on your own." Thus in our country no genuine struggle for liberation can be waged without offering a strong counterpoint to the white race that permeate our society so effectively.

The apologists of Apartheid and other B.C. detractors have called B.C., protagonists reverse racists and white haters. How frivolous. Are Black people expected to hate racism and oppression in a vacuum? Aren't they entitled to concretise their hatred by hating the oppressor, who in this case is the white man? This does not constitute racism at all. It is simply a matter of hating an evil phenomenon and its perpetrators or practitioners. But as soon as racism and oppression are done away with, and the white man is simply another human being and not an oppressor, Blacks shall have no cause to hate him. The hatred of whites by Blacks is completely justified as long as whites remain oppressors. It is ridiculous to hate the stick that hits you but love the man who wields it. This is the practical side of the whole issue.

Exclusion of Whites

For reason of group cohesion the ranks of the oppressed and recognition of Blacks as the only custodians of their own liberation, Black Consciousness believe in the exclusion of whites from their struggle. There can be no viability in the union of the oppressor and the oppressed, since their interests are opposite of one another. B.C. does not deny the existence of a tiny group of whites who can identify with the Black man's struggle. Such whites are indeed a rare species and hard to get. However, the priority Blacks have and the desire to solidify the ranks of the all important oppressed, requires the exclusion

of whites who, in any case, are mere sympathizers who know nothing about the Black man's experience of oppression.

Some of the most diligent critics of B.C. are found among the ranks of those dogmatics and blinker-wearing socialists who see the S. African situation as a simple classical situation of the class struggle (It should be noted that we are talking about dogmatic socialists here, and not about socialists as a whole). According to them, in South Africa the struggle is between the workers on the one hand, and Capitalists on the other. *They advocate the rallying and unification of all workers, Black and White, under the same banner in order to confront the capitalist exploiters. They refuse to accept the fact that in the South African situation racism transcends everything and that it has seriously bled and distorted the classical capitalist class division and related contradictions. It is perhaps painful to observe that we are dealing here with people who have learnt some good and elegant theories and formulas, and who are intent on applying them blindly to any situation confronting them.*

That is indeed a pity, because the said theories recognise the fact that no two situations can be identically the same in the world. It is incumbent upon freedom fighters in each situation to study it as objectively as possible and devise the necessary and suitable strategies. No matter how powerful and famous a mathematical formula is, *we cannot solve every problem with it. One should fit a problem to the formula and not the other way round.*

Now let us look at the eight classes of society and assess their composition and behaviour in the South African situation.

(1) The International Bourgeoisie

This comprises international capitalists whose domain of both political and economic activities have gone beyond the borders of their own countries. They are the essence of imperialism, since they are actual exporters of capital which becomes a matter of great political, economic and social consequence in the host country and compels the exporting country to have vested interests in the domestic affairs of the host country. In our country, this class is represented by foreign multinational investors like the IBMs, GENERAL MOTORS, DATSUN NISSAN, etc. They are exploiting the available black cheap labour and other resources for their own benefit and that of the South African white racist minority. They do all in their power to strengthen the white racist economically and politically which allows the racist whites to

spurn World opinion and perpetuate their evil Apartheid System.

(2) The National Bourgeoisie

This class consists of those capitalists whose capital is confined to the borders of their own countries. It is a very powerful group which holds the real reigns of power and government *in its country and manage things to its own advantage.* It consists almost entirely of whites in our country and there is no significant Black capitalist in our country. The little ones who are there are incapable of playing their ruling class role due to the constraints of Apartheid.

They have no political powers at all and their meager capitalist activities are severely curtailed and restricted by the demands of Apartheid. This small number of Blacks belonging to this class regard themselves just as oppressed as any other Blacks.

(3) Comprador Bourgeoisie

This is the managerial class. This is a very skilled class which is in charge of the actual running of capitalist production. It plans and erects necessary production infrastructure, such as buildings and machines; it hires and fires workers, it markets products etc. while the real capitalist owners are idling, gambling or walking half naked on the various beaches of the world. To a large extent this class consists of whites in *this country and it is completely reactionary.*

(4) The Petty Bourgeoisie

This is a class of students, teachers, lawyers, journalists, doctors, nurses etc. Although not well off it is just comfortable. Classically, it is not associated with revolutionary fervour. In our country this class consists of both Whites and Blacks. The white members of this class are part and parcel of the white racist power structure and have a vested interest in its perpetuation. Their Black counterparts, however, are subjected to the vile rigours of racism and many of their members have joined the Black liberation struggle. The leadership of the Black liberation struggle is provided largely by this class. Its revolutionary zeal and participation was amply demonstrated in the 1976 uprising and the continuing resistance by our people to the White oppression.

(5) The Proletariat

This is a class of wealth-producers. The workers whose existence depends entirely on the selling of their labour to the capitalists for a wage. Classically, it is the most revolutionary class in society. In our country it consists of both

Blacks and Whites. The white components of this class have not escaped the all pervasive racist mania. The white working class vote and work to promote and maintain the present racist set-up which is affording them benefits they can only have by keeping the Black man oppressed. Traditionally and classically, trade unions promote and protect the interests of all the workers against the evil machinations of the capitalist exploiters. In South Africa, the white Trade Unions have ganged up with the white capitalist and Government to trample the Black worker. Together, they have fashioned laws, regulations and traditions that have reduced the Black worker to a neoslave. Furthermore, almost every white worker is an employer of a Black man as a so-called maid, garden boy etc. Thus all White people, be the capitalist or workers, have a common interest in keeping the Black man as poor and voiceless as possible.

Now, with the white worker as thoroughly reactionary as this, where does the "logic" of the apostles of the "unity of all white and black workers" lie? How can a black worker even start approaching a white worker, who insists on being called "Baas", to discuss problems they do not have in common. In fact, the Black and White workers are each other's problem. The blinker-wearing socialists refuse to see all these.

They refuse to accept the B.C. view that the only workers in South Africa are the Black workers, and that the bribed White working class should be regarded as part of the enemy. Presently, the white capitalists and their State, having been alarmed by the resilience of the Black worker and his unrecognised Trade Unions have decided to change tactics and strategies. They will now register black unions in order to emasculate them. We all know how hysterical the white worker is in his opposition to the move, simply because he believes the black worker will be able to threaten the privileged position of his white counterpart.

(6) The Lumpen Proletariat

It consists of the won't works. It is a class that completely refuse to work within the morality of capitalistic system. For capitalists and their State, this class is a constant headache and menace. The huge security fences around properties, the night watchmen, the burglar alarms etc. are all provided in honour of this class. Well over 90% of all the inmates of prisons are members of this group.

In our country it consists overwhelmingly of Blacks. Due to its hatred of authority of any kind, this class is at all times ready to participate in the Liberatory struggle, as demonstrated by its role in the 1976 uprisings. The only drawback about this class is its general lack of integrity and hence its coupling of participation in the struggle with other purely criminal acts like looting for personal gain.

(7) The Rich Peasantry

It consists of those who are able to produce a surplus from their limited agricultural activities who might even hire others to assist with related chores. The surplus is sold. In our country this class consists mainly of Blacks in the rural areas. It is a very small class indeed and it is largely severely restricted by the unavailability of land for the expansion of their farming activities.

The 13% land allocated to Blacks in this country hits the class particularly hard. Like other Black classes, it thoroughly loathes Apartheid.

(8) The Poor Peasantry

This consists of those peasants who can hardly make a living from their meagre and poor farming activities. It consists entirely of Blacks in the rural areas of our country. It is from this class that the bulk of the migratory labourers are drawn. In fact, this class leads a dual life somewhere between the peasantry and the proletariat. It leads a particularly harsh and miserable life away from its family associations — crowding the devilish hostels.

Having glanced briefly at these classes, it is clear that the South African situation defies the normal or classical class orientations. Almost in toto, the White working class has defected to the capitalist class and operate as such politically and economically.

On the other hand, none of the Black classes plays its traditional role, due, largely, to the all pervasive monster called white racism. Black people tend to see themselves, not in terms of economic classes, but in terms of their experience as an oppressed and exploited group.

At this time BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS is facing an onslaught from both left and right but resisted it.

Having seen the situation for what it objectively is, Black Consciousness offers itself as the only viable and appropriate vehicle Black people can ride to final victory and freedom.

2. Black Working Class Struggles

"The collective awakening of the Black workers to their historical role in the liberation struggle could herald a new epoch". This collective awakening has been frustrated for centuries through the history of Black labour in the South African situation. There is a need on the part of the exploiter and the oppressed to frustrate and delay this inevitable labour revolution within the South African situation. White minority, domination, capitalism and oppression are parasites which strive on exploitation of Black labour. They are nourished by the bitter sweat of the Black working class. Hence the ideological practical imperatives to maintain and retain the present status-quo. The Wiehann and the Riekert Commissions, the resulting developments in government policies and the present draft bill on labour as well as the new labour dispensation, are the response of the government to the growing strength and militancy of the mass of the workers, as shown by the Natal strike of 1973; the Ford strike in Port Elizabeth; the Sigma Plant strike in Pretoria; the Black Municipality Workers Union strike in Johannesburg and recently the newspapers strike by the Media Workers Association of South Africa.

The government response to the labour situation must be seen from their policy of total strategy. The government has set out amongst other things to destroy the political potential of the Black labour force by co-opting a section of the labour force into a semi-white mode of existence. The new labour dispensation give to the black working class:

- a) access to some white jobs. (Blacks can now be allowed into managerial positions in the so-called Urban Areas).
- b) Semi-Permanency in white areas. (The 99 year lease-hold and the granting of powers to the Building Societies to grant loans for the purpose of building and buying of houses).
- c) Intercity mobility.
- d) Local municipality status.
- e) Trading rights in the so-called neutral zones of non-segregated business zones where multi-racial companies could be built.

If these issues are not properly analysed, they can retard the progress towards National emancipation and bring confusion within the working class. The government material concession to the workers is a form of ideological domination which results in the submissiveness of the Black labour force because the government offers *not a radical change but an immediate ma-*

terial need. This therefore leads to accommodationist attitude amongst the black working class. This will perpetuate the absence of militancy amongst Black workers. By allowing workers to have access to the official bargaining machinery, the government has succeeded in imposing restrictive control on the workers movement.

What does the Government see in this New Strategic Labour Move?

In the past, the South African government has been the subject of international pressure because of its denial to grant the Black working class union rights because of apartheid policies. Various labour organisations in the third world countries have been pressurising international organisations like the International Labour Organisation to boycott South Africa because of its draconian policies. Various other Patriotic forces have through the United Nations and Organisation of African Unity urged foreign governments to embark on trade and economic sanctions against South Africa. Because of the new labour dispensation the government hopes to improve its image and credibility in the eyes of the international community. It hopes to create a new attitude, an attitude of a flexible government and thus there will be more investment. This new created image will paralyse the campaigns of disinvestments and render redundant prospects of sanctions and boycotts. Internally, the new labour dispensation gives the urban labour force a stake within the system and ipso-facto it converts them into the defenders of the oppressive system - now liberal - now oppressive. The new labour dispensation debilitates the workers from going on strike when they see fit. Now the workers can only go on strike on government terms.

Counter Strategy

Now that the workers can organise openly it gives them an opportunity to form unions and to consolidate their labour movements. These moves have been pushed onto a new threshold of their collective consciousness of being a power that can challenge the unholy alliance between the government and management. The Black working force can challenge management on: working hours, job conditions promotion, wages, equal pay for equal job etc. On the other hand they can challenge the government's right to make laws for them when they have no say in the formulation of such laws.

Workers through an organised labour movement can challenge the government's interference in their freedom of association which the government introduces through an extension of the prohibition on political activities (in Trade Unions) to include bodies not covered by the present provision to be effected by the new proclamation. The workers can challenge the government's right to legislate on their behalf when they have no vote to determine the course the country must take. Thus the problem of rising prices in all commodities without equal increase in terms of wages and salaries, unemployment, high rental increase in residential areas, lack of residential accommodation be-

cause of acute shortage of houses, increase in train and bus fares, lack of industrial training facilities to enable Black workers to improve themselves in terms of skilled labour. All these and many others will sharpen antagonism rather than create stability. By granting union rights to the Black workers, the government at last conceded - what they have been denying all along - that the black working class has a right to bargain. It is important for the liberation movement to develop workers' consciousness and militancy which will ensure that the bargaining power is used to the advantage of the liberation struggle as a whole in demand of fundamental socio-economic and political change.

3. Education & Liberation

Education is a process towards liberation. Liberation is ultimately the humanization of men. To be human is to engage in relationships with others and with the world. Man is a being of relationships. He is not only in the world but with the world. Men relate to their world in a critical way. Men transcend a single dimension of mere internal "todays". He looks critically at the past, understands the present and moves towards the future, as if permanently asking "where do I come from, where am I, and where am I going". The role of man is not a passive one. He participates in the creative dimension as well as intervenes in reality in order to change it. Thus the liberated being, the humanized man is able to perceive reality, the contradictions that lie therein and thereby respond to solve these contradictions on the basis of his perception.

In a state of oppression man is a dehumanized thing, an adapted being. He has lost his ability to make choices, he is subject to the choices of others, his decisions are no longer his own, they result from external prescription. The adapted man represents the most weak form of self-defence. If man is incapable of changing reality he adjusts himself instead. Adaptation is symptomatic of man's dehumanization. The adapted being accepts his submission and servility through the historical experience of the oppression of men by men. The oppressor introjects his values, his external authority into the being of the oppressed whereby the oppressed internalizes this and thus develops a consciousness which "houses" oppression, which creates what we often call "slave mentality" or colonial mentality. This then, is what we refer to as men as "object".

Education that is liberatory is that which integrates men with reality. Integration is a distinc-

tively human activity. Integration results from the capacity to adapt oneself to reality plus the critical capacity to make choices and to transform that reality. The integrated person is a person as Subject as opposed to an adapted person as object. The Subject person is a participant of change, a liberated being who is architect of his destiny. This then is what we call a conscientized person.

Education should be a process of extrojecting i.e. to destroy myths and values introjected into the oppressed by the oppressor to maintain and perpetuate his position of privilege.

In this respect we must avoid being sectarian. Liberatory education and sectarianism are incompatible. Sectarianism is predominately emotional and uncritical. It is arrogant, anti-dialogical and thus anti-communicative. The sectarian disrespects the choice of others, he tries to impose his own choice on others. Herein lies the inclination of the sectarian to activism: action without the vigilance of reflection; the sectarian sloganizes, which remains at the level of myths and half truths, and attributes absolute values that which is relative. The liberatory educationist rejects activism and submits his action to reflection.

The sectarian whether rightist or leftist sets himself up as the proprietor of history, as its sole creator, and the one entitled to set the pace of its movement. Rightist and leftist sectarians are similar in imposing their own convictions on the people, whom they thereby reduce to mere masses and objects. For the sectarian the people matter only as a support for his own goals. They are not supposed to think. Someone else will think for them, their relationship with people is either that of blatant contempt (rightist) or pa-

tronising. They still think of us (leaders, students etc.) and them (workers, and peasants). Sectarians can never create a truly liberating revolution because they themselves are unfree.

The liberatory educator on the other hand is truly a radical. He is subject to the degree that he perceives the historical contradictions in an increasingly critical fashion, however, he does not consider himself the proprietor of history and while he recognizes that it is impossible to stop or to anticipate history, he is no mere spectator of the historical process. On the contrary he knows that as a subject he can and ought, together with other Subjects, to participate creatively in that process by discerning transformation in order to aid and to accelerate them.

Education towards liberation is not restricted to institutionalized education as the school or university. It is a process which takes place in every aspect of life, whether it is the factory, the home or the street. It aims at transforming men from being mere objects submerged in reality to that of being subjects and active participants of history and change.

It recognizes the school and other such institutions created by the system as mirrors which reflect the oppressive society we live in. Liberatory educationists believe that instead of educators or teachers we have co-ordinators, instead of lecture, where pupil or educator is regarded as a receptacle for useless facts, we have true dialogue, instead of alienating syllabi, relevant learning experience to reflect upon. Hence, the move is doing away with a leadership clique which is prevalent in most societies. The aim of education is not to create a leadership divorced from the people, but rather a leadership which co-ordinates the action of the people. Leadership should be like a froth on a wave, dependent on the wave, which represents the people, forever moving, forever renascent.

Curriculum and Syllabus

The dominant ideas of any society are those of its ruling class. It arrogates to itself all areas of government and means of enforcement thereof and thus is able to organise society so as to entrench itself and keep in subjugation the other classes. Education is one of the weapons in a vast array at its disposal to preserve the status quo. It is clear therefore that no fundamental change in education is possible without change of the ruling class and the sweeping away of the values and norms they represent.

Our own ruling class has its origins in the Western Power Elite –the colonies of Africa, the plunderers of its resources, the enslavers and

merciless exploiters of its people. They are the local caretakers and junior partners of the Western-Power-Elite and like all caretakers and junior partners develop grandiose ideas of its own status and of its powers over a subjugated and oppressed people. Society in all its facets is so regimented to maintain and bolster this insecure ruling class and undermine the progressive forces of the oppressed. Education, in its curricula and syllabi, is just one facet of the oppressive regimes amouring to maintain its position in society. It is clear therefore, that this ruling class cannot effect any meaningful change in the interest of the oppressed. This change can only be brought about by the oppressed when it has achieved national liberation. The contradictions of the oppressive regime must inevitably lead to its collapse under the pressures of the oppressed. The dominant ideas of the new society will be those of the liberated oppressed. These ideas will not arise phoenix-like from the ruins of the oppressive society but will grow, as it even grows now, as the national liberatory struggle gains momentum.

1. Criticism of Existing Curricula

Within the framework of the above criticism of the oppressive regime we can enumerate some of the ways in which the curriculum maintains the status quo.

i) No attempt is made to meet the needs of Society as a whole. On the contrary, the schooling provided for the oppressed is intended to enable them to acquire the minimal standards to create the wealth of the ruling class and to perpetuate their own kind to sustain this process.

ii) It develops the individual to fit into the existing establishment and hence entrench the social divisions and dominance of the ruling class. The existing curricula are presented as the ideas of an enlightened and highly educated class. Those who dare to challenge them in any fundamental way are branded as radicals, non-conformists, non-scholars and extremists who are totally unacceptable to "society".

iii) Those who are close to the establishment and who conform to the prevailing social norms of the ruling class and uphold its "ideals" as enshrined in curricula, are rewarded as the enlightened and highly educated class. It thus builds in its own defence mechanism.

iv) The history, traditions, values and norms of the conquered are given such minimal attention so as to entrench the idea that these are the history, traditions, values and norms of an inferior and backward people. This psychological and spiritual demolishing of the oppressed has

the temporary effect of making the ruling class less vulnerable to being overthrown.

v) The history, traditions, values and norms of the ruling class is given such prominence as to invoke the belief that these represent the height of human civilization throughout the ages. It encourages each and every member of the caretaker and junior partner establishment to fraudulently claim the accumulated knowledge of all mankind as the creation and property of its own "white group".

vi) It bolsters the value system in which theoretical academic pursuit is the height of intellectual development and the natural objective of the leisured and monied classes, while artisan and technical training is for the lesser intellects and naturally the pursuit of the working classes. Even in this category the oppressed is denied access to certain avenues as this may undermine the privileged position of the white worker, which he enjoys by virtue of the exploitation of the black worker.

CRITICIS OF EXISTING SYLLABI

The norms and objectives of the curricula are pursued in the individual syllabi. Here too, no fundamentally meaningful changes can be made without change of the curricula and indeed in the total re-organisation of society. We may cite the following general areas of criticism of the syllabi.

i) The study of Language, and of the English Language in particular, is the study of the literature and culture of the Western Power Elite or of the local establishment. The emphasis this receives leads inevitably to the interference that this literature and culture represent the values to which society and every learned person should aspire. The study of African Languages is justified, when at all, on purely utilitarian grounds. The very minor position given to this, inevitably leads to the ideas that it represents an inferior culture. What is superficially treated "must be superficial and not worthy of serious pursuit".

ii) The study of History is the study of the success of our conquerer over the conquered; the sufferings of a courageous people at the hands of uncivilised hords; the taming by hardworking, dedicated people of a hostile environment; the torch bearers of an enlightened civilization uplifting the "natives". The exploitation and enslavement becomes heroic deeds of teaching the dignity of labour and curbing the wandering, marauding and plundering ways of the natives.

iii) The study of Geography is by and large the

study of the resources of the country as discovered by the colonisers; the development, exploitation and distribution is the study of the accumulation of capital in the hands of the ruling class. It does not study the unequal distribution and exploitation of resources to meet the needs of the vast majority of the population. It does not study the distribution of disease in the relation to the provision of resources and amenities. It does not study the unequal development of manpower resources and the creation of labour reservoir or the dumping of "Excess" labour in inhospitable regions without the facilities for keeping body and soul together.

iv) The study of the Sciences is geared to the needs of large scale industry and agriculture on meeting the wants created by the social ruling machine rather than in the service to the population as a whole. The medical sciences devote fantastic resources, human and physical, to meet the "needs" of a small elite and the academic and the monetary aspirations of the individual medical practitioner. The needs of the vast majority of the population is only superficially met if at all. Thus we can have Kwashiokor, Cholera, Tuberculosis and other social diseases widespread amongst the oppressed while highly specialised medical centres serve a minute fraction of the population with the wealth to pay for this special attention. Highly developed veterinary services are provided for the pets of the wealthy but mediocre and minimal veterinary services are provided for the peasant farmers in the rural areas.

v) The study of the Mathematical Sciences is geared to the needs of the physical sciences. Hardly any attention is given to the role it can play in the social sciences to meet social problems. It is presented as an academic pursuit suitable for the academically orientated person and as if it has no bearing on the lives of workers other than in a few rudimentary arithmetic calculations.

THE NEW CURRICULA AND SYLLABI

The new curricula and syllabi will be dictated by the forces brought into being in the process of the existing oppressive social order swept away by the national liberatory movement. The oppressive society must inevitably collapse under the weight of the liberatory movement and in its place must arise a new social order in which the oppressed become the dominant group in society. No detailed educational programme can be worked out at this stage. Thus for example we cannot now speculate on the programme of the re-education centres that must come into being. We can, however, say

that the new curricula and syllabi must set new values and norms.

- i) Service to the community as a whole.
- ii) Develop the potential of all the people in service of the community.
- iii) Examine the needs, resources and social, political and economic development of the country as a whole and its relationship to Africa and the World.
- iv) Develop the human personality in full relation to the above.

Bearing in mind the limitations mentioned above the new educational institutions should provide for the following transitional training:

- a) Provide training to produce highly qualified and motivated manpower who could effectively grapple with the problems of the country in its

social, political and economic facets.

- b) Provide the technically qualified and socially motivated manpower to implement development ideas.
- c) Provide training at an essentially in-service level to raise the level of manpower and give the social motivation in order to create a social base which makes (a) and (b) possible.

The aims and objectives of the new educational institutions shall of course be determined by the Constituent Assembly of the new society which must arise as the present minority white oppressive regime falls apart and collapses in ruin. A new nation with new ideas is already being born and when it fully sees the light of day it shall write the detailed educational programme.

4. Why AZAPO Rejects a National Convention

by **GEORGE WAUEHOPE**

Today it is an open secret that the idea of a National Convention was mooted as far back as 1978. Individuals from various organisations, Black and White ranging from church, welfare services to political organisations came together. Concerning the political organisations all except one or two are working within government created institutions. What I must stress is that this people came as individuals with no mandate from their respective organisations. Due to the attacks, especially Azapo's rejection of a National Convention, this movement has been renamed the Constituion Movement, and its task is to draw a new acceptable constitution for this country. A questionnaire to this effect has been drafted by Dr. Van Zyl Slabbert leader of the PFP.

The initiative in this move was taken by the Black Sash and all the monthly come togethers were chaired by their chairperson Mrs. Joyce Harris. Two things that must be enlightened are:

- 1) This move is a result of the 1976 aftermath
- 2) it comes immediately after the banning of 18 B.C. organisations in 1977.

1976 gave birth to liberal organisations like the Urban Foundation, whose main objective was to diffuse and to blunt Black anger and militancy of the oppressed Blacks by promoting middle class aspirations for the maintenance and sustenance of capitalism.

Similarly the Black Sash seems to have exploited the bannings of BPC and Saso specifically and started this move of an internal settlement thereby trying to promote a South African Muzorewa. The PFP also joined the bandwagon for similar reasons.

Again we have the case of liberals entering our struggle at leadership level rather than at grassroots level, deciding what is good for us, fighting our struggle for us thereby giving a white head to a Black body.

We are here faced with a total onslaught and it is imperative that we know what we are fighting for and who we are fighting against. We must be able to tell our genuine friends from our genuine enemies. In order to do this we must have a clear and concise revolutionary thinking. We must have absolute ideological clarity, be coherent and comprehensive. Those who want to participate in the struggle for liberation must therefore ask themselves whether they want to be reformists, revisionists or revolutionary.

We know that reformists abandon their original principles and expect others to do the same. Revisionists add to or modify their original principles. Whilst revolutionaries are fighting for the complete overhauling of the system. I leave it up to you to decide on which of these three categories the National Convention move falls.

This brings me back to the basic tenor of

Black Consciousness viz, that in South Africa today there is only one class of people who have nothing at all to lose if the present system were to be radically changed in such a way that the present white ruling class disappears as a ruling class, and that class is the Black working class. It alone can look at the situation without any qualifications or reservations. It alone can question. The holy-cow not only of the so-called petty apartheid but of the socio-economic system of the total onslaught. The Black worker has nothing to lose but the chains that bind him in the form of pass laws, influx-control, migratory labour, inferior education, rent hikes, bus fare hikes, forced resettlement, evictions, detentions without trial, banning orders, banishment, death in detention and all the myriad of South African oppressive laws.

In short, the rank and file Black activist is the crucial lynchpin of the workers' organisation. He is in the struggle not because of moral obligation, nor because of pangs of conscience but because he really lives and feels the agony of oppression. It is therefore he, who because of ideological commitment, faith and wisdom in the organisation, will continue with his valour in the struggle because of practical knowledge and experience he has acquired in the quagmire of oppression.

The present initiative for a National Convention comes from quarters that have ulterior motives and have certain privileges that they want to protect. Hence the harnessing and grooming of Black leadership that they will manipulate at will.

At the present moment negotiations are out in South Africa. Firstly our non-negotiable is one man one vote in a unitary state. The white minority settler regime speaks of one man one vote in the so-called National states, i.e. the Bantustans.

Dynamics of Black Thinking in Azania Today

Black consciousness emerged 10 years ago as the most important development in black South African politics following the banning of nationalist organisations in 1960. A few black consciousness proponents have recently called for the movement to abandon its exclusivist stance by opening its ranks to whites. But the proposal is meeting fierce resistance in black consciousness ranks. LETSATSIS MOSALA, national organiser of the Azanian People's Organisation (Azapo), outlines the black consciousness standpoints and argues against integrationist moves.

Black consciousness is a national response on the part of the oppressed black majority against domination, oppression and exploitation by the white settler community.

It is also important to note that the proponents of the National Convention reject the President's Council not because of principle in the sense that it does not grant the franchise to the dispossessed, but because "Africans" are not included in it, and being a government created institution the President's Council is a non issue to us.

The preconditions that Azapo would lay before entertaining any ideas of attending a National Convention would be:

1. It should be about the means of transferring complete power and the land to the indigenous owners of it.
2. All political prisoners should be freed, the banned unbanned, the banished unbanished, and amnesty granted to the exiles which act would be a de facto recognition of the authentic leaders of Azania.
3. Structural violence in the form of influx control, migratory labour, enforced resettlement, detentions without trial, deaths in detention, banning orders, evictions, rent hikes, transport hikes, police harassment, unprovoked baton charging and teargassing etc. should come to an end.
4. The historical political organisations such as ANC, PAC, and BPC should be party to the talks.
5. The attack on our brothers at the borders should come to an end for we believe that the people who have resorted to the armed struggle have done so because of frustration that their protests and complaints have fallen on deaf ears.
6. There can be no negotiations between non equals.

From the foregoing, it is clear that time is not yet ripe for a National Convention and that it is an exercise in futility.

In a society like South Africa, with its high level of socio-economic and political stratification, the birth and development of an ideology that tends to unite the oppressed along their

common experience is inevitable.

In a situation where the "white settler group" is seen to be oppressing and exploiting the black nation because the black nation belongs to a race different to that of the "white settler group" it is logical and inevitable that the exploited black nation would and should seek redress from such a situation as a nation and all its activities are bound to be organised along such lines.

The national response against domination and exploitation manifests itself in black consciousness which is a philosophy for national liberation on the part of the oppressed blacks.

Philosophies and ideologies do not have an independent existence, but are from beginning to end a social product.

The social products that led to the birth and development of black consciousness as a philosophy for liberation still exist, namely:

- (i) Domination by the „white settler community" that denies black meaningful participation in the administration of their country.
- (ii) Racism which declares black people third class citizens in the country of their birth.
- (iii) Exploitation of the black people by a capital which is concentrated in white hands. Blacks have been reduced to perpetual beggars in the face of so much wealth.

Their lives are deliberately rendered unstable by forced removals into arid unproductive land and the vigorous application of influx control laws so that they can provide the much needed cheap labour.

Black consciousness arises out of life and thus reflects black people's struggle to create meaning in life in a country that has denied them humanity for over 300 years.

Since domination, racism and exploitation are aberrations from normal human behaviour, this extreme dehumanisation and exploitation of black people has created its own antithesis, that is, those on the receiving end have been transformed into a unit that must destroy the aberrations.

While we must make distinctions between the „social element of thinking" ~ sociology of knowledge and „political element in thought" ideology –we must realise that „consciousness" is a social product as Professor Anna Stark put it.

Black consciousness takes the black experience as a source for its starting point. The black experience is the experience of a people

who have been dispossessed of their land and stripped of their political power.

Political power is concentrated exclusively in white hands.

That is the reality of the South African situation and that reality is mirrored in the lyrics of this African song:

"Thina Siswe Esimnyama. We the black nation. Sikhalela iswe lethu. We cry for our country. Elasthathwa ngabamohlopho. Which was taken by the whites. Mabouw yeke umhlaba wethu. Let them leave our country."

That bitter cry from more than 19-million black concretises the conflict in South Africa.

The conflict is about the land issue and political power.

It is the conflict between the landless, impoverished exploited black nation on the one hand and the "white settler community" which wields power over and above the black majority on the other hand.

The dynamics of black consciousness as a philosophy for liberation in South Africa have taken the philosophy out of its introspective phase.

The introspective phase gave black people a chance to indulge in self-reflection and self-definition that resulted in self-affirmation as a people.

As the Rev Buti Tlhagale says: "It is therefore quite clear that awareness as such was merely on preparation for the struggle against domination. Awareness as such could not reverse the process of discrimination... It had therefore become imperative, in the light of the built-up self-confidence, not only to challenge the State and the dominant classes but also to work out strategies which enable the black community to achieve its aim of regaining its right to South Africa."

Azapo, the main black political organisation operating above-board in South Africa today, has taken black consciousness beyond the phase of black awareness into the class struggle.

It has taken into cognisance the fact that black people are exploited as a nation in South Africa.

The fact that black people were dispossessed of their land which is the basis of any economy (mining and agriculture depends on ownership of land) indicates clearly that the proletarianisation of the black people was a planned process.

Blacks were to provide cheap labour for white capital. The introduction of Bantustans

as "cheap labour camps" for the so-called white South Africa was the logical culmination of oppression and exploitation.

The enactment by the white Parliament of Section 10 of Act 25 of 1945 coupled together with the job reservation laws clearly demonstrates a calculated controlled process to protect white capital and white privileged positions.

Since the task of a philosophy is not merely to interpret the world but to change it, black consciousness seeks a radical transformation of the South African situation.

Transformation requires the dismantling of the unjust economic system which has reduced blacks to impoverished, starving masses.

The toiling black masses, which constitute 70% to 75% of this country's labour force, can use their labour power to bargain for fundamental change in this country. This implies mobilisation of black workers and development of workers' consciousness.

What is the position of white workers in the South African situation? It is very important for the proponents of black consciousness to answer this question because it has caused so much confusion.

Rev Tlhagale says: "From a political viewpoint, whites are seen as a potential supportive class to the power block." They are protected by Parliamentary Acts (job reservation) against fair competition from black workers in the labour market.

Throughout the labour history of this country white workers have struck when their privileged positions were threatened by fair competition from black workers, example of which was the 1913-14 Gold Fields revolt, 1922 Rand revolt, in 1979 mine workers union threatened to go on strike if the job colour bar were removed within the mining houses, and recently the Government was forced to reject the main recommendations of both Wiehahn and Riekert Commissions simply because of pressure from white trade unions.

"The co-option of white worker classes into the capitalist relations at the level of petty bourgeois places in the division of labour was facilitated by a common consciousness of a sense of belonging, of racial identity and the belief in the superiority of Western civilisation," says Rev

Tlhagale.

If we examine the structures which employ the so-called poor uneducated whites like the SA Railways, Escom, the Post Office, etc. we will find that whites are in the supervisory roles. They are clearly on the side of management.

At the most we can call them "labour aristocrats".

As Mr. Tom Manthata (a leading black consciousness proponent) has indicated, any white who claims he is oppressed is living in a fool's paradise.

Alliance between white labour aristocrats and the black proletariat is impossible in the South Africa situation, hence the practical imperatives that blacks be galvanised into united front in opposition to white domination.

The calls for opening the ranks of black consciousness to whites cannot be accepted.

Azapo's significance is for the black working class, based on grassroots leadership and with a programme for society as a whole.

This is completely different from the change, envisaged by the integrationists, which creates a middleclass black who feels protected by the maintenance of capitalism.

Integration of this type means blacks accepting white institutions, norms and values, with the implication of black inferiority.

Whites who appear sympathetic to the black cause more often than not want to form alliances on a leadership level, rather than joining at grassroots level. They thus want to fight our struggle for us by giving us the lead.

Exclusivism in the black consciousness context must remain so long as oppressive and racist white institutions remain, since only white political parties have the choice to rule.

Black consciousness as an ideological binding force is bound to prove its resilience simply because economic and political domination are primarily structured on racial lines.

We in the black consciousness movement advocate an open egalitarian society where skin pigmentation will not play a part, but we also believe that the tactics to achieve liberation won't necessarily be the same with those required to reconstruct the new society.

Role of the Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa: Part II

The role of whites in the Azanian liberation movements is again being stirred up by the Charterists and the colonial mass media. Their representatives from the missionaries, to liberals like Alan Paton, to "communists" like Bram Fischer have always attempted to integrate us into the colonial and imperialist system, either in the name of Christianity, liberal values or socialism. But we are little interested in their sympathy or charity. Invariably they deny the colonial nature of Azania, advocating a socialism that liquidates the national question, take up multi-racial positions, are thoroughly impregnated with bourgeois or petit bourgeois ideology, divide and rule us in the liberation movements in the same manner as the imperialists using the power of their monies and privileged access to resources, and are never free from white chauvinism in different varieties. This article, the second part of the "Role of the Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa", gives us some valuable lessons about the role of "progressive" missionaries when Christianity was in the forefront of the conquest of the African peoples.

The British next aimed their attack at Hintsa, paramount chief of the Gcaleka, who had rich lands and many cattle beyond the Kei River. To the south of him, the maNdlambe, the maNgqika and other Xhosa tribes were being squeezed into an ever-narrowing strip of territory; to the north-west of him were the baThembu, to the north-east were the maMpondo and to the north of them was another pressure of tribes one upon another, driven south by certain developments among the coast tribes.

It is not part of this history to look into the forces responsible for the rise of the war-like chiefs of the people later known as the maZulu. But their rise seems to have been connected with a new development that was taking place at this time in the tribal system itself. The period of the vast movement of Bantu tribes from the north had come to an end. Land to the south was no longer inexhaustible and the tribes had halted at the Indian Ocean. This circumstance produced a change in the social fabric of the Bantu, a change that was accelerated by other forces, such as contact with the Mohammedans and Arabs who came in their sailing ships along the east coast, and the growing trade that the chiefs engaged in. All these things had a profound effect on the existing tribal organisation and was felt as far afield as the Cape Colony. Tshaka himself was a product of these far-reaching changes, which supplied the conditions for the operation of his military genius. As a result of these developments some sections of tribes moved southwards and among these were the maHlubi, the maBele and the maZisi, who were sections of the maMbo. They were also known as amaFengu, and to the English as the "Fingos", a name which we shall use for convenience. According to traditional Xhosa custom, when these tribes asked for land and pasturage from Hintsa, it was granted them. While they had their own chiefs and councillors, they gave him allegiance as paramount chief.

It was to these "Fingos" that the Wesleyan missionaries were to turn their particular attention.

The Wesleyan missionaries seem to have been a remarkable able body of men, ready at all times to co-operate with the Government, which in turn expressed high appreciation of their services. About the middle twenties they had started laying their chain of mission stations among the Bantu tribes. The Rev. William Shaw first established Wesleyville beside the Gqunukhwebe chiefs, Phatho and Kama; the mission station at Mount Coke placed another missionary beside the aged chief Ndlambe; then followed Butterworth, which brought the Rev. Shrewsbury and then the Rev. John Ayliff close to Chief Hintsa; Clarkebury placed another among the baThembu; at Morley the Rev. Shepstone, father of Theophilus Shepstone, a future Minister of Native Affairs in Natal, was beside a Mpondo sub-chief, while at Buntingville the Mpondo chief, Faku, was brought under the eye of the Rev. William Boyce. The effect of this was to surround the paramount chief, Hintsa, on all sides.

It will be remembered that, by winning over Ngqika, the London Missionaries had effected the first breach in the Xhosa ranks. In the 1818 war against Ndlambe, Ngqika alone had been on the side of the British. It was now the task of the Wesleyans to effect the second breach in the Xhosa ranks, and then a third, and both of these were to have serious results in the coming attack on Hintsa.

The Rev. William Shaw, as he himself claims, succeeded in gaining an ascendancy over the chiefs Kama and Phatho, one of his first converts being Kama's wife, who was a daughter of Ngqika. These chiefs were persuaded that the missionary could intercede on their behalf for the recovery of their land, which had been lost to them through the treaty forced on Ngqika.

"I promised I would present their case before the Colonial Government, if they stopped marauding", reported the Rev. Shaw in a letter to the Colonial Secretary. The result was that they were allowed to re-occupy grazing land in the poorest part of the "Ceded Territory" – on condition of good behaviour." Here indeed the missionary had procured for them the proverbial stone where they had expected to receive bread. Nevertheless the price was a heavy one. For the Rev. Shaw contrived to bring them to the side of the British in the subsequent war against Maqoma and Hintsá. The Rev. Boyce in his "Notes on South African Affairs," written after the war, was able to record with high satisfaction that those chiefs who had resisted the British, namely, Maqoma, Botomane and Tyhali, were those who had been "alienated from their proper missionaries and natural advisers (the Wesleyans)... by the injudicious interference of Dr. Philip," who had held out to them "extravagant expectations" of the recovery of their land. On the other hand, "the chiefs whom the Wesleyan missionaries saved from this injudicious tampering, *took no part in the war.*"

Rev. John Ayliff and the Fingos

Nowhere have we a clearer example of the tactics of "divide and rule" than in the way the Rev. John Ayliff drove a wedge between the Fingos and their natural allies, the Gcaleka. At Butterworth, the mission station became the very symbol of tribal division. First Ayliff persuaded one of Hintsá's chief councillors, who was a Fingo, to stay at the mission station. He used some of the christianised Fingos as his messengers and informants. He also succeeded in christianising Hintsá's chief wife, Nomsa, whose son he had cured of a sickness. He was aware that a sympathetic woman could be used to protect Europeans, if the occasion should arise. Thus Christian was divided against non-Christian; the Fingos were separated both from their non-Christian brothers and from their natural allegiance to the paramount chief. And that was not all. Ayliff, in his communications with the Governor, described the Fingos as "held in the most degrading bondage" (though elsewhere he stated they had large numbers of cattle). This was a most pernicious falsification on the part of the missionary. The system of slavery was completely foreign to the Bantu at this stage. And it was not likely that a chief of all the maXhosa would marry his daughter to Njokweni, the young Zizi chief, if in his eyes he was a slave.

It must be said that Ayliff acted with jesuitical cunning in driving a wedge between the Gcaleka and the Fingos. One may well ask how he gained the ascendancy he did over the Fingos and persuaded them to look on the British as their "protectors." There is no doubt that their particular circumstances laid them open to his influence. They had been uprooted from their territory and their settled way of life; in their journeyings south they had known privation. Hintsá had given them land and pasturage, but they had not yet become a part of their new surroundings. The process of integration into the Gcaleka tribe, which was normal in such cases, was not completed when the Gcaleka themselves became affected by the pressure of the white man's aggressions from the south. In this unsettled state, the missionary could the more easily play upon the minds of the Fingos. They who had so recently been refugees would the more quickly fear the threat of a new insecurity, and all too readily believe in the promises of "protection" under a powerful nation such as the missionary would describe, a nation which itself received (as he would say) the special favours of Divine Providence. No doubt he would read to them from the Scriptures the story of how the Israelites – wanderers like themselves – received the divine promise of a land flowing with milk and honey.

Hintsá had at first merely tolerated the presence of the missionaries. In a letter to the Governor, D'Urban, Ayliff had to admit the chief's obvious aversion to foreign doctrines. But in the general state of uneasiness after the outbreak of war, with Maquoma's people fleeing before the British soldiery, Hintsá's suspicions were fully aroused and he removed himself from the vicinity of the mission station at Butterworth. He seemed anxious to avoid war and did what seemed to him the wisest thing. On this point Ayliff had something to say to the Governor:

"He (the chief) viewed us in the light of agents of the Colonial Government and nothing more than colonial spies."

Ayliff went on to say:

"The chief was able to keep me completely in the dark as to the whole of his proceedings, and from his messengers passing through Butterworth to different parts of the tribe I could get no information."

In spite of this admission of ignorance, he presumed to state that:

"During the progress of the war we sometimes heard that Hintsá gave direct encourage-

ment to the hostile chiefs to proceed."

Of course, the point is not whether Hintsá did or did not act in such a way as paramount chief of all the maXhosa. What we are concerned with is the way the missionary identified himself with the interests of the Government while professing to be the "friend" of the Africans.

The campaign to blacken Hintsá was in the hands of the missionaries. It was now expedient *to regard him as paramount chief, where previously the title had been thrust on an unwilling Ngqika, with what dire results we have seen.* Hostile incidents between traders and Africans, though in themselves trivial, were used in order to pin responsibility of the war on the chief. In this connection it may be of some interest to observe the methods employed by the missionaries in assisting the Government.

A trader who had beaten an African was found murdered, whereupon letters passed between the Rev. Ayliff, the Rev. Shepstone and the Rev. Shrewsbury, all of whom had lived in the vicinity of Hintsá at one time or another. The Rev. Shrewsbury, passing on the information to the Commissioner for Albany, reinforced his suspicions by quoting the opinions of the Rev. Shepstone:

"Mr. Shepstone states it as his conviction from what he has heard (though he mentions no particulars) that Hintsá, the chief, is the real murderer."

And again:

"Mr. Shepstone did not express the opinion from any circumstance that came under his own observation or that has come by others, but from an intimate knowledge of the Caffre chiefs generally, and of Hintza in particular."

Then in passing on the missionary's letter to the Governor, the Commissioner, in turn, explained that:

"Mr. Shrewsbury states as his opinion that *the property to be obtained by the killing of Purcell (the trader) was a sufficient motive.*"

As these men of peace were accustomed to describing the Africans as "irreclaimable thieves," *these absurd conclusions are not surprising.* Subsequently, the Governor, D'Urban, used the very form and language of these missionary communications to justify to the Imperial Government the ferocity of his attack on Hintsá.

The Wesleyans at this time showed themselves such willing agents of Government that it is difficult to separate out the military aspect of the campaign from those that more particularly

concern the missionaries. By April, 1834, D'Urban was ready to enter Hintsá's territory. At the beginning of the month four divisions of the army under Colonel Harry Smith, assisted by Colonel Somerset, had "scoured" the country of the maXhosa to the base of the Mathole mountains, from where Maqoma and Tyhali defied the British with their guerilla tactics. The undermining of Hintsá's position had been in the excellent hands of the Rev. Ayliff. The Rev. Davis, at Clarkebury, had contributed further to this process by negotiating on behalf of the Governor with Fadana, chief of the Vusani Thembu, and persuading this tribe to the rear of Hintsá to accept the "friendship" of the British and assist with troops if called upon to do so. A similar treaty had been made with Faku, chief of the maMpondo.

Halted at the Kei River by a councillor of Bukru, Hintsá's brother, the Governor bade him tell the Chief that he had no intention of acting in a hostile manner, provided his commands were obeyed, namely, to cease assisting the Ngqika chiefs. Hintsá was given five days in which to answer. But the chief saw no reason to answer. How could one answer the presumption of command on the part of a foreign intruder into one's territory? The hollow sham of these formalities was evident from the fact that the British troops moved on without pause during these five days, until they reached Butterworth.

At this point the Rev. Ayliff took action. Calling the Fingo chiefs together, he persuaded them to agree not to support Hintsá, to defend the missionaries and traders if they should be attacked, and to act as his couriers to the military commanders.

Soon afterwards a body of Gcaleka and Ngqika warriors came past the mission station, calling to their brothers: "The English soldiers have fled, the farmers have left their farms, the cattle are wandering over the land waiting to be gathered. Come and join us!" But the voice of the missionary prevailed over that of their own people. Ayliff advised the Fingos to go to the British camp as soon as the Governor arrived and "seek protection" as subjects of the King of England. Then he himself fled to safe sanctuary in the mission station at Clarkebury.

Thanks to the Rev. Ayliff, 16000 Fingos (according to his own figures) delivered themselves *into the hands of the enemy without a blow.* He enabled the Governor to write at this juncture to the Home Government that he "had freed a grievously oppressed race of 15000 souls from slavery... living in a state of degradation and oppression difficult to describe."

The profits of the transaction are best described in these further words of the Governor, addressed to the Colonial Secretary in London:

"The Fingos are an acquisition of incalculable value to the Colony."

He pointed out that they "would assist his measures in the present war." And again:

"This supply of hired servants, especially for all farming purposes, will be of the greatest benefit to the community."

He proposed to

"bring them back to the Colony . . . and settle them in the present uninhabited and worse than useless district between the Fish River and the Lower Keiskamma . . . They will soon convert it into a country abounding with cattle and corn . . . They will furnish the best of all barriers against the entrance of Kaffirs into the Fish River Bush . . . and will afford the Colony a supply of excellent hired servants."

The Governor went on the expatiate on the great benefit to the White settlers of this "liberation" of the "Fingo race". He underscored the benefit from the military point of view:

Being now well disposed to fight against the Kaffirs . . . they will become the best militia for the protection of that tract of country which for 25 years has been the vulnerable part of the Colony."

The Fingos, then, were persuaded to join the British forces and they drove off large numbers of Hintsas' cattle. At the end of the war they were marched off to a location near to a British fort, Fort Peddie. Ayliff himself described it as "naked, unimproved land," but in his first address to them as their appointed missionary, he reminded them of what "Christianity and the Governor had done for them." But some of them, we are told, were so disillusioned with what they found, that they returned to the Gcalaka.

And what was the nature of their so-called liberation? They were the first Africans to be placed in a Reserve, and under such impoverished conditions that they were forced to seek work as hired servants to the farmers who were now swarming like locusts into the land of maXhosa. A missionary and a magistrate were placed in jurisdiction over them. The first missionary at Peddie was the agent of their "liberation", namely, Ayliff. As we shall see later, it was on them that the first experiments in "Native" policy were carried out. The need for a new labour force was growing with every new seizure of land. War was slowly bringing that labour force into being. The missionaries, however, had engineered the peaceful capitulation of a large bo-

dy of potential labourers. And the Fingos supplied, as it were, the first raw material for the working out of Government policy, which would then be applied in full once the ravages of war had released the full flood of men seeking food and work.

The capitulation of the Fingos was not the only achievement of the missionaries in this war against the Xhosa chiefs. But before picking up the thread of their activity we have to return to the scene of the war itself. After the Fingos had handed themselves over to the Governor, Colonel Harry Smith and Colonel Somerset proceeded apace with their devastations of Hintsas' territory and within a few days the chief came to interview D'Urban, Hintsas' action was consistent with his statement that the war was not his war, and it is clear that he looked to the White man to respect the honour and safety of a chief. Yet he must have been aware of the fate of the warrior-prophet, Makhanda, who, believing that he could save his people from further destruction, had come to consult with the British commanders, only to be seized as a prisoner. Neither Makhanda nor Hintsas seem to have been sufficiently acquainted with the fact that aggression knows no law.

Hintsas was treated virtually as a prisoner who had come to "sue for peace". Aggression was capped with a violent "peace" declaration and a "Treaty" which made Hintsas responsible for the resistance put up by Maqoma and the other Xhosa chiefs, and therefore demanded, through him, their immediate surrender. With a fine extravagance of language the invading Governor declared that the chiefs, "having without provocation or declaration of war, invaded and plundered the Colony, and having now been defeated, chastised and dispersed," were sentenced as "treacherous and irreclaimable savages" to be "forever expelled" from the country west of the Kei River.

The violence of the Governor's language in this, his May Proclamation 1835, echoes that of several missionaries who subsequently constituted themselves as his praise-makers for his "humane conduct of the war". In a public address they stated that

"The Kaffirs . . . most wantonly, cruelly and ungratefully commenced this war with a people who sought and desired their welfare and prosperity."

D'Urban announced the acquisition of a new province, Queen Adelaide. He also "rewarded" the Fingos and the maGqunukhwebe — the sections who had been persuaded by the missio-

naries to break away from their natural allies – with Reserves in the territory already confiscated from the maXhosa. Maqoma, however, had not yet capitulated. By the Governor's army was not large enough to enforce expulsion; his volunteer forces were those very burghers who wanted to settle down and reap the fruits of their plunder. The Governor was becoming impatient; the colonists were clamouring for more land, and events now moved with the violence of the time.

D'Urban demanded from Hintsá a hostage as guarantee that the terms of his "peace treaty" would be carried out. The chief, who was being mulcted of 50 000 head of cattle in addition to those already seized, offered himself and his son, Sarili, as hostages and accompanied the British forces under Colonel Harry Smith, in order to facilitate the rounding up of the cattle.

The full facts of the tragedy that followed will never be known. But it is one of the most shameful incidents in a long history of rapine and plunder. Hintsá was brutally murdered "while attempting to escape". From evidence subsequently given before the Aborigines Protection Committee which instituted an enquiry into the "Hintza War", it seems that, as a party of British soldiers, with the chief in their midst, were making their way on horseback towards the Ngabara River, information was received from Colonel Somerset, who was busy rounding up cattle at Butterworth, that the Gcaleka were attacking the Fingos, who were assisting Somerset. In other words, the missionary-fanned feud was well and truly begun. The Governor seized this news as a pretext to turn on his voluntary hostage and threaten him with hanging. The effect of this threat on the chief need not be described. Hitherto he had borne himself with restraint and forbearance. It may be that he did make a desperate attempt to escape. Whatever the truth, it is clear that the savage spirit that hunts the quarry to the death took possession of his pursuers, for his body was found by his people at the water's edge, mangled and mutilated.

An enquiry was subsequently held, but, as one would expect in such cases, the British officers involved were "honourably absolved" of the deed. A contemporary commentator calling himself "Justus", made the following observation:

"The enquiry can have but one termination, for it is arranged by the persons implicated and the witnesses are Hottentots or soldiers who know only too well the consequences of accusing their superiors."

Now the worst excesses of devastation were let

loose on the people of Hintsá and justified on the grounds of the chief's "treachery". Gorged with destruction, the British soldiery made their way back to the Colony.

"Peace-Makers"

Strange to say, the Xhosa chiefs in the Mathole mountains did not obey the commands even of their murdered leader (i.e., in terms of the "Treaty"), though the Rev. Ayliff stated, and the Governor in his despatches repeated, that he had been the "instigator of the combination among the chiefs". Military expenses were mounting, the farmers were clamouring to take over the newly confiscated territory, but the Xhosa had still not surrendered. And now the Wesleyan missionaries stepped forward to fulfil yet another function in the service of the Government. An attempt had been made to persuade Maqoma to come and meet representatives of the Governor. He refused. Then Major Cox, accompanied by a missionary, waited upon him in the Mathole. They came and departed unharmed, but with an emphatic "No," to the suggestion of a treaty. Something had to be done to induce them to surrender. The Governor had an able and shrewd adviser in the person of the Rev. William Boyce, who, together with the Rev. Shepstone, and young Theophilus Shepstone, concocted a plan. Apparently it was the young Theophilus, the future administrator, who suggested the idea of making use of African women to circulate the rumour of the Governor's intended "clemency" towards the chiefs. It is noteworthy that the missionaries made a point of first winning over the women. Witness the case of Nomsa, Hintsá's chief wife, who was said to befriend Ayliff when Hintsá's anger was stirred against him; and Suthu, Ngqika's widow, who protected Wesleyan missionaries when they feared attack during Maqoma's attempt to recover the lost territory of his fathers.

The Rev. Boyce, then, outlined a plan or trick to the Governor as follows: the Rev. Shepstone, the missionary with chief Phatho, who had been induced to withhold his support from Maqoma, was to find women of the Gqunukhwebe tribe willing to carry certain messages to their relatives among the resisting maNgqika. The Rev. Boyce made it clear that it would be best to make use of the women to convey a "secret" message, which, he said, "would answer the desired end without in the least committing Your Excellency . . . by leading the chiefs to form extravagant hopes as to terms." Then he went on to explain the nature of the message:

"Mr. Shepstone will send to Maqoma and Tyali, thanking them for orders to spare his life, and, *by way of recompense*, will commiserate their present distressed condition, and, *as their friend who wishes them well and as missionaries desiring peace*... will advise them to send to Your Excellency to ask for mercy." It was to be added that "their expulsion beyond the Kei could perhaps be avoided" – if they surrendered. The shrewd Christian diplomat, however, considered it necessary to put a threat in the tail of this offer of mediation.

"At the same time" (he explained to the Governor) "the chiefs will be told that Your Excellency intends to prosecute the war with the utmost vigour, and if they resist, they may be certain of destruction. But *we will say we will venture to intercede for them*... Then Your Excellency can negotiate with them *unfettered by any promises*." (Our emphasis.)

This plan, so eloquent of petty cunning, speaks for itself. Small wonder that the Governor referred to this missionary piece of work with the highest commendation:

"In a further part of this Despatch" (he wrote to Lord Glenelg, Colonial Secretary), "I shall show Your Lordship how efficient these Wesleyan missionaries were... in enabling me to effect my purpose... of at length bringing the savages of the Amatola to negotiation."

Yes, the plan worked. In their desperate position, the Xhosa chiefs were persuaded to believe that the missionaries would intercede for them. They were informed that "if they agreed to become British subjects and submit to restraints in a few small particulars, the Governor would grant them peace." But these "few small particulars" were no less than the dispossession of their land and measures for still further undermining their position.

In the traditional language of the liberal, the Rev. Boyce reported that:

"At the earnest requests of the chiefs, they desired to be British subjects."

Furthermore, "at the special request of the chiefs", they, the Wesleyans, were to be placed on a commission that was to deal with the treaty.

For the chiefs, such a request could only have one meaning: they were persuaded that the missionaries would act on their behalf. For the missionaries, identified as they were with the aims of the Government, the meaning was the very reverse.

Since the Wesleyans had drawn up the plan of

negotiation, it was natural that the Governor should get their assistance in drawing up the clauses of the treaty. On this score there is no reason to doubt the Rev. Boyce's word. Briefly, the Xhosa chiefs, while not yet driven over the Kei River, were to be restricted to a small part of their own territory between the Keiskamma and the Kei. The Conditions for this severely restricted occupation were: that they gave up their arms and became British subjects under the laws of the Colony, and that they held themselves responsible for "cattle-theft." The last and very important condition was that they had to accept missionaries and Government agents or magistrates.

"Native" Policy

This last point touched the very core of the problem facing the agents of a Christian capitalist civilization, namely, to undermine the tribal system from within. From this point of view the Treaty of September, 1835, was an important one because it envisaged so much more than fixing the temporary limit of land-plunder. It considered the subjugation of the Africans on a broader basis and embodied the beginning of a deliberate "Native" policy. In fact, the policy here envisaged was almost identical with what Dr. Philip was trying to negotiate with Maqoma when the military situation had become explosive – only now the chiefs were more vulnerable to the application of that policy. The intervening months of war facilitated its enforcement.

It was to be expected that the all-important question of "Native" policy was being hammered out by a number of different people simultaneously. In this instance it seems to have been the work of Colonel Smith assisted by the heads of the Wesleyan mission. Precisely because it involved a question of "Native" policy, the hand of the missionary was evident in the September Treaty, for the Government perforce made use of those who knew, and could influence, the Africans.

To impose a magistrate and a missionary on the chiefs meant to hasten the process of tribal disintegration, which in turn paved the way for the next stage of military conquest. Actually these were two aspects of a single process. The confiscation of land increased the necessity to accelerate the break-down of the old system and incorporate the Africans into the new system as labourers. In the early stages the military machine had been enough; the first necessity was to get hold of the land. But now a stage had been reached when ways and means had to be found for precipitating the process of breaking down. In other words, a "Native" policy had to be

evolved. The treaties that were worked out in 1834-36 anticipate to a remarkable degree the system that is usually ascribed to Sir George Grey twenty years later. The earliest formulation of it on record occurs in the already quoted discussion between Dr. Philip and Andries Stockenström. The Wesleyans made their contribution to it in their various communications with the Governor about the years 1835-6, and when the so-called "Stockenström Treaties" were adopted in 1836, he, as Lieutenant-Governor of the Eastern Districts, was applying the same basic policy as already fully discussed between Lord Glenelg, Secretary for the Colonies, and Buxton, who were in consultation with Dr. Philip. The fact that these various agents were together responsible for the working out of "Native" policy simply demonstrates what we have elsewhere mentioned — their common identity with the aims of British Imperialism. As agents of a Christian capitalist civilization their activities converged to the same end.

Once again, a little more detail will serve to illuminate the temper of the time. In the general anarchy of the situation in 1834-36 the war atmosphere had been whipped up to explosive point; there had been the alarms of Maqoma's attack and protracted resistance; the greedy land-grabbers were waiting to take occupation, but there were the delays occasioned by the unavoidable slowness of communication between the Governor and the Home Government. Added to this there were rumours of an official enquiry into the conduct of affairs, with Dr. Philip once more in the role of arch meddler. (His position as confidential adviser to the Governor had been taken over by the Rev. Boyce and he himself was in London holding talks with Buxton.) *In this situation the missionaries were particularly vocal and ready with advice on how to deal with those whom they termed the "rebellious Kaffirs."* There were several occasions during the war when they acted quite simply as Government spies handing on information to the military officers. But these we shall pass over.

It is more pertinent to see how the heads of the Wesleyan mission expressed themselves. As D'Urban's confidential adviser, the Rev. Boyce naturally covered a wide field, discussing points of military significance as well as "Native" policy. He advocated the presence of a large military force; with a military officer as Lieutenant-Governor near the "frontier." He suggested reinforcing the cleavage between the Fingos and the *maGqunukhwebe* and the rest of their peo-

ple. "They might be partially armed as an irregular militia," he wrote. "In the event of war with other tribes they (under European officers) would be found to render far more effective assistance in putting down aggressions than double the number of regular troops." Towards the Xhosa chiefs who had agreed, through him, to accept "peace" negotiations, he proposed a chastisement that vied in severity with that of his master, Major-General Sir Benjamin D'Urban. With his knowledge of African custom, he pointed out that a fine of ten head of cattle should be imposed for every beast stolen. Therefore to exact only one from the "rebel" Xhosa might be dubbed by them as British weakness or stupidity. This would never do. But since the *maXhosa* had already lost thousands of cattle, the missionary had to admit it would be rather difficult to seize more. Instead, he proposed compensating the "suffering colonists" with grants of land between the Keiskamma and the Kei. Here is as pretty a piece of logic as one would meet anywhere in the annals of British aggression. Even that ruthless military officer, Colonel Harry Smith, was moved to remark that: "The man of the gospel is after all a worldly fellow . . . more full of dragooning our new subjects than a hundred soldiers."

In his "Notes on South African Affairs, 1834-1838," the Rev. Boyce wrote as a chronicler of events in which he himself took part. Here he summed up the "Native" policy of the Government at the end of the 1835 war. It aimed at "the subversion of the kaffir political system by the transference of supreme power to the British Government." The power of the chiefs was completely neutralised by the new system, "which made the people "subject to the supremacy of British law."

Since the European magistrate would take over the chiefs' function of imposing fines, the chiefs would be "recompensed with a small salary."

"A most important purpose would thus be effected," concluded the Rev. Boyce, "namely, the influence of the Chiefs would cease to exist."

Now let us hear what the head of the Wesleyan mission, the Rev. William Shaw, had to say, for he was an able man. In his Introduction to "A Defence of the Wesleyan Missionaries in South Africa," he wrote: "The Wesleyans believe that the interests of the two classes, aborigines and colonists, are not incompatible. Nay, it is essential to the safety of both classes that a kindly feeling should grow up between them."

How often have we heard these sentiments in the history of the exploitation of the Non-Europeans? The same man who used these classical liberal phrases did not hesitate to describe the Africans as "irreclaimable thieves". There is a very illuminating letter of his addressed to the Colonial Secretary on the war of 1835 ("On the Late Irruption of the Caffres.") In it he stated first what he considered to be its causes. Calling himself a "friend of the Caffres," he nevertheless felt it his duty to state that: "As to the cause of these collisions between Caffres and colonists . . . the chief one . . . is . . . the moral state and habits of the Caffre tribes . . . They are very much given to carrying off the cattle of their neighbours."

This he ascribed to "their imperfect moral perceptions, deeply rooted habits and defective mode of government."

In the same letter, after pointing out that so far there did not exist a single written treaty, he proceeded to set forth his proposals for dealing with the situation. Most of these were embodied in the September Treaty of 1835. These were:

- (1) Annexation of land to the Keiskamma, including the whole of the disputed "Neutral Territory." (He meant Ngqika's land.)
- (2) The "reward" of the Gqunukhwebe chiefs by putting them in their original territory on condition that they placed themselves under the "protection" of the British Government and became responsible for stolen cattle.
- (3) The use of "friendly natives" as a barrier against other tribes.

The same letter contained an outline of "Native" policy. Shaw advocated the appointment of a Government agent as well as a military governor at Grahamstown and emphasised the necessity for a close co-operation between the local government and the missionaries.

"Let the local Government aid the missionaries," he wrote, adding that the cost of this to the Colony need not be great, since the profits of trade with the Xhosa were already considerable.

Such views were indistinguishable from those that the Superintendent of the London Mission had put forward some years previously. Thus the missionaries vied with one another in their readiness to serve the Government and give them the benefit of their advice. Among the rest, we include the suggestions of the Rev. Shrewsbury addressed to a military officer under the heading of: "Principles to be adopted in reference to the Caffre tribes." They provide a curious reflection on the zeal with which the

missionaries carried out their function. It must be said that even the Colonial Secretary found that these "principles" of chastisement on the maXhosa smacked too much of the Christian zealot.

Here they are:

- (1) "The chiefs who have invaded the colony, to forfeit their chieftainship; and their people to forfeit their country, their arms and their property.
- (2) "Deserters from the British Government who may have taught the Caffres the use of arms, to be punished with rigour.
- (3) "The actual murderers of British subjects . . . to be executed on the spot, that the Caffres may see that murder with Britons is an unpardonable crime.
- (4) "Caffre offenders whose lives may be spared, to be employed in making high-roads in every part of Caffreland, if necessary even to Natal, their labour as convicts being a visible proof of the punishments mercifully inflicted on those who might have lost their lives.
- (5) "A universal registration of Caffres to be effected, every man wearing on his neck a thin plate of tin, containing his name and the name of his chief, which will be to him a passport of peace and the absence of it a token of enmity. This will both serve to identify offenders and enable the British Government at once to know the number and strength of the frontier tribes.
- (6) "British agents to reside in Caffreland to carry this registration into effect."

After the missionaries had prepared the ground for negotiating with Maqoma and the other Xhosa chiefs, it fell to Colonel Harry Smith as commander of the forces to announce the "September Treaty" before the assembled chiefs and warriors. As he was subsequently to show when he himself became Governor, he was everready to make use of the missionaries, and to give them due recognition. This is evident in his "peace" oration delivered with a mixture of arrogance and piety in the old British tradition.

"You are now subjects of the most powerful nation, whose laws, manners, customs and institutions are the admiration of the world. Land has been given you.

"Your clergymen have returned to you, hoping to forget your sins in the observance of your penitence. You are taken by the hand and called 'brother' by the inhabitants of the greatest nation under the protection of Almighty God."

In his confidential Memoranda, however,

Colonel Smith unmasked the true aims behind his dramatic speeches. These contained an exposition of the new "Native" policy whereby magistrates were to usurp the function of the chiefs.

"While left to occupy a portion of the land originally belonging to them, the Xhosa people will be distributed into family locations under magistrates. Their system of clanship, by this very arrangement, will be at once broken up, as the power of the chiefs will be seen to have ceased and passed away."

He added that it would be an easy matter to keep control under this scheme, "since military posts are within, around and among their locations."

It is noteworthy that the Government was at pains to disguise from the chiefs the true function of the Government agent (i.e., magistrate) whom they proposed to place beside them. "He must be at once magistrate, monitor and arbitrator," we read, "endeavouring, as far as possible, by acquiring a salutary influence in the two last characters, to avert the necessity of appearing in the former."

On this important point Colonel Smith himself had something pertinent to say:

"By the gradual and gentle process of the measures involved, the chiefs will at length find, before they are aware of it, their supreme power dissipated and divided, and themselves reduced to the more wholesome position of subordinate magistrates... acting under prescribed rules and limits... But it is necessary that they be not startled at the outset, or their eyes opened to the future consequences of the process, until by its advancing force, when they do discover its influence, *they no longer have any power to be effectually restive.*"

"One great political point has been gained," he added, "the disjunction of the tribes."

It may be said that there is no contradiction between Dr. Philip's proposal to rule through paid chiefs and Colonel Smith's proposal to "dissipate and divide" the power on the chiefs. The paid chief is no chief, for he gives up his independence to become the agent of his masters. But the missionary-superintendent was naturally more concerned with the problem of how to govern, while the military man was concerned with the question of how to conquer, and therefore visualised a chief so emptied of power that he could no longer be the military leader of his people.

Now while the Colonial Secretary in London

was still waiting for despatches that would have informed him of the far-reaching plans contained in the September Treaty, those on the spot began putting those plans into operation. The recent upheavals had released a supply of labourers for the White man and it was necessary to put into motion the machinery for controlling them. In other words, the process of integrating a tribal people into the new economy was under way. The Fingos were settled in their locations at Peddie and before long were to fall under a scheme of taxation that anticipated Sir George Grey's more elaborated schemes for increasing the labour force. Colonel Smith, enlisting the help of the missionaries, was pursuing his plans for dissipating the authority of the chiefs. A "Resident Agent" was appointed with each of the tribal groups, and the chief magistrate was the very man whom Dr. Philip had recommended to the Governor when the plan was first mooted. At this time, too, Africans were employed as policemen. So comprehensive were the Government plans, that they covered also the field of education; there were to be additional religious establishments with provision for teaching and training Africans in the "mechanical arts," as they were called. In such a scheme the missionaries were indispensable. Here, in embryo, in 1836, was all the machinery for controlling the African people and transposing them from the old system into the new.

A certain Major Maclean, writing to Colonel Smith to warn him to proceed slowly, said:

"Radical changes can only be effected by imperceptible degrees. . . . In the interim all coercive measures necessary should appear at least to emanate from their own judges and tribunals. (In a particular case under discussion.) I would advise a meeting of the councillors of Sutu (Ngqika's widow), submit to them the cause of the complaint, let them decide to enforce the law, the 'Great Chief' reserving to himself the right supreme to approve, confirm and revise their proceedings and verdict." (*Quoted in "Bantu, Boer and Briton," by W. W. Macmillan*).

With such examples before them, subsequent "Native" administrators had only to elaborate what their predecessors had already so skilfully conceived.

The "Humanitarians" Again

The immediate application of the plans worked out by Colonel Smith in conjunction with the Wesleyan missionaries, was interrupted by the arrival of Despatches from Lord Glenelg,

Secretary for the Colonies, advising the Governor to suspend for the time being the land seizures announced in the May Proclamation. This step has been quite erroneously described as the "Abandonment Policy," resulting from the efforts of the liberals and particularly Dr. Philip with the backing of Buxton in the British Parliament. No doubt the petty landsharks, whose snouts were turned in the direction of the nearest cattle kraal, felt cheated of their spoils, but this does not alter the fact that Dr. Philip and the rest were acting consistently in the best interests of British Imperialism. Philip, while at first supporting the Governor, D'Urban, condemned the complete expulsion of the maXhosa from their territory as decreed by the May Proclamation, since this ran counter to his plans for conciliating the chiefs. So quite characteristically he began sending his voluminous reports to the London Missionary Society with passages marked "To be sent to Mr. Buxton and Lord Glenelg," and subsequently he himself went to London, where he consulted with his supporters and without doubt pressed for the continuance of the Treaty System on which he was already embarked when war had broken out. It may be said that neither he nor Lord Glenelg were yet informed about the September Treaty, which to a large extent embodied their own plans for the subjugation of the chiefs. D'Urban resented their interference, but, like Lord Somerset before him, had to yield to the more progressive sections in Britain, and was recalled.

These internal quarrels were unimportant. The fact that the Colonial Secretary proposed a system of Treaties with the chiefs instead of immediately seizing their land, did not alter by one jot the ultimate subjugation of the maXhosa. Neither did it indicate any humanitarian scruples on the part of the Imperial Government. Apart from the question of the expense of military campaigns, Britain at this stage found it politic to foster the myth of her "protection" of the people she intended to subjugate. Hypocrisy increased with rapacity. It was at the very time when military aggression was forging ahead that the British "Humanitarians" invented the "Aborigines Protection Society" which did much to bolster up this myth of Britain as the "friend" of the "Black races" in her colonies throughout the world. Buxton, its natural parent, at the same time fathered the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines (1836), which instituted a Commission of enquiry into frontier affairs in the Cape Colony. Dr. Philip was requested by Buxton to gather information and "send immediately his own views and opinions," which

were passed on to the Colonial Secretary, Lord Glenelg, and when the Committee met, Philip, Stockenstrom and many others gave evidence.

Commissions come and Commissions go, but the subjugation of the Africans continues without ceasing. Herrenvolk historians solemnly ascribe what they call the "Great Trek" and the split between the two White sections, Boer and British, to the liberal policies of the British Government in their relations with Non-White peoples. In particular they see the "Humanitarians" (Philanthropists) as either the villains who caused the long alienation between the White sections, or as the "saints" who sought to defend the unhappy aborigines. To us neither view is tenable. It is all part of the thoroughgoing falsification of history. It is a static instead of a dynamic approach of events. In a cut-throat competition for world-wide colonial possession, Britain was outstripping her rivals, the French and the Dutch, precisely because of her advanced industrial development and her varied methods of conquest. On the South African arena both White sections were engaged in crushing a tribal people. The Dutch were creeping steadily northwards both before and after the arrival of the British, and British Governors were always sympathetic to their land-grabbings. Under these circumstances the majority of the Dutch knew that their interests were well protected by the British. The Trek Boers were the die-hards, who were given rein as long as they didn't endanger the British advance into Africa.

Today we are in a better position to understand what lay behind Lord Glenelg's so-called "Abandonment" policy and the substitution of new treaties with the chiefs. To put it down to missionary-liberal-humanitarian agitation is acceptable only if we understand the true function of the missionary and the other liberals acting in the interests of British Imperialism. If politicians suddenly discovered the "obligation of trusteeship to the aborigines" and spoke in terms of a "high moral trust", we may be sure that the lever behind this elevation of language was political expediency dictated by economic necessity.

In this connection we may quote an interesting answer to an interesting question that was put to Andries Stockenstrom when he was called upon to give evidence before the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines already referred to. Stockenstrom was asked which of two systems, "that of controlling the natives by an overwhelming military force" . . . or . . . "entering into amicable relations . . . would be the

cheapest. . . . Which would be the most likely to extend the influence of Great Britain among the native tribes?"

To this he replied: "Most decidedly, I should think, trade and commerce . . . the greatest power that Great Britain has been able to exercise. . . ." This question and answer flowed from a common approach to the whole problem of conquest and the purpose of that conquest. Here are the Commission's conclusions:

"The oppression of the barbarous countries is, in point of economy, of security, of commerce, of reputation . . . a shortsighted and disastrous policy. It has engendered wars, in which great expenses were necessarily incurred . . . and banished from our confines or exterminated the natives, who might have been profitable workmen, good customers and good neighbours."

This is followed by the oft-repeated herrenvolk refrain which equates colonial conquest with the dictates of divine providence:

"The British Empire has been signally blessed by Providence, and her commerce, her strength, her wealth, her prosperity, her intellectual, her moral and her religious advantages, are so many reasons for peculiar obedience to the laws of Him who guides the destinies of nations. . . ."

In this finely-balanced blend of sharp business sense, arrogance and piety, we hear the very voice of the English middle-class. Here we have the fount and origin of Dr. Philip's emphasis on a new "Native" policy, on peaceful penetration, civil administration and trade, all drawing the tribal African into the orbit of the economic system of the invaders. Armed with this sound economic outlook, he was the perfect agent of the industrial and mercantile classes of England.

But if we took such statements as indicating an abatement of military aggression in 1836, we would be very much mistaken. We today, for instance, know how much truth there was behind Smuts's statement in 1942 that "Segregation had fallen on evil days," uttered not long before a full-scale attack was launched against the few remaining rights of the Non-Europeans. We today do not, again, make the mistake of judging the nature of the United Nations Organisation (U.N.O.), the instrument of imperialist machinations between the First World War and the Second, on the strength of its grandiloquent Preamble to the Charter of U.N.O., drawn up by no less than General Smuts under the title of "Declaration of Human Rights," which begins thus:

"Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world;

"Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed the faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women; . . ."

"Now, therefore, this General Assembly proclaims this universal declaration of human rights. . . ." etc.

There is a cynical effrontery in such high-sounding public statements made by the Prime Minister of a country that denies human rights to four-fifths of its population.

The so-called policy of "Abandonment" of Xhosa territory, then, was actually the preparation for the next stage of land-seizure. Stockenstrom, on Philip's recommendation, was made Lieutenant-Governor of the Eastern Districts, with express authority to make new treaties with all the Xhosa chiefs, as well as with the Thembu and the Fingo. (Even a chief so far distant as Mzilikazi was persuaded in this year, 1836, to sign a treaty of "friendship" with Britain.) Stockenstrom put the case for the treaties pretty clearly when he indicated that outright annexation might provoke resistance "if applied prematurely to self-contained Bantu tribes," and expressed the hope that the chiefs would ultimately "be glad to throw up their independence and embrace British supremacy." Dr. Philip, also, having marshalled his arguments against military governors, seems to have thought that he had succeeded too well if any of the territory confiscated by D'Urban was going to be given up. "I wish it to be understood," he wrote, "that I do not object to the extension of the colonial boundary to the Kei River, provided the lands are secured to the Caffres as has been the case in all our conquests in India."

So we are back once more to the plan evolved by Dr. Philip for treaties "on the Indian model." This in effect was what the Colonial Secretary proposed in place of D'Urban's land seizure, and one must say that these proposals were as closely akin to the plans that Colonel Smith was already carrying out, as the Nationalist policy of Apartheid is to the Segregation policy of the United Party today.

In place of Smith's magistrates there were to be "resident agents with diplomatic powers." (The actual taking over of tribal authority by the magistrates would be the next logical step.) There were to be missionaries stationed with the

chiefs, and, of course, there would be the traders. In other words, all the instruments of tribal disruption. And these agents were to be backed by the presence of the military. In place of Colonel Smith, butcher of Chief Hintsá, was Andries Stockenstrom, friend of the missionaries, who had routed Maqoma from the Kat River valley. The tribes were to be permanently under *martial law*, for all were agreed that the "peaceful" treaties could not otherwise be carried out. This needs no explanation. "The administration of justice was left to the Commandant (Stockenstrom) and his soldiers." On the vital points of land and cattle the maXhosa were placed at the mercy of the invaders. There was the arrogant proviso that land was to be re-occupied "on good behaviour." The Government had the right to place military forts where it pleased. The chiefs were made responsible for "cattle-thefts." This was to ensure a state of perpetual disturbance with the frontier farmers, to whose interest it was to find a pretext for the next "war," i.e., land-seizure.

It is not for us to lament with the liberal historians that the new treaty system "was launched under the most unfavourable conditions" because Stockenstrom, appointed through the influence of the "Philanthropic Party," happened to be at loggerheads with a military governor who was resentful of divided authority and in league with the land-greedy frontiersmen. Once again it was merely a question of a clash between two sets of imperialists, those with the longer and those with the shorter vision, the advocates of peaceful penetration and the freebooters. D'Urban called the Treaties "nothing but waste paper." Stockenstrom retaliated with the very significant observation that all was peace, except that the Governor had set the Fingos and the Xhosa at one another's throats, whereas, under Hintsá, *there was no feud.*"

The function of the treaty system can further be judged by its results for the Whites. Professor Macmillan ("Bantu, Boer and Briton") records that "there was a fresh development of Kafir mission work." He goes on: "Above all, the early forties were a time of boom and of rising prices in the much-complaining Eastern Province itself." To this Professor Walker, in his "History of South Africa," adds:

"When all is said and done, property on the frontier had doubled in value and doubled and doubled again since the inauguration of the Treaty System. . . . There was a boom in wool. . . . But wool would have been non-existent without a good measure of security."

Farmers who swore that the maXhosa, and

the Khoikhoi of the Kat River Settlement, too, were preparing to eat them up, were paying high prices for sheep-farms bordering on Xhosa territory.

With this boom in the wool industry went an increased demand for "Native" labour and it was ready to hand, not only from among the Fingos, but from among the Xhosa and other tribes. The long period of military devastation was producing the desired harvest. Now we hear much about passes and the controlling of "squatters." Government agents as well as field-cornets were kept busy issuing passes to the destitute Africans. Mr. Fynn, the Government Agent with the baThembu, reported that streams of Bantu were passing through to seek work in the Colony.

"No description of servants or such an abundant supply," he said, "could be so well suited to the wants of the frontier farmers. The colonists are materially benefited and many a native is saved from famishing."

Out of anarchy the pattern of the new society is beginning to emerge. The widespread upheavals of military devastation are creating a new labour force which is already assisting in the more rapid development of the economic system of the British invaders. At the same time, the insecurity and consequent demoralization of the Bantu tribes provides a ready soil for the infiltration of the ideas of the missionaries. This in turn leads to a further disruption of tribal authority and tribal unity.

It need not surprise us to read that, with Stockenstrom's resignation from his position as administrator in the Eastern Districts, "the last thing to receive consideration was the proper administration of the frontier. . . . even the attention of the Philanthropists being all but completely diverted from the Kafir frontier." (Macmillan.) The Philanthropists were by this time busy further north.

"Praise-Makers"

Events have carried us away from the Wesleyan missionaries, but this does not mean to imply that they were not extremely active throughout, both on the Xhosa front and further afield. In the year of grace, 1836, they had yet another mission to perform on behalf of the Governor, D'Urban. Though the latter had been winning golden opinions from the frontiersmen for his barbarous conduct of the war against Maqoma and Hintsá, Lord Glenelg had mildly censured him and D'Urban was in high dudgeon, since he blamed these censures on the meddling pen of

cheapest. . . . Which would be the most likely to extend the influence of Great Britain among the native tribes?"

To this he replied: "Most decidedly, I should think, trade and commerce . . . the greatest power that Great Britain has been able to exercise. . . ." This question and answer flowed from a common approach to the whole problem of conquest and the purpose of that conquest. Here are the Commission's conclusions:

"The oppression of the barbarous countries is, in point of economy, of security, of commerce, of reputation . . . a shortsighted and disastrous policy. It has engendered wars, in which great expenses were necessarily incurred . . . and banished from our confines or exterminated the natives, who might have been profitable workmen, good customers and good neighbours."

This is followed by the oft-repeated herrenvolk refrain which equates colonial conquest with the dictates of divine providence:

"The British Empire has been signally blessed by Providence, and her commerce, her strength, her wealth, her prosperity, her intellectual, her moral and her religious advantages, are so many reasons for peculiar obedience to the laws of Him who guides the destinies of nations. . . ."

In this finely-balanced blend of sharp business sense, arrogance and piety, we hear the very voice of the English middle-class. Here we have the fount and origin of Dr. Philip's emphasis on a new "Native" policy, on peaceful penetration, civil administration and trade, all drawing the tribal African into the orbit of the economic system of the invaders. Armed with this sound economic outlook, he was the perfect agent of the industrial and mercantile classes of England.

But if we took such statements as indicating an abatement of military aggression in 1836, we would be very much mistaken. We today, for instance, know how much truth there was behind Smuts's statement in 1942 that "Segregation had fallen on evil days," uttered not long before a full-scale attack was launched against the few remaining rights of the Non-Europeans. We today do not, again, make the mistake of judging the nature of the United Nations Organisation (U.N.O.), the instrument of imperialist machinations between the First World War and the Second, on the strength of its grandiloquent Preamble to the Charter of U.N.O., drawn up by no less than General Smuts under the title of "Declaration of Human Rights," which begins thus:

"Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world;

"Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed the faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women; . . ."

"Now, therefore, this General Assembly proclaims this universal declaration of human rights. . . ." etc.

There is a cynical effrontery in such high-sounding public statements made by the Prime Minister of a country that denies human rights to four-fifths of its population.

The so-called policy of "Abandonment" of Xhosa territory, then, was actually the preparation for the next stage of land-seizure. Stockenström, on Philip's recommendation, was made Lieutenant-Governor of the Eastern Districts, with express authority to make new treaties with all the Xhosa chiefs, as well as with the Thembu and the Fingo. (Even a chief so far distant as Mzilikazi was persuaded in this year, 1836, to sign a treaty of "friendship" with Britain.) Stockenström put the case for the treaties pretty clearly when he indicated that outright annexation might provoke resistance "if applied prematurely to self-contained Bantu tribes," and expressed the hope that the chiefs would ultimately "be glad to throw up their independence and embrace British supremacy." Dr. Philip, also, having marshalled his arguments against military governors, seems to have thought that he had succeeded too well if any of the territory confiscated by D'Urban was going to be given up. "I wish it to be understood," he wrote, "that I do not object to the extension of the colonial boundary to the Kei River, provided the lands are secured to the Caffres as has been the case in all our conquests in India."

So we are back once more to the plan evolved by Dr. Philip for treaties "on the Indian model." This in effect was what the Colonial Secretary proposed in place of D'Urban's land seizure, and one must say that these proposals were as closely akin to the plans that Colonel Smith was already carrying out, as the Nationalist policy of Apartheid is to the Segregation policy of the United Party today.

In place of Smith's magistrates there were to be "resident agents with diplomatic powers." (The actual taking over of tribal authority by the magistrates would be the next logical step.) There were to be missionaries stationed with the

chiefs, and, of course, there would be the traders. In other words, all the instruments of tribal disruption. And these agents were to be backed by the presence of the military. In place of Colonel Smith, butcher of Chief Hintsá, was Andries Stockenstrom, friend of the missionaries, who had routed Maqoma from the Kat River valley. The tribes were to be permanently under *martial law*, for all were agreed that the "peaceful" treaties could not otherwise be carried out. This needs no explanation. "The administration of justice was left to the Commandant (Stockenstrom) and his soldiers." On the vital points of land and cattle the maXhosa were placed at the mercy of the invaders. There was the arrogant proviso that land was to be re-occupied "on good behaviour." The Government had the right to place military forts where it pleased. The chiefs were made responsible for "cattle-thefts." This was to ensure a state of perpetual disturbance with the frontier farmers, to whose interest it was to find a pretext for the next "war," i.e., land-seizure.

It is not for us to lament with the liberal historians that the new treaty system "was launched under the most unfavourable conditions" because Stockenstrom, appointed through the influence of the "Philanthropic Party," happened to be at loggerheads with a military governor who was resentful of divided authority and in league with the land-greedy frontiersmen. Once again it was merely a question of a clash between two sets of imperialists, those with the longer and those with the shorter vision, the advocates of peaceful penetration and the freebooters. D'Urban called the Treaties "nothing but waste paper." Stockenstrom retaliated with the very significant observation that all was peace, except that the Governor had set the Fingos and the Xhosa at one another's throats, whereas, under Hintsá, *there was no feud.*"

The function of the treaty system can further be judged by its results for the Whites. Professor Macmillan ("Bantu, Boer and Briton") records that "there was a fresh development of Kafir mission work." He goes on: "Above all, the early forties were a time of boom and of rising prices in the much-complaining Eastern Province itself." To this Professor Walker, in his "History of South Africa," adds:

"When all is said and done, property on the frontier had doubled in value and doubled and doubled again since the inauguration of the Treaty System... There was a boom in wool... But wool would have been non-existent without a good measure of security."

Farmers who swore that the maXhosa, and

the Khoikhoim of the Kat River Settlement, too, were preparing to eat them up, were paying high prices for sheep-farms bordering on Xhosa territory.

With this boom in the wool industry went an increased demand for "Native" labour and it was ready to hand, not only from among the Fingos, but from among the Xhosa and other tribes. The long period of military devastation was producing the desired harvest. Now we hear much about passes and the controlling of "squatters." Government agents as well as field-cornets were kept busy issuing passes to the destitute Africans. Mr. Fynn, the Government Agent with the baThembu, reported that streams of Bantu were passing through to seek work in the Colony.

"No description of servants or such an abundant supply," he said, "could be so well suited to the wants of the frontier farmers. The colonists are materially benefited and many a native is saved from famishing."

Out of anarchy the pattern of the new society is beginning to emerge. The widespread upheavals of military devastation are creating a new labour force which is already assisting in the more rapid development of the economic system of the British invaders. At the same time, the insecurity and consequent demoralization of the Bantu tribes provides a ready soil for the infiltration of the ideas of the missionaries. This in turn leads to a further disruption of tribal authority and tribal unity.

It need not surprise us to read that, with Stockenstrom's resignation from his position as administrator in the Eastern Districts, "the last thing to receive consideration was the proper administration of the frontier... even the attention of the Philanthropists being all but completely diverted from the Kafir frontier." (Macmillan.) The Philanthropists were by this time busy further north.

"Praise-Makers"

Events have carried us away from the Wesleyan missionaries, but this does not mean to imply that they were not extremely active throughout, both on the Xhosa front and further afield. In the year of grace, 1836, they had yet another mission to perform on behalf of the Governor, D'Urban. Though the latter had been winning golden opinions from the frontiersmen for his barbarous conduct of the war against Maqoma and Hintsá, Lord Glenelg had mildly censured him and D'Urban was in high dudgeon, since he blamed these censures on the meddling pen of

Australia – surely apartheid in the extreme and an introduction of the South African Bantustan policy to Australia, a situation the Queensland Government would not tolerate.”

Thus the Australian Authorities now reject apartheid, after using it in the early Reserve system, as it would allow Aborigines to keep some land from the whites and maintain a separate identity.

In Australia, the high standard of living of the whites has always been based on the expropriation of Aboriginal land. All the policies evolved to “deal with” Aborigines have had this as a major element – from “elimination” to “protection” to “assimilation” and “integration”.

Unlike the blacks of South Africa, Australian Aborigines are usually not particularly wanted by whites as a cheap labour force. First, because there are many more white workers than black. Secondly, and more importantly, because Aboriginal values conflict sharply with the Protestant work-ethic.

Individual private property is not a basic social value in Aboriginal society. The Aborigines traditionally live a far more communal style of life, sharing the proceeds of their work with their kith and kin, and with others. They distribute goods according to need rather than rank.

Such attitudes and beliefs can be deeply disturbing or threatening to people imbued with the values of individualism, private property and hard work . . .

In the late nineteenth century, white Australians found it necessary to import South Sea islanders as slaves to work the sugar plantations because Aborigines were “unsuitable” . . .

The way Aborigines respect and use their land is very foreign to the capitalist. He sees it as just “wasteful”.

The Australian assimilation policy was therefore evolved:

1. To secure all of Australian lands and minerals in white hands.
2. To make Aborigines live as whites – and thus possibly make them into workers.
3. To eventually remove all signs of a distinctive Aboriginal race and leave Australia white.

Like Apartheid, it is aimed at maximising the white standard of living – at maximising the profits to be made from blacks and their land.

However, Aborigines do not want to keep their land in order to turn it into a black reflection of European society – with blacks seeing other people and every tree and rock in terms of maximum possible profits. Rather, they want their lands to be communally owned, protected by Elders, a place where they can live as they want to live.

It seems that decisions have been made in many countries to destroy these peoples – at least as land-holding races. This is a natural outcome of seeing these peoples as racially inferior, as useless and unprofitable, and as a hindrance to the maintenance of a high standard of life for the dominant race.

The Brazilian Catholic Bishops in 1973 spoke out in defence of all the Natural Peoples when they said of the Amazon Indian:

“ Without assuming the idyllic vision of a Rousseau, we feel it urgently necessary to recognise and make public certain values which are more human . . . than our ‘civilized’ values and which constitute a true alternative for our society:

1. *The native peoples in general have a system of using land for the community and not for the individual . . .*
2. *The economy is based on needs of the people, not on profit.*
3. *The only purpose of the social organisation is to guarantee survival and the rights of all, not just of the privileged few.*
4. *The educational process is characterised by the exercise of freedom.*
5. *The organisation of power is not despotic but shared.*
6. *They live in harmony with nature.*

The time has come to announce, in hope, that he who would have to die is the one who must live.”

The values of the Brazilian Indians are those, too, of the Australian Aborigine. White Australians can only gain by the survival of Aboriginal Australians and their culture. But for this to happen, land must be returned and Aborigines listened to with respect. This is as yet very far from happening.

For Aborigines, the idea of selling land is far more strange and unthinkable than selling air would be for Europeans.