

Contents

| | |
|---|-------|
| Editorial – P.K. Leballo Expelled: But can the P.A.C. Revive Itself From the Ashes of “Leballoism” | p. 1 |
| China's Foreign Policy – IKWEZI Delegation to China | p. 3 |
| <i>Sobukwe and his Ideas. By S. Motion</i> | p. 6 |
| South African Expansionism and the Problem of Transition. By Tsiu Selatile | p. 11 |
| Neo-Marxism and the Bogus Theory of “Racial Capitalism” | p. 17 |
| The Role of Students and Youth in the Changing Azanian Situation. By Bafana Buthelezi | p. 20 |
| Present Tasks of the Azanian Revolution. From “Isandhlawana” | p. 28 |
| Azanian Marxist-Leninists Respond to B.C.M. Communique | p. 36 |
| Problems of Fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the National Liberation Movement in Africa By Kazu Wamba-dia-Wamba | p. 38 |
| The Wichahn Report and the Black Worker – Black Allied Workers Union (B.A.W.U.) Report | p. 47 |

Help IKWEZI from Grave Financial Problems!

In the past we have made several appeals for financial assistance. But this time our appeal is more urgent than ever. We are facing the most serious financial crisis since our birth four years ago. Ever since we have struggled to produce this Journal and to counter the revisionist lies about the nature of the Azanian struggle, peddled mainly by the ANC-CP and picked up by its revisionist supporters all over the world. For the revisionist South African “Communist” Party and the African National Congress of South Africa which it totally controls there is no problem of publication. Their Journals, the “African Communist” and “Sechaba” are printed free for them, and they probably do not even have to pay for postage. Besides the ANC is one of the richest liberation movements in the world. With us the position is directly the opposite.

We have determinedly produced IKWEZI, not only to counter the multi-racial rubbish of the ANC-CP and to present the truthful position regarding the nature of the national struggle in Azania, but also we are determined to help in the building of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party in Azania to lead the struggle. We have forcefully and in a thorough-going manner brought Marxist-Leninist politics to the Azanian situation, based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung-Thought. We have certainly brought about a clarification on the national question and the nature, content and motive forces of the national democratic revolution that none of our opponents have dared to challenge us openly upon. We have upheld the Africanist Position in the Azanian struggle as correctly reflecting the struggle of the African people for self-determination and national independence. We have exposed the dangers that social imperialism poses to our struggle through the ANC-CP.

But to a large extent IKWEZI has been dependent upon the support of our friends and subscribers abroad. We make an URGENT appeal to them to continue this support, to renew their subscriptions and to help us get other subscribers. This is extremely urgent. There are many subscribers to whom we regularly send IKWEZI, but who have not renewed their subscriptions. We hope that they will do so right away.

Bookstores who order from us are also major defaulters. We are not paid in time by them.

Those who would like to act as agents for us in various centres are welcome. This can go a long way in resolving our financial problem and boosting our sales.

In Britain where revisionist influence is strong IKWEZI has faced much sabotage. Colletts, the biggest left-wing bookshop in Britain has refused to stock our journal. It is perhaps the only Journal in the world which it has refused to put on sale. The Alternative Distributors in England have also refused to reply our letters. All this has badly affected our sales.

Editorial – P.K. Leballo Expelled: But can the P.A.C. Revive Itself From the Ashes of “Leballoism”

The formal expulsion of P.K. Leballo from the Pan-Africanist Congress at a plenary session of the Central Committee must bring a sigh of relief to many P.A.C. members. It was an event long overdue. But nevertheless the great crisis in the P.A.C. can hardly be said to be over. The assassination of David Sibeko has also brought serious questions to the forefront of the organisation.

The exile movements – and particularly the ANC-CP and the P.A.C. – now joined by the B.C.M. – in-exile – have been operating outside the country now for the past twenty years, ever since their banning after Sharpeville. During all this time, despite great international assistance – political, material, financial and moral – they have not contributed an iota towards the liberation struggle inside the country, despite pretentious claims. This was proven by the events of Soweto which completely by-passed them.

The political bankruptcy, corruption and cowardice of the ANC-CP leadership is only too well known. The history of the ANC-CP is a miserable one of tailism and charlatism. Even today dissident members of the ANC-CP are shot in Angola, some are even poisoned and there is fierce repression in the ANC camps, giving rise to serious and grave contradictions between the leadership and rank and file.

But the record of the P.A.C. in exile – and one must make this distinction – is none better, even though that of the ANC-CP is far worse. The simple fact is that the P.A.C. leaderships over the years

have been as politically bankrupt as their ANC-CP counterparts, more interested in forming little cliches, power struggles and building their own private bank accounts. It would be a misnomer to call the P.A.C. an organisation as it has hardly functioned as such. The so-called organisation of the P.A.C. has been the voice of a few powerful people. This “leadership” has been responsible to no one and the elections of the Central Committees have been farcical. Rank and file members are treated with contempt while the so-called “leaders” carry on their international jauntings.

Much of the problems of the P.A.C. has been blamed upon Leballo. His leadership certainly has been disastrous. He failed to unite the organisation and to give it any positive leadership. His style of demagogy (Azanians are swept away by demagogy and rhetoric) influenced the young elements, appealing to their anarchism and adventurism. Consequently he was always able to rally the young, trained cadres against the leadership who had no access to them, a ridiculous situation in itself. In order to cling to his power he constantly created divisions. During his reign the P.A.C. involved itself with Israel, Idi Amin and all sorts of other buffoonery. But the phenomenon of “Leballoism” which has afflicted the organisation for so long and just about paralysed it, goes much deeper, and is to be found in the very manner in which the P.A.C. came into birth.

(“Leballoism” can be defined as rank opportunism, the prostitution of a revolutionary organisation to serve the interests of a small cliché giving rise to splits and an

anarchistic style of work, the lack of clearly defined policies around which to mobilise the entire organisation, demagogy, rhetoric. This style of work which is characteristic of the petit bourgeois has brought the P.A.C. to the state in which it is today.)

The real tragedy of the P.A.C. was that the organisation was banned a year after its birth and an honest and tried leadership could not emerge within such a short time. But it provided a field day for the opportunists, the demagogues who have mastered the art of conning and deceiving with glib revolutionary phrases. This took root when the organisation came into exile and an exile leadership emerged. The clichism, factionalism and struggle for power that has characterised the P.A.C. “leadership” in exile stemmed right from that time. Leballo was able to function in the manner in which he did because he could always get people to toady to him, because there was always somebody who could be flattered and bought with a position in the organisation.

It is this lack of honest people in positions of power in the leadership that is the central tragedy of the organisation.

Ever since, the P.A.C. has not been able to overcome its leadership crisis. Factions succeeded factions with responsibility to nobody except their little cliches. Demagogy and revolutionary phrase-mongering took the place of careful preparation for the struggle and the mobilisation of the masses. They preferred their comfortable bureaucratic positions outside as “leaders” of the struggle. P.A.C.

leaders never respected the rank and file, they engaged in international showmanship, and scores of excellent cadres were destroyed through disillusionment. Rogues and opportunists of the first rank occupied positions of power.

How an honest leadership can emerge from the ranks of the P.A.C. is a moot point. But amongst the rank and file there are those in power who are honest and sincere in their dedication to the struggle, although inexperienced. We hope that from amongst them can begin a movement to purge the organisation, to cleanse it of its opportunistic filth.

But the very nature of the exile movement imposes severe limitations on the P.A.C. An exile movement itself can only be meaningful if it is directly related to events inside the country and is sincerely dedicated to the struggle inside the country. That is also the only source of its legitimacy. But for a long time the P.A.C. in exile had atrophied from being out of touch with events inside the country and only became rejuvenated with the injection of new blood following Soweto. P.A.C. leaders also are subjected to all sorts of manipulation from imperialist agencies who pose as friends and backers of our struggle and throw dollars around. It requires sterling qualities to resist the blandishments of imperialist agents that surround the Azanian movements.

IKWEZI has always supported and stood by the P.A.C. as a national liberation movement in opposition to the ANC-CP. It has done so because it has believed that its Africanist position as opposed to the multi-racial position of the ANC-CP correctly defines the struggle of the African peoples for self-determination and national independence in the country of their birth. We believe that this is a crucial question concerning the direction of the Azanian struggle

approximating to the correct resolution of the national question. We had also done so in the hope that the P.A.C. would be able to correct its mistakes and move forward in the spirit of criticism and self criticism.

But the P.A.C. has yet to emerge as a dynamic and united organisation mobilising the Azanian masses on the basis of a correct policy affecting the national struggle. It is still far from becoming so. Nor must the P.A.C. underestimate the efforts of the social imperialists to de-recognise it.

Now is the time for more responsible elements in the P.A.C. to make a summary of the history of the organisation, to boldly criticise itself and admit its mistakes and failures, and to lay down definite guide-lines for the future of the organisation. If this is not done in a thorough-going manner, if all the blame is merely laid on Leballo, if Leballo merely becomes the scapegoat for serious illnesses in the organisation – that are political, ideological and organisational – then the organisation will be stuck in the same old rut and one can just about forget it making a useful contribution to the struggle.

The P.A.C. must now begin to criticise itself and do so boldly. It does not matter how harsh the criticism, if it purges each and every one of us it is worth it. It will make us better revolutionaries. We must seriously study the examples of other revolutionary struggles and learn their revolutionary style of work that succeeded in uniting the masses around them.

We do not believe that the P.A.C. must be abandoned. We believe that it can be changed and must be changed. The old baggage in the P.A.C.-leadership – and everybody knows who they are, – must be thrown out. Over the years they have proven their

worthlessness. The emergence of a new leadership will only come after much struggle. But the new leadership must have first loyalty to the Azanian masses and the Azanian people. Not to their self-perpetuating cliché, giving rise to toadyism and arse-licking in the organisation. It must bring into the Organisation all those who have a positive role to play and who are dedicated to the struggle. Positions of power must be occupied by those who are fit for them.

There are those who contend that the petit bourgeois nature of the P.A.C. leadership makes it impossible for it to overcome its crisis. There is a great deal of truth in this. The Azanian Black petit bourgeois, the product of a thoroughly colonising education, has special characteristics. Petit bourgeois national movements are always faction ridden. But where are the mature Azanian Marxist-Leninists who can give guidance to the national movement and unite the Azanian masses around it. Marxism in Azania has had a distinctly petit bourgeois flavour. It has been used more as a badge of honour and decoration than as an instrument to build a genuine revolutionary vanguard.

Sooner or later such a Marxist-Leninist vanguard will have to be built, separate and apart from the national movement, if we are to prosecute the struggle on the highest plane.

The time for heroes in the P.A.C. and the Azanian liberation movement is NOW. Heroes endowed with the sterling qualities of honesty, dedication to the struggle, respect for the ordinary masses, with a plain and humble style of living, not money grabbers who love to live in plush hotels, dress flashily and womanise. Heroes who are statesmanlike in their leadership, and not buffoons who clown about.

China's Foreign Policy

IKWEZI Delegation to China

In July this year IKWEZI was invited to send a delegation to China. The delegation which was led by our chief editor, Bennie Bunsee, was able to see and understand at first hand the situation in China today. It spoke to writers, artists, members of the redeemed national bourgeoisie, intellectuals, students, trade unionists; it visited factories, communes and held a number of important talks on key issues affecting socialist construction in China today, and other important issues. A lengthier and fuller report of our visit will be carried in our next issue. Here we publish a talk given us by a member of the Liaison Department of the CCP on China's Foreign Policy, a subject that often tends to confuse many people as to China's intents and aims on the international scene.

There are misunderstandings about China's Foreign Policy due to propaganda of the Western Press and Soviet Social Imperialism. There are two main aspects we wish to deal with:

(1) How to handle the relationships on the diplomatic plane with other countries and support for revolutionary struggle in those countries.

(2) How to handle the relationships between the anti-hegemonist front and revolutionary struggles in the various countries.

Ours is a proletarian country under the leadership of a proletarian party taking M-L as its ideological basis. Our basic view is that the proletariat can win emancipation only when the whole world is liberated. Our slogan is "Workers of the World Unite". Our basic stand in dealing with international affairs is to persist in proletarian internationalism. Starting from this basic stand we say that a revolution should rely on the leadership of its own proletariat. It should make revolution in its own country and give support to other struggles. Our basic stand is that the proletariat should rely on its own people to make revolution by relying on its vanguard party, the Communist Party. Revolution cannot be exported. The road taken by revolutions in different countries may differ but the basic experience is the same. We call this the universal truth of M-L.

The basic truth of M-L should combine with revolutionary conditions in one's country and from this principle policies and lines must be worked out.

The M-L Party can only gradually apply M-L by getting deep roots amongst the masses and unifying the struggle. The proletarian cause is an international one and in their respective struggles they should support each other and should exchange experiences. Revolutionary ideas go

beyond boundaries and proletarian parties can co-ordinate their struggles.

We should abide by self-reliance in our revolutionary struggles. We should support each other and learn from each other. We should not exclude foreign support but this is not the main struggle.

It is unimaginable that people can win victory in one's struggle through other peoples' support when people are not awakened in one's own country, and it will not even be a good thing if victory came from external support.

As a proletarian M-L Party we must support other struggles when our country is liberated. This is our international obligation. We can also give diplomatic support - give support through diplomatic channels.

Our Party can have various contacts with countries. We can have cultural exchanges. We can thus spread our ideas and make contact with peoples. Then we can also do work among the upper class, the ruling class in the country.

As a socialist country our line is in conformity with the basic interest of peoples all over the world.

We have a line in foreign affairs initiated by Mao and Chou and we have achieved great successes. Our line is diametrically opposed to that of imperialism and social imperialism. (Refer to Hua-Guo-Feng's Report on Foreign Affairs - Section on How to Build the Anti-Hegemonic Front).

Relationships between foreign policy and revolution

We hold that our foreign policy supports the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world and it cannot be separated from this support to the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of the world. Here I wish to get down to the essence of our foreign policy.

Diplomatic affairs have their own characteristics and special features. We have to abide by diplomatic norms in government and state to state affairs, to the laws of that country and the sovereignty of that country. These are based on the well-known Principles of Peaceful Co-Existence.

The foreign policy of imperialism and social imperialism is for expansionism. They subvert and bully other countries to gain world hegemony. Ours is a peaceful one. We must set a good example in this to defend people's basic interests. In accordance with our revolutionary foreign policy we must take the basic interests of the various peoples into account. The relationships between revolution and foreign policy is not contradictory to each other. But in concrete situations there may be contradictions between the two.

When revolution and diplomatic relations come into conflict with each other we uphold the basic interests of the revolutionary peoples, we uphold proletarian internationalism. We must also uphold the basic interests of the country. In tactics and methods we must be prudent in handling these relations. We must have flexibility in tactics.

Take a few examples. Our country is situated in Asia. In S.E. Asia Thailand, Burma, Malaysia have Communist Parties which are engaged in armed struggle. These Parties have a long history. These are also countries which are our neighbours. We have diplomatic relations with these countries. It is important to win ruling circles in these countries against hegemonism, in fact it is very important to do so. Internally these ruling circles try to persuade us not to support these Communist Parties. The state leaders raised this question saying that China should not support these Communist Parties. To Mao, to Chou, to Deng they tried to persuade us to restrict the Communist Parties in their countries.

But on this question we have a clear cut stand and we clearly stated our views to these Party and State leaders and both Deng and Hua Guo-Feng said that there is no such thing as a Communist Party which does not support another Communist Party. If a Communist Party does not support Communist Parties in other countries then it ceases to be a Communist Party. They told then that they are pleased

at the development of the revolutionary struggles and we give moral and political support but we do not intervene in the internal affairs of those countries. In the beginning the ruling classes in these countries cherished illusions but gradually they came to see our stand. The Thai Minister said after his visit to China that he knows what China means when it says that Party relations are Party relations and state relations are state relations.

Our Party and State leaders straightforwardly put forward our viewpoints. They told them that all their countries are threatened by hegemonism and said that if China cuts off relationships with the Communist Parties then China would be like the Soviet Union and China would be unable to give them support.

While upholding our principle stand as Communist Parties we must also uphold tactics and strategy and should not make big noises about supporting one another. We suggest to fraternal Communist Parties that they must both unite and struggle against hegemonism, but we cannot lay down the lines and policies of struggle in their own countries.

This is a brief account of how we handle relationships between diplomacy and revolution.

Some ultra leftists like Albania, together with the Western Press and the Soviet Union all attack China and cite examples, Chile, Zaire, Oman and Eritrea. They say that China only wishes to make diplomatic relationships. They even slander us saying that China has gone in for alliances with reactionary forces in the world. This is sheer slander.

Take the question of Chile. In Chile a reactionary coup d'etat took place of an anti-communist character. We opposed it as oppression of the forces of the national democratic revolution. It took place under complicated international situation; against the background of rivalry between the Soviet Union and the U.S. Latin America is under the influence of the United States. Allende had met Chou en Lai and had visited China. When he died we sent a telegram of condolence. The Soviet Union tried to take him as an example of peaceful transition to socialism, which is a revisionist line.

With ulterior motives the Soviet Union made bad suggestions to him. We advised him not to follow the

Soviet Union as he would divorce himself from the masses, but Allende was taken in by the Soviet Union due to his lack of experience and he became a sacrificial lamb for peaceful transition.

When Allende was killed the Soviet Union again made a lot of fanfare and propaganda to divert the attention of the world's peoples and adopted such measures as severing diplomatic relations with Chile, and so on. By doing this the Soviet Union tried to pose itself as the most revolutionary country and slandering China as siding with the totalitarian regime of Chile. This is sheer deception. If the Soviet Union really supported revolutionary struggles why did the Soviet Union have diplomatic relations with Suharto of Indonesia. But this is not the crux of the matter.

After the coup d'etat we did not follow suit. We first exposed Soviet policy in Chile. Besides the military regime in Chile is anti-communist and we oppose it, but Chile is a Third World Country and we must not go to extremes in handling it, and we must unite with it in the anti-hegemony struggle.

We did not sever diplomatic relations with Chile, we wanted to maintain a foothold in the backyard of U.S. Imperialism.

Through our Embassy we tried to render various kinds of help.

Therefore tactically we adopt different methods. To maintain diplomatic relations with countries does not mean support for the internal policies of that country. We also maintain diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and the U.S. but we oppose their policies vigorously. Maintenance of diplomatic relations is different from support for revolutionary struggles.

Zaire, Iran as further examples. We maintain good state relations with Zaire and with the Shah because they are all third world countries. They push reactionary policies at home but they have anti-hegemonistic positions. We push the latter but it does not mean we support their home policies.

We have always supported Eritrea and Oman and their struggle against colonialism and for national liberation. But the situation in these countries is complicated. They are part of either Ethiopia or Dhofar. These are sovereign countries and here we apply

principles of non-interference and these are questions left over by colonialism and imperialism. The Third World have different views of these struggles. Some support it and some don't. What commands our special attention is that the two superpowers are intensifying their interest in these areas and trying to fish in troubled waters.

In handling such questions we must adopt a prudent attitude and not interfere with the internal affairs of these countries. And our attitude is that 3rd world countries must settle differences among themselves by consultation.

What we do is for the support of the national liberation struggles against imperialism and colonialism. We strive for their unity.

Relationships between United Front against Hegemonism and Revolution in Various Countries

After World War II there have been basic changes in political forces in the world. These changes are expressed in the Theory of the Three Worlds. Crux of the thesis of the Three World Theory is that the first socialist state has changed into a social imperialist country and has become the most dangerous source of war and the main enemy of the world's peoples.

The U.S. is also a superpower. It is an old time imperialist power. The Soviet Union is more ambitious and aggressive while the U.S. is more defensive. Our policy is to make use of the contradiction between the 2 superpowers with the main spearhead against social imperialism, the arch enemy of the peoples of the world.

This involves questions of proletarian tactics and we must try to annihilate the main enemy and make use of the contradictions amongst the enemy.

Some ultra leftists like Albania oppose our tactics to lay emphasis on opposing the main enemy, but this is anti-Marxist.

We can find numerous examples in history of such tactics. Germany, Italy and Japan when they were the main fascist enemies, the countries and peoples of the world formed a united front against them. The Soviet Union united with the U.S. and Britain. In this way they were able to defeat the fascists. Stalin regarded the U.S. and Britain as indirect allies although in the long run they were enemies.

We regard the United States as the case was during the time of World War II. Of course we still say that the U.S. is a superpower and is a target of the World Revolution.

The U.S. has its own aims in dealing with us. They try to make use of us in seeking world hegemony. And in dealing with it we regard it as a temporary ally in the struggle against the Soviet Union. We must not fall into the orbit of the U.S. and make sure it serves the struggle against hegemonism.

For example in dealing with South Africa we must oppose U.S. Imperialism because it supports the racist regime. We must constantly expose its schemes. We must also expose its collusion with Israel.

As to Western countries like Britain and France we call them second class imperialist powers. These countries have economic interests in the Third World. In some countries the contradictions are very sharp with British and French Imperialism. This is natural and understandable.

But now the whole world is under the rivalry of the superpowers. They threaten the national independence of the European countries, and it is in Europe that the focus of attention is. For which superpower can control Europe can control the world. These countries have anti-hegemonist desires because their national independence is threatened by the superpowers. The tendency to unity amongst them is developing – from a unity in the EEC to Defence. Though they are a powerful force they are scattered and weak and they do not pose the main danger to the world.

Therefore our main policy is alliance. Whilst struggling against their reactionary policies we ally with them against the superpowers – both alliance with and struggle against.

In Third World countries the situation differs from country to country. Some are feudalists, monarchists, big bourgeoisie. In the 3rd World countries the contradictions are sharpening between the different classes daily.

But viewing the situation as a whole they still have positive factors for the struggle against hegemonism – especially social-imperialism – even among the ruling classes.

This does not mean we support their reactionary policies at home. The internal contradictions and revolution

can only be solved by relying upon the people themselves.

This is the relationship between Revolution and the Anti-Hegemony United Front.

In our view the leadership and struggles of the working class in the revolution is the crux of the anti-hegemony united front.

The revolutionary struggles waged by the working class and the progressive forces in the 3rd World countries, including the 1st and 2nd World countries are the foundation of the world's anti-hegemony United Front. They are the reliable guarantee of the development of the world's anti-hegemony Front. For tactical reasons in our pamphlet we did not deal with this part. Our emphasis in the pamphlet is why the world should be divided into three parts and the revolutionary struggles was not the main emphasis.

For a revolution in a particular country which is the main enemy must be developed by the revolutionary forces in that country.

The contradictions in different parts of the world are quite different. In Azania the main enemy is the white racist regime and the external main enemy is Western Imperialism. This is direct and actually threatens the Azanian peoples. In the Middle East they are confronted by the expansionism of Israel. The situation in different countries are different.

Many African leaders say that U.S. and Western Imperialism is the main enemy. This is said with just reasons.

Viewing the world situation as a whole the main characteristic is the intense rivalry of the two superpowers, especially of social imperialism. The revolutionary peoples who take Western powers as their direct main enemy must take into consideration social imperialism and its hegemonist designs.

For social imperialism Africa is rich in mineral resources and has important sea lanes.

In order to get hegemony over Western Europe it tries to get hold of the African continent.

So Azanian people must keep guard and consider this fact.

We warn African friends against this new danger. While driving the tiger through the front door they must

beware of the wolf coming in through the back door.

But some African friends do not understand our advice. They say Western Imperialism are like snakes in the house and that we must make use of Cuba and the Soviet Union to drive out these snakes. But we reason with them. To get Cubans in is easy, to get them out is another thing, – as in Angola.

IKWEZI exposes constantly the true nature of social imperialism in order to awaken African peoples. This is significant.

I would like to make a suggestion. In exposing social imperialism we should combine exposure with concrete situation in South Africa and Southern Africa in general. Externally the Western imperialist powers are the main enemy. We must not divorce ourselves from this reality. We must start from reality in South Africa. In many countries some revolutionary movements put forward the slogan that we want neither Soviet imperialism or Western imperialism as in Turkey, Iran. This is a correct slogan.

With the intensive rivalry between the 2 superpowers the world situation is more turbulent and tense. There is bound to be war and we must see the danger of war.

In Europe none of the 2 superpowers dare reckless action. The tactics of the SU is to get African and Middle East countries to encircle and outflank Western Europe. Here are important strategic sea lanes. Without them Europe will be isolated. Therefore Africa becomes one of the hotspots for world rivalry.

World War is possible but it is possible to put it out and to defend world peace.

China's four modernizations is for preparation against World War, so that if war does break out we can have a good trial of strength with them and win victory over them. We must frustrate their plans and defeat them in Indo-China, Afghanistan, etc.

We must struggle against the appeasement policy of the Western countries which wish to direct the Soviet Union to the East.

The revolutionary peoples must prepare to develop their forces to meet a drastic change in the world situation and to win final victory.

The question of joint ventures:

Does China help capitalist powers by trading with them. Such a possibility does not exist. Our trade with them is 0.7%. By making use of their technology our aim is to quicken socialist modernization. Lenin has spoken about this. What we are doing cannot save the Western capitalist system from its crisis.

Some reactionaries are making an anti-China campaign on the question of joint ventures, saying that they are returning to the old days.

China is a powerful socialist country based on self reliance. The dictatorship of the proletariat is consolidated especially after the downfall of the Gang of Four. We have built an independent socialist economic system. We run joint ventures to accelerate the speed of the four modernizations.

Situation is different from pre-Liberation days. China has risen up to become a powerful socialist state. No country can control China. The joint ventures are like oases in the desert. The capitalists wish to make more money and we take advantage of their greed. This policy is one of redemption, to get advanced technology in

order to speed up socialist modernization. This is the policy of Mao which was brushed aside by the ultra left line of the Gang of Four. They regarded this as selling out the sovereignty of the country and betraying the motherland. We are implementing Mao's policies by taking advantage of the international situation.

In advanced age before passing away Mao waged sharp struggle against the Gang of Four. In the Central Committee the Gang of Four attacked Premier Chou. They said the Foreign Trade Ministry was betraying the motherland because through it we were importing Western technology. In Taching we imported whole sets of equipments and we were criticised for selling our resources to foreign capitalists.

The question of NATO is similar to that of World War II. After WWII NATO was an aggressive bloc posing threat to 3rd world countries and the working class in W. Europe. But now the world situation has changed. Social imperialism has appeared. On the one hand NATO still has bad intents to the 3rd World countries, on the other hand it is opposed to Social imperialism. We fight the former and support the latter.

The ANC "Freedom Charter" and the Land Question

To the philistine social chauvinists South Africa was a "special case". They recognised, in their settler national interests, South Africa as an independent state – meaning that the national (Land) question was settled. This position was sanctified by the Congress Alliance's Charter which heinously declared that the Land in Azania belonged to all those who lived there irrespective of the process and method used by them prior to be considered to "live" there. The land belonged with equal force to the foreign settler usurper and the indigenous African dispossessed.

The declaration of the "Freedom" Charter could make meaning to the political organisations which were predominantly representing already privileged alien nationals who wanted their usurpation and exploitation of the Azanian Land to be given support by an African Liberation Movement, namely the African National Congress (A.N.C.). It was, and is still untenable for a political organisation which considered itself as National liberation movement to start sharing the robbed and plundered land of those it claimed to represent before it had conquered and recovered it and made known the terms as to how the land would be used by those who would have accepted to stay within the country when its indigenous people would have gained self-determination.

Thou shall not share thy property yet uncovered; Thou shall fight for it, recover it, and share it in thy terms to all those who deserveth a share.

This indeed, is the scripture of revolution for national liberation and self-determination. In fact, how can ANC be a national Liberation Movement if South Africa is an independent state.

Mangaliso Sobukwe put the matter abundantly clear that the P.A.C. was for self-government or self-determination of the Azanian people, not just a good government as was the case with the old movement.

Sobukwe stated unequivocally that P.A.C. stood for a non-racial society not a multi-racial one with racial exclusivism and protection of racial rights – be they of the majority or minority.

In fact, in a non-racial society to speak of minority rights (which

Sobukwe and his Ideas

By S. Motion

When Sobukwe Entered the Political Arena

Mangaliso Sobukwe entered the political arena in Azania with a momentous political bang which resounded throughout Azania. This historical moment was occasioned when Mangaliso was elected the first President of the Pan Africanist Congress in April 1959.

The political period before and at the time the P.A.C. was formed was characterised by prevarications, tongue-twisting and issue-side stepping by the elitist leadership of the old movement. Those were the days wanting of an authentic and unequivocal African voice and leadership. Yes those were the days when there was a deliberate attempt by political quislings to confuse the true nature of the Azanian Revolution.

The leadership in the old movement behaved as if the struggle was a civil

rights one. Together with the social chauvinists, as represented by the Communist Party of South Africa, the old African leadership was essentially bent to gain some civil rights for the African indigenous majority under a multi-racial Status Quo with the "Constitutional guarantees" or "national rights" for the alien nationals. The philistine social chauvinists had actually opposed the resolution by the Comintern (1928) which declared South Africa as a Black Country (Indeed Azania) and that the creation of a "Native Republic" was a requirement to symbolise the settlement of the national (Land) question and the right of self-determination of the indigenous African majority.

The CPSA, by its action and pronouncements, opposed the works and declarations by socialist leaders on national questions (eg Lenin: The Right of Nations to self-Determination, J.W. Stalin: Marxism and the National Question).

presupposes the existence of special majority rights) is a misnomer. People have individual human rights which are enshrined in the people's constitution. Sobukwe called multi-racialism racialism multiplied.

It is clear, therefore, that Sobukwe and his party, the P.A.C. opposed to the Communist Party and the A.N.C. (Azania) on the National (Land) question, the nature of the Azanian Revolution and the non-racial status quo in an independent Azanian State. It was not the opposition based on anti-Communism per se or anti-Marxist-Leninist principles or anti-Socialism.

It should, of course, be admitted that there were/are people within the

P.A.C. who were/are confused on this issue and those who because of their capitalist orientation, looked at the CPSA activities from their latent class interests even though the CPSA was the betrayer of the Marxist-Leninist principles and stands on the specific Azanian socio-politico-economic issues.

Sobukwe entered the political arena of Azania when the Azanian people had no programme of liberation but were led and made to react to laws passed by the oppressor's legislature. The leadership at the time had no initiative but only called upon the masses of the people to react to the ever unfolding oppressor's machinery.

From the time P.A.C. was formed, under the dynamic presidency of Mangaliso Sobukwe, the political struggle in Azania got a decisively new fillip. The Azanian masses were mobilized on the scale unknown before to participate in their liberation. They were imbued with patriotism, developed a sense of self-adequacy in the mapping out of their struggle's objectives – deciding on the methods to be used by them, the oppressed Azanian nation. The Azanian masses were made to realise that they had a role to play in settling the National question and struggle for national self-determination irrespective of the education or status they held in the oppressed society.

David Sibeko

The assassination of David Sibeko in Dar Es Salaam in June this year was a great loss not only to the Pan Africanist Congress of which he was a senior member but also to the Azanian liberation struggle. He was a sterling African patriot totally committed to the cause of African libera-



tion. He ably represented the Pan Africanist Congress – and thus the whole Azanian liberation cause – at the United Nations where he was permanent P.A.C. representative. He made a deep impact upon the diplomatic world at the United Nations and particularly upon African diplomats who came to look upon him not only as a spokesman of

Azania but of the whole of Africa. On a number of occasions he boldly challenged the arrogance of the Soviet hegemonists and through the fire of his oratory and abilities in the diplomatic world eclipsed the ANC presence at the United Nations.

The manner of his assassination was cowardly and it should provoke the P.A.C. into a serious assessment of its politics.

Memorial services were held for him in various parts of the world, and particularly in the United States, where he had made a deep impact upon the solidarity movements. He had successfully mobilised a considerable section of American opinion behind the P.A.C. and one of his last acts was to have held an extremely successful Sharpeville commemorative meeting attended by almost every Black organisation in the States.

Over 3,000 Azanians attended his funeral in Botswana, many risking to come from Azania itself.

Ebullient and warm-hearted in his relationships with others, David did not always endear himself to Azanians. But even his critics must admit that he had made a great contribution to the Azanian struggle and kept the flag of the P.A.C. flying high.

The P.A.C. should now take the step of commemorating his memory in a fitting manner.

PAC Launches Its First Campaign

On the 21st March 1960 P.A.C. under the leadership of Mangaliso Sobukwe launched an anti-pass Campaign. Sobukwe made it clear that this was an unfolding programme which would be pursued until total freedom was attained. The year 1963 was to be a decisive one between the forces of liberation and oppression.

The old movement, The African National Congress of Azania was invited to participate but refused stating that the 1960 anti-pass campaign was opportunistic and that it would be a total failure. But events soon proved the ANC wrong. The ANC leadership, realising the success of the Campaign, had to rush its President-General, the late Chief Albert Luthuli, from Durban to Pretoria and called a press Conference where he ostentatiously burnt his "dom-pass". This was a reaction to avoid a political funeral on the part of the ANC since the campaign had already received massive support from the Azanian masses.

There has been an argument as to whether Sobukwe was correct to launch the 1960 Campaign. In some quarters it has been argued that P.A.C. was still too young, less organised for the campaign and had no properly tested, disciplined leadership and followership. Yes it should be conceded that P.A.C. was, as a political organisation, still young. It was about 11 months old. It should, however, not be forgotten that almost all of its leadership had been, for a number of years, participating in the political struggle in Azania under the Youth Wing of the ANC.

It should also be conceded that a number of Sobukwe's co-leaders and lieutenants betrayed him and the struggle thereafter. This process is still going on.

But it should be categorically stated that in the final analysis the growth of a political organisation, party or movement is through action rather than perpetuated political breast-feeding or perpetuated political infantilisation which is essentially political cowardice or indecisiveness.

Since man cannot be separated from his environmental conditions it should be realised that revolutionary conditions in any country do not mature on their own. Revolutionary conditions are both the product of actions by revolutionaries as well as the producers of political revolutionaries.

From a materialist point of view when man acts upon and against his environment to control and improve it, he also, by that action, improves himself.

Mangaliso Sobukwe had to lead his party to bring about the development of revolutionary conditions with the broad masses of the oppressed people fully mobilised and participating in their struggle. These conditions have also produced a lot of revolutionaries thereafter. Even the old movement leadership had to make a lot of amends to survive the political challenges in Azania.

This indeed is an undeniable historic role played by Sobukwe. The political arena and demands after 1960 took a much more dynamic perspective. The whole world was awakened from slumber to see the true realities of the Azanian struggle. The enemy seeing that there was then a political organisation which aimed at taking over the State Power (not to reform it) on behalf of the broad masses of the people reacted and is still reacting with characteristic brutality. One does not become brutal for something that does not diametrically oppose one's interest or represents an outcome that what it gains is what one loses i.e. a zero-sum game model of conflict. The advantages of the 1960 campaign can be summarised as follows:

The proper revolutionary perspectives of our struggle with the full participation of the masses of the people were highlighted; the oppressor and the oppressed were given proper distinguishing classification; the strug-

gle's objective was clearly defined – that of seizing State Power by the revolutionary forces; the new leadership through time emerged and the old leadership of liberation movements has ever since been under continuous trial, *most of the leaders in the liberation movements have survived only because of compelling and obstructive conditions of exile where they have entrenched themselves with the blessings of host governments and world super-powers.*

It is, however, important to realise that the 1960 anti-pass campaign had also its disadvantages. The main disadvantage was that the Azanian masses were robbed of the leadership of Mangaliso Sobukwe up to his death. Sobukwe was robbed of the opportunity to lead the Azanian people up to his death.

The Azanian masses were robbed of the development in Sobukwe's thinking as the perspectives of our struggle became clearer as they became complex. Sobukwe was robbed of the opportunity to see the efficacy of his ideas and methods as the struggle became clearer as it was becoming complex.

Furthermore, one of the conditions and outcome of his banishment was that he could not be quoted within Azania.

So, to be in the position to say how Sobukwe's ideas were to develop or were to take into account the new perspectives of Azanian revolution as a part of the world revolution by the socialist forces against capitalist imperialism, one can only do so by projection, that is, by taking Sobukwe's ideas, methods and pronouncements before his arrest and during court proceedings and project them through the present to the future free Azania.

The other disadvantage, arising directly from the 1960 events was/is that the leadership of the PAC fell to persons who were either less able or less dedicated compared to Sobukwe's leadership. Some were/are outright opportunists and careerists. These have played a more destructive role in the party than they have contributed constructively to its growth. Furthermore, the leadership, with increasing polarisation has been operating under two arenas – the exile and home arenas, with the exile group continuously usurping powers and being directive to the home leadership while

at the same time losing the touch with the day to day political events and conditions at home. The dysfunctional effect of the working relations between the home and exile leadership was undoubtedly demonstrated by the Party's failure to launch the 1963 programme which was decided upon before Sobukwe was imprisoned.

Sobukwe's Ideas

In terms of the demanding present revolutionary conditions in Azania and in the whole world what has to be answered unequivocally in terms of ideological and revolutionary categories: What were Sobukwe's ideas?

Sobukwe's social thoughts can be found in his speeches before he was arrested and in the basic documents of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania – the party he illustriously led. But it behooves us to unashamedly handle and interpret his speeches which represent his social ideas and beliefs, his ideological system. We should do so in the continuing interest of a very dynamic revolutionary process both at home and internationally. Was Sobukwe merely a pure nationalist, a revolutionary intellectual, revolutionary national democrat, a Marxist-Leninist, an anti-colonialist/imperialist revolutionary?

Before answering these questions directly, it will be of great service to highlight Sobukwe's ideological beliefs and standpoints.

Sobukwe believed that the African masses mobilised under the banner of African nationalism was the effective force to challenge to defeat the instrument of national oppression as represented by the white settler capitalist South African State. The right of the indigenous Azanian masses to self-determination was the key objective to settle the national (Land) question.

In South Africa the indigenous African masses were/are not self-determinant.

This stand was in total agreement with the resolution of the Comintern (1928) and the writings of great socialist leaders, namely Lenin and Stalin, as already mentioned, on the Rights of Nations to be self-determinant. It was also in line with what was happening in the entire colonial world including Africa. Sobukwe did not subscribe to the illusion of South

African exceptionalism as advocated by the social chauvinists and their allies who took Azania as a unique case because to them it was an "independent" state even though its indigenous majority is not self-determinant.

From this account Sobukwe was a national revolutionary democrat, leading, during the phase of the National Democratic Revolution in Azania.

Sobukwe was undoubtedly an anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist revolutionary. He was cognisant of the fact that since the South African ruling minority is backed by the forces of international monopoly capitalism it was necessary for the Azanian National liberation movement to have an international outlook. This outlook meant to co-operate and collaborate with all the genuine anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist forces of the world at large.

Furthermore, this outlook correlates or is consistent with international proletarianism. Sobukwe was not a narrow nationalist.

It should also be noted by all and sundry that Sobukwe showed his advanced understanding of imperialism (imperialism as articulated by Lenin) when he observed that Africa as well as all exploited continents were no longer faced with mercantile imperialism of the 17th and 18th centuries but by an advanced and sophisticated financial and economic imperialism.

The Azanian leader was not lacking in understanding the laws of capitalist development which would lead to the collapse of the capitalist system and the emergence of the socialist mode of production.

In October 1949 at Fort Hare Sobukwe had this to say: "... We are seeing today the germination of the seeds of decay inherent in capitalism; we discern the first shoots of the tree of socialism."

We should understand that by that time the first socialist state – which was the product of the 1917 October Revolution did not come as a result of the immanent crises in an advanced capitalist state. Russia was, in European capitalist development terms a backward country. The same is true of Mao Tsetung's Socialist China which was proclaimed in 1949.

Addressing himself to the Free Azania Sobukwe, in putting the P.A.C. case, advocated for a socialist

government which will use systematic planning in order to bring about the most rapid development of every part of the country and the state. He stated his convictions on the supremacy of the socialist mode of production as follows: "A socialist government will promote the idea of African unity ... The potential wealth of Africa in minerals, oil, hydro-electric power and so on is immense. By cutting out waste through systematic planning, a central government can bring about the rapid development of every part of the State."

This contention about the ability of socialist production relations to bring about all round rapid socio-economic development in a country is in line with the words of Karl Marx, who declared that socialism ushers in days worth twenty years each.

To further emphasise the ability of socialist production relations to bring about the all round rapid development in any community Sobukwe compared the rate of development between capitalist India and socialist China with the latter outstripping the former.

Sobukwe rejected capitalism as a mode of production which is based on the exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few.

Putting the PAC case he declared: "... We also reject the economic exploitation of many for the benefit of the few."

At this juncture we can justifiably conclude that, although anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism are not necessarily identical with anti-capitalism Sobukwe was anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist.

Sobukwe's life-style and social practices were represented by humility and empathy. In the crowded trains of Johannesburg he, in spite of being a University lecturer, travelled in a Third Class with the hardcore of the African proletariat and lumpen proletariat. Indeed Sobukwe was different from what we see today as our "socialist" leaders in the National Liberation Movements.

Weakness in Sobukwe's Socialist Ideas

In order to show weakness in Sobukwe's ideas it is important to provide the basis of and nature of class formation and relations in colonial – especially settler colonial countries.

In countries which were invaded by the colonial system of imperialism, the metropolitan advanced capitalist production relations were imposed upon indigenous pre-primitive or primitive stage of capital accumulation and production relations. This process leads to situations where clear-cut capitalist class formation within the indigenous forces remains incomplete.

The colonised or semi-colonised indigenous people were/are economically circumscribed, such that within themselves, the formation of clear-cut class and class relations were/are not completed. What usually happens is that almost the entire population became proletarianised with some members (limited in number and influence) forming the petty bourgeoisie group which together with the proletariat and peasantry are nationally oppressed politically and economically exploited by the colonial system of capitalist imperialism.

The growth of the indigenous petty bourgeoisie including elements of lumpen bourgeoisie has been a negative one. They can only move one downward direction – that is, the proletarianisation direction. Imperialist and local settler capital gives no room for the growth of the indigenous petty bourgeoisie to the full status of bourgeoisie equal in strength and ability to either the local settler capitalists or imperialist capitalists.

Since the indigenous population, irrespective of whether it can be fully put in class categories of proletariat, petty bourgeoisie and peasantry, is first and foremost nationally oppressed politically and economically exploited as a conquered indigenous national group, the initial phase in the struggle for self-determination by the indigenous masses takes the form of National Democratic Revolution characterised by de-emphasis on the class struggle as a strategy of mobilising all the patriotic forces against foreign rule and domination.

Social classes may be in the formation but political classes (class consciousness and pure class struggle) are not yet developed. In white settler ruled Azania the Black proletariat and white proletariat do not, for anti-white settler South Africa State revolutionary purposes, form the same class. Neither do they belong to the same struggling masses. Furthermore, it is important to note that the black pro-

letariat simply forms a social class. It is a "class by itself and not a class for itself."

This means that it is not class conscious in so far as it is not organised on a class basis and does not fight to overthrow the State Power in order to proclaim and protect its class interests.

But it should be fully appreciated that when the white settler South African State will be overthrown different classes will, like water, find their own levels. Whether the new State will be socialist or capitalist depends on, when different classes will be finding their own levels, which class or alliance of classes will dominate.

With this theoretical background in mind, it behaves upon genuine revolutionaries (not opportunistic praise-singers of Sobukwe) to concede openly that Sobukwe had the following weakness in his socialist ideas:

He did not specifically identify the class or alliance of classes that will bring about the Socialist Azania. The petty bourgeoisie, the illiterate or semi-literate and some members of the African and Indian proletariat (as social classes) are highly capable of ruthlessly fighting for socialism once the white settler colonial State will be overthrown.

The African petty bourgeoisie will struggle to grow full size so as to take over from defeated local and imperialist capitalists; some members of the African and Indian proletariat will attempt to migrate to higher class categories.

The same can be said about the peasantry which without proper political education, may oppose the nationalisation of the land they would have grasped from the settler rural Boer bourgeoisie during the armed revolutionary struggle.

We can see clearly now that socialism in Azania will come about only with the organisation and politicisation of the African and Indian proletariat including the African peasantry on the Marxist-Leninist principles and ideology. It is also important to follow Lenin's strategy of not struggling against and estranging the petty bourgeoisie and its theorists, but to win them over to the side of the proletariat.

We should also accept the outcome that once the white settler colonial State will be overthrown, and conse-

quently, the privileges that accrued to the white workers would have been removed from the production and distribution relations, political system and Statute books, the white workers will have an important role to play with all the Azanian proletariat without racialistic distinction.

The second weakness that Sobukwe showed was that of speaking about Africanist Socialist Democracy. There has been a tendency by many ideologues to try to emphasise African "exclusivism" or "uniqueness". This is a complete ideological fallacy. Marx and Engels distinguished between Utopian and Scientific Socialism. Socialism is said to be scientific because it takes into account the objective laws of social development and the objective experiences of people at different levels of social development in different countries. The laws of social development take into account the material (productive forces) cultural and historical background of different peoples of the world and show how different social formations took place and how they are to develop in the future.

Scientific Socialism takes into account that socialist society might be brought about differently in different countries because the social laws of development will be operating under different material, cultural and historical constraints. But any Socialist State once achieved bears the same production relations with other states at its level of socialist development.

The universal class to bring about socialism is the proletariat supported by the peasantry and revolutionary intellectuals.

All countries, including the present capitalist countries, passed through primitive-communal socialism. This is not unique to Africa. We Africans after independence are very capable of becoming capitalists – in fact the majority of our leaders have these appetites. The only problem the African "national" bourgeoisie faces is the obstacle to this growth which is represented by international monopoly capitalism and its international system of the ownership of the means of production, production relations and distribution of international wealth. At best the African bourgeoisie forces engage in an intra-capitalist struggle with the imperialist capitalists but by no means in inter-class struggle. This is why it was stated in this paper, earlier on that anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism are not necessarily anti-capitalism. Furthermore, the experiences in independent Africa show that those who advocate "African Socialism" or other "makeshift or home-made Socialism" are essentially anti-socialist and simply capitalist aspirants or they are the African national bourgeoisie which hoodwinks the workers through socialist sloganeering whilst refuting the need and existence of class struggle in their countries.

This is not to say Sobukwe belonged to this category of leaders. Sobukwe's genuineness and integrity in all what he

Great Azanian Leader Zeph Mothuping

Despite the political bankruptcy and opportunism of many of the so-called "leaders" of the P.A.C. in exile the organisation inside the country still produces stalwarts like Zeph Mothuping and the Bethal 18, who were recently sentenced to long terms of imprisonment on Robben Island for allegedly preparing an armed uprising against the South African fascist state. Zeph, an old and tried leader of the Pan Africanist Congress was himself sentenced to twelve years imprisonment and sent to Robben Island, the second time that he has been sent there.

Zeph is one of the great leaders of the Azanian liberation struggle. In his sixties he has been involved in the struggle for over 40 years and is a supreme example to P.A.C. members of untainted dedication and sacrifice to the struggle. Despite his age and the heavy toll that the struggle has taken of him he still continued the struggle under illegal conditions, despite his banning and the constant vigilance of BOSS. He contributed greatly to the development of the Black Consciousness Movement, an organisation ideologically close to the P.A.C.

The example of Zeph and the Bethal 18 shows that the P.A.C. can still produce many heroes in the struggle.

said and stood for is beyond reproach. But we should be aware of such weakness in socialist ideas in Africa so as to advance as a revolutionary force.

Having pointed these weaknesses we can unashamedly state that Sobukwe was not a Marxist-Leninist. His social thoughts were a combination of Marxism and the revolutionary democratic movement. This combination leads to the formation of a State with the dictatorship of the workers, revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie, communal peasants and the revolutionary section of the intellectuals.

These social thoughts can be easily transformed into Marxist-Leninist scientific socialism. This transformation is, of course, only possible when a proletarian Marxist-Leninist Party with the support of the peasantry and revolutionary intelligentsia is formed and develops to be a dominating force to lead the revolutionary struggle to socialism.

With Sobukwe's social thoughts and ideological stands in mind and the weaknesses already indicated, it should be stated that Sobukwe during his active political days stood above all leaders of the African Liberation Movements in his ideas, which admittedly, need development and elaboration.

One cannot compare Chief Albert Luthuli, the late President-General of ANC, who was at best an African liberal or an African peace-maker, with Sobukwe. Even when we take Nelson Mandela's celebrated court statement where he declared his admiration of the British Constitution and private enterprise system, despite his association with CPSA, we see clearly that Sobukwe was above him. So, in as far as the socialist ideas are concerned, weaning the ANC from the Communist Party of South Africa, he had no equal. So was he in the stand and ideas on the Azanian National Liberation struggle. It should be understood that this is not to disregard the contributions made by Luthuli and Mandela but, we are here engaged in comparative analysis.

Whither the P.A.C. After Sobukwe?

Asking this question one has to remember that for all practical purposes P.A.C. has been without Sobukwe since towards the end of March 1960. Many developments took

place before his death and after it.

Before his death the P.A.C. like the ANC had not been successful in launching a decisive protracted People's Revolutionary war in Azania. Many factors have contributed to this state of affairs. The enemy's vigilance and high state of preparation and preparedness played a significant role. This, of course, includes the support the enemy got from its Western capitalist allies and the buffer States which were acting against the liberation forces.

But, perhaps, the greatest shortcoming has been with the party's bureaucratic leadership. The learning ability of the leadership on revolution requirements in Azania has been appalling, to say the least. The leadership has excelled in bureaucratic power struggles, the reign of "Mendaciocracy" (rule of lies), insincerity and procrastination. Life-leadership accountable to no one but to itself has "ruled" P.A.C. for sometime now as it has been the case with the ANC.

Before the death of Sobukwe the party found itself divided into conflicting ideological camps, although at the leadership level there was less ideological conflict than purely power struggle, but between the entire leadership as a whole and the followership there has been an acute ideological conflict. This state of affairs is still going on.

Different ideological groups or forces have emerged: Marxist-Lenin-

ists, Marxist-Leninist-Mao-Tse-Tung-Thoughts, social democrats, pure nationalists and lost sheep, i.e. those who do not know what they are and their behaviour does not show consistent patterns. There are of course, all-out capitalist-roaders.

Where the P.A.C. will move from here and now on depends on the ideological school that will emerge and be dominant. The revolutionary requirements in Azania demand a political organisation guided sincerely by the Marxist-Leninist principles to lead the National Democratic Revolution to crush the Western imperialist capitalist client South African State and build a Socialist Azania which will see the proletariat moving to a dominant dictatorship position with the support of the peasantry and revolutionary intelligentsia.

If the P.A.C. cannot take off from Sobukwe's ideas, develop them and move towards the direction given above the Azanian revolutionaries will be justified in bringing into existence a new party to fulfill this responsibility.

Any move by the party that does not develop from Sobukwe's social thoughts to Marxism-Leninism represents an ideological retrogression. It should not be tolerated. P.A.C. and indeed the entire Azanian scene are now in need of the Sobukwe of the time and revolutionaries at home and abroad are going to produce one.

South African Expansionism and the Problem of Transition

By Tsiu Selatile

The Conference for which this paper was prepared was supposed to be held in Botswana at the beginning of this year (1978), but it did not take place, because of difficulties that emerged during preparation.

1. Introduction

This prestigious conference in "Disengagement and Development" is an event the significance of which, I'm sure, will be better appreciated when looked at in retrospect - some time later. This is the first gathering at which government functionaries, party activists, cadres from liberation movements, public figures and scholars have assembled in Africa South of Limpopo to exchange views and experiences, learn from each

other, reason things out on a theme of both regional and global importance: apartheid and the colonial question in Southern and South - Central Africa. Sponsors and organisers of the conference have to be commended for making this gathering a reality.

"Disengagement and Development", touching as they do on customs' union, migrant labour, industrial corporations, essentially hinge on the local, regional and international standing of Republic of South Africa

(RSA) in world economics and politics, whatever the angle of approach. Although Rhodesia and its relations with independent African states is an important issue, yet by and large it is South Africa which is the core of the entire problems and to which greater attention has to be paid. The very topics on the conference agenda suggest this.

Common customs' union between South Africa and former High Commission Territories – Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana – underscores the latter's dependence on the former in import-export and state revenue from foreign trade turnover. Migrant labour underlines the capitalist-colonial essence of sub-continental economic set-up and the identity of former High Commission Territories to South Africa's own Homelands or Bantustans in political economy, despite differences in international judicial standing between Bantustans and Britain's former Protectorates. South African incorporated transnational and multinational industrial corporations – Anglo-American and Sanlam group of companies – determine the role played by that country in economics and politics of Southern and South-Central Africa – from Angola to Mozambique – and also in world capitalistic business.

Politically, not all countries and areas and regions of South-Central and Southern Africa were, in the past, or presently are, constituent parts of the South African body politic – whatever the influence of RSA on their destinies. Until 1975, Angola and Mozambique were part of the Portuguese Colonial Empire. Until mid 1960s, former High Commission Territories belonged to the British Empire; and Rhodesia too was Great Britain's Crown Colony until UDI in 1965. Even South Africa itself was a Dominion of the British Crown from 1910 to 1961. Only South-West Africa, a former German colony, is administratively integrated to the South African state machinery ever since World War I.

The problem before us, namely, South Africa, has a far longer history and has much deeper political economic and socio-historical roots than *may appear to be the case at first glance*. It is the product of Portuguese, Dutch and British socio-economic transformations. It emerged in consequence of the transition of Portuguese-Dutch-British economies to the capita-

listic formation; it has existed, and still exists, to the degree to which South African capitalist – colonialism is essential for local, regional and global profit accumulation. RSA, it is true, has its idiosyncracies, but in essence it is inextricably bound up with the capitalist socio-economic formation. If it is a problem in world economics, politics and diplomacy, then its problematic nature, however particular and specific, is quintessential to the capitalist historical epoch.

“Disengagement and Development”, the better to live up to African expectations, must place South African practice and experience in proper perspective. It is a practice and experience which, taken as apartheid for instance, expresses materially determined relations and trends; and its ideological reflections – which are expressed in its policies – are not just whimsical or an irrational attitude of mind towards social ecology, economy and history, or a regional parochialism shaping the emotional-perceptive and moral make-up of the white community, but – as racism and apartheid – they express modern global capitalistic relations, based on a long colonial history, and are manifested in this sub-continent. “Disengagement and Development” therefore make sense when treated as disengagement from local capitalism and colonialism and development on a non-capitalistic and non-colonial political economy, on the one hand. On the other, and resulting therefrom they are a question of the essence of the blackman on whose shoulders present capitalist-colonialism has thrived: of his place – at present, and his transition to the future.

2. “Local” Imperialism:

South Africa, like Rhodesia, result from foreign European – particularly, Holland's and England's expansion into Africa. Thus RSA and Rhodesia are extensions of Europe on our own African soil.

In terms of economic history, the European factor in Southern Africa takes us from early mercantile capitalism (which accomplished the geographical discovery of the Cape), through industrial capitalism (which promoted English immigrant settlements of 1820s and the development of export-orientated agriculture and animal husbandry in the Cape colony), to monopoly capitalism (which stimulated the capitalistic industrialisation

of South Africa). Equally, European colonialism in the sub-continent – like elsewhere – has gone through the phases of plantation slavery (characteristic of early mercantile capitalism in Cape colony), classical colonialism (during later Stages), and of neo-colonialism (of late). Afro-European racial relationships within the sub-continent – that is, the South African problem – manifest these salient features of our capitalist-colonial history and political economy.

Prior to 1870s South Africa had but little in the form of an industrial infrastructure; it was predominantly an agrarian economy. Industrialisation starts from 1868 with discovery of diamonds at Kimberley and the opening of the Diamond Fields. And full-scale industrialisation and capitalist transition was effected under the impact of, and in response to, the demands of the opening of the Gold Fields along the Witwatersrand during 1880s. Changes that have taken place in the economic structure of South Africa since then have been largely in response to demands by the gold-mining industry. Its fuel and energy demands stimulated coal mining and electric power generation; its explosives requirements laid the basis for the chemical industry; its metal requirements were instrumental in leading to the emergence of an iron and steel industry and to machine-building; the latter have influenced the development of a manufacturing industry after World War II; and beginning from 1950s, particularly during 1960s, the better to meet the challenge of the collapse of classical colonialism in Africa and the rising liberation movement within its borders, South Africa has spared no efforts to develop atomic energy, rocketry and aeronautics – all with an eye on their military application.

These structural changes, influenced by mining, have determined state intervention in the economy ever since 1930s, the result being formation of state-controlled corporations like ISCOR, ESCOM, and others; giving a state-capitalistic character to the South African economy.

Ours is not an analysis of South African economic history: only the most relevant moments are of interest to us.

Discovery of rich minerals' deposits, which has so influenced political-economic transformations, took place

during that historical stage when European capitalism, having gone through the Industrial Revolution (1770 – 1870), was making its transition to monopoly capitalism or imperialism (1870 – 1900). Imperialism is the historical stage whereby profit accumulation has led to:

first, concentration of capital and formation of monopoly in industry and banking;

second, industrial and banking monopoly have merged to form finance capital and a financial oligarchy;

third, export of capital supercedes, in importance, export of commodities as was the case theretofore;

fourth, the capitalistically less developed world is divided among monopolies into "spheres of influence" and international monopoly epitomised by transnationals and multinational is a reality;

fifth, the capitalistically less developed world is divided among the capitalist world's big powers.

Diamond Fields opened opportunities for big investments and the inception of large companies and banks with connections with London City, London money market. Standard Bank (S.A.), the first British bank to do business locally was incorporated around 1862 in the Cape, and through a policy of amalgamations it spread its tentacles to every corner of Southern Africa. Presently, together with Barclays Bank (S.A.), it is one of the titans of big business.

Diamond Fields also brought to the scene that assiduous empire-builder, financier, millionaire and statesman, Cecil John Rhodes: founder of De Beers Mining Company and its life chairman, founder of Consolidated Gold Fields of South Africa, founder of British South Africa Company, sometime minister and premier of Cape colony, founder and first governor of Rhodesia, moving spirit and principal architect of Southern Africa's conquest by British finance capital, pioneer of "local" Anglo-American monopoly and its financial oligarchy, and one of the principal brains behind the capitalist-colonial transformation of the sub-continent. It is no exaggeration to say that, in terms of materialisation of ideals, the sub-continent political-economic set-up during the past seventy-seven years of this century conforms to the dream of Rhodes.

When Gold Fields were opened (1885) the British economy, the most powerful at the time, was definitely imperialistic – with Germany, France, USA, following closely at its heels. Johannesburg Chamber of Mines (1889), Standard Bank and other financial houses manifested British economic prowess and the imperial factor in our political economy; so did the ideals and activities of Cecil John Rhodes.

With locally incorporated monopoly companies from among the Anglo-Boer business community – Anglo-American and Sanlam group of companies, for instance, – with state-monopoly ownership in industry and landholdings, with transnational and multinational capital export and shareholdings by South African monopolies in countries of Southern, South-Central and Central Africa – and even with holdings in Uruguay, Chile and Brazil, – with state-monopoly exports of capital, so-called "aid", and with its own classical colony (South-West Africa), RSA has acquired all the five principal features of imperialism. But South Africa's is not, and evidently cannot be, a global type of imperialism like US, Japanese and European imperialisms. It has a limited geographical orbit. It relies on Euro-American and Japanese monopoly capitals for its own individual survival because it lacks their scientific and technological advancements. It is a junior partner of global American-Japanese-European imperialism due to the less concentrated nature of its capital. It is monopoly capitalism political-economically, but geopolitically it is "local" imperialism.

The acute nature of relations in Southern Africa manifests the polarisation of the principal contradictions of monopoly capitalism. It is at one and the same time: (1) a question of the strained nature of relations between labour and capital, (2) between an oppressor community and oppressed nationalities, (3) between colonisers and the colonised, (4) between oppressor race and oppressed race. There is classical colonialism in South-West Africa, neo-colonialism in former High Commission Territories, specific colonialism within RSA. Apartheid, we contend, is not racial segregation in the American sense, or racial intolerance in the anti-semitic European sense, it is not a question of the blackman's acceptability into the

whiteman's community – as is the case in both instances, but it is a capitalist-colonial question within the "local" imperialistic context. It is a national question and also a class question – a question of African self-determination from "local" imperialism and colonialism – and of transition or transformation from the political economy of imperialism to the political economy of anti-imperialism.

3. Afro-European Conflict: Principal Contradiction in Sub-continent

"Local" imperialism is the economic basis of the Southern African problem and the crux of the matter in solution is African liberation and socio-economic emancipation. However monopoly capitalistic, therefore however class determined in nature in the final analysis, yet, – due to the capitalist-colonial essence of sub-continent socio-historical reality, the most immediate, direct and clearly perceptible aspect of our environment is the conflict between Europeans and Africans. This is the principal contradiction.

As the dominating and exploiting oppressor group, Europeans in Southern Africa, particularly South Africa, form a "local imperialistic settler-colonial community". From their midst has emerged the sub-continent's monopoly capitalists and landlords – super-exploiters of African labour-power and expropriators of African lands – whose political representatives were initially Cecil John Rhodes and Paul Kruger, and are presently Harry Oppenheimer and John Vorster. It is true that not everybody of South Africa's close to four million Europeans is a capitalist, for that matter a monopoly capitalist, or a landlord, or a farmer; certainly, there are non-property holding industrial, commercial, and government employees within this community. But the monopoly capitalistic nature of the economy and the particular socio-economic relations in industry, commerce and the bureaucracy have turned the European employees into a privileged stratum of the working people, into a labour aristocracy. By its material interests, life-style, and by its perspective goals, the labour aristocracy is political-economically and socio-historically tied to the destiny of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords. It is thoroughly racist, colonialist and imperialist in all respects because the continued ex-

istence of capitalist-colonialism guarantees its privileged position. It is divorced from the black working class.

The entire European community in town and countryside constitutes what I call the "local imperialistic settler-colonial community". It is against this "local imperialistic settler-colonial community" that sub-continental African efforts in politics, economics and culture, are directed; and "Disengagement and Development" is disengagement from the politics, economics and culture of the "local imperialistic settler-colonial community." In all these respects, "local" Europeans express, promote and propound the totality of material relations and spiritual values of settler-colonial capitalist-imperialism; while quintessentially the African effort, particularly the efforts of African labour, can be summarised as the struggle for promoting what is at times referred to as the "African Personality". This is, the struggle for African control of production, social development, and cultural construction; a struggle for overcoming exploitation; a struggle for self-determination; a struggle for promoting the negation of "local" imperialism and colonialism. As a struggle for self-determination it has the land as its touchstone – and to that extent it differs from the struggle for civil rights or for mutual social tolerance among the three principal races within the sub-continent. Racial federation is not the issue – the key questions are the land (national self-determination) and the political economy (nature of productive relations) – which are the essential conditions for "Disengagement and Development". In so far as this implies negation of capitalist-imperialism, including of course its special cultural-linguistic creation known as the Afrikaans Language, then this "Disengagement" is carried on under different banners: "Black Power" or "Black consciousness" or "Azania" – all of which portray the ideal order in different aspects: either geopolitical-ly or purely politically, or culturally.

In short, "Disengagement and Development" only acquire a concrete meaning when given a concrete analysis within the concrete situation of South African "local" imperialism – that is, when understood in the precise framework of self-determination and transition from capitalism. More generally, "Disengagement and Development" boil down to the negation of

negation: African reconquest of the Fatherland and transformation of the entire socio-economic fabric from top to bottom. This is the content of "Disengagement and Development"; the form they acquire is national-liberatory.

So far, the major milestone in national liberation of the Southern Bantu is the formal independence of former High Commission Territories, but it as yet lacks political-economic content. The political-economic content of self-determination by the Sotho and Nguni speaking people of Southern Africa can only fully blossom when the present formal independence of former High Commission Territories links up with the triumph of black workers' power in South Africa. This brings us to geopolitical connotations of "Disengagement and Development".

However great the euphoria, and however strong the jealousy about present boundaries by the local population of former High Commission Territories, yet from the standpoint of Southern Bantu unity it would be myopic to reduce "Disengagement and Development" to separatism. Former High Commission Territories are African sanctuaries in the face of sub-continental European jingoism. African unity beyond the historical era of "local" imperialism necessarily must place revision of boundaries as a key element of the transition to the epoch of "Black Power". This question is not as easy as it is at times made to appear in publicism. What has to be appreciated in this respect is the variety of alienation we are subjected to by "local" imperialism.

4. Alienation and White Racism.

The political-economic basis of European presence in the sub-continent is, and always has been, appropriation of African surplus-labour and the surplus-value it generates in the varying forms of profit, rent, interest. Therefore, Europeans within the sub-continent are either capitalists, landowners, commercial farmers, or rentiers, because the basis of their economic existence is surplus-value. With Africans, labour and the sale of labour-power is the basic factor for economic survival – although there are feudal aristocrats. Hence the majority of Africans are industrial proletarians, farm tenants, communal peasants, migrant labourers, and some

other types of labourers – they are urban and rural working folk. This category of labour is at the same time the material basis for African solidarity. On the other hand, African solidarity is the result of African alienation from ownership of their motherland – because we're a colonised people; and it is also the outcome of alienation from the results of our own labour-productive activity in industry and agriculture: from our commodities and the surplus value they give rise to in market exchange. And African unity becomes political-economically meaningful to the extent to which it promotes the overcoming of alienation from means of production (land and industry) and from results of labour. Otherwise it is impossible.

With regard to "local" imperialism, taken as a system, alienation has much wider implications.

Indeed, combination of African labour-power and means of production or assets, while necessary for effecting socio-economic growth, is constantly impeded by the content of property relations, giving rise to antagonism and anarchy in the production process. African labour finds no material stimulus to the development of agricultural and industrial prowess because of the extremely non-economic government labour legislation regulating productive factors – although the capitalist commodity-producing economic basis necessitates wage-labour (in industry) and allotment-holding tenancy (in agriculture). Equally, industrialists, farmers and bankers, while resentful to high-skilled African labour as racists, are yet obliged by the requirements of competition – which imposes labour-intensification as a necessary condition for profitability – to employ this same African labour in order to squeeze out surplus-value.

The result is general low level of efficiency in economic performance: low productivity of labour; low capital exploitation by labour; low technical composition of capital; technological dependence on foreign countries; low scientific-technological potential. In a word, owners of labour-power and owners of means of production are mutually disinterested in intensive development of factors of production due to alienation, resulting in overall low efficiency of economic growth.

Sociologically, migrant labour to leading branches of industry results in

the alienation of breadwinner from dependents, to fluxity of the semi-proletarian family, to tremendous rift between the urban and rural environment within the same socio-economic system.

Ethnologically, African alienation from the land, which is a means of production, has resulted in the artificial and arbitrary disruption of national communities: Batswana in Botswana are but a fraction of all the Batswana in the sub-continent, the same applies to Lesotho's Basotho and Swaziland's Swazis – all are communally alienated; and that poses reunification of ethnic communities as an important task before the Africans.

Ideological perversions of alienation are varied enough. Racism, as an ideology, is alienation from material reality: it has no scientific basis in biology. It is sheer aggressive jingoism employed by the imperialist bourgeoisie to justify foreign expansions and super-exploitation. Philosophically-speaking, it is the mental reflection of the alienation of surplus-value in economic reality. It has class, and not biological roots; and is utterly inconsistent from the standpoint of principles of scientific biology. And the national policy of the monopoly bourgeoisie is cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism, alienation of the African from his ethnicity, culture and language, has influenced the sub-continent. And, not surprisingly, a large part of people of African origin have adopted the settler-colonial tongue (Afrikaans) as their own – thus getting alienated from the Southern Bantu communities. Equally, sociological alienation has prevented the white community from becoming Africanised. Despite centuries of domicile it is still essentially settler-colonial.

“Local” imperialism has alienated all – black and white, but to varying degrees. And all are to varying degrees attempting to overcome it. It is our contention that despite outward displays of bravado and intransigence even the Boer is attempting to overcome alienation however wrong and futile the methods employed. The crucial question in overcoming the alienation in which our environment has placed us – the crucial question in “Disengagement and Development” – is the political and socio-economic standing of the African. Decolonisation is the primary condition for overcoming alienation.

5. South Africa or Azania or Chamohia?

What merits attention is the interrelationship between decolonisation of South-West Africa, decolonisation of South Africa and the geopolitical destiny of former High Commission Territories.

Geopolitically, the former's i.e. South-West Africa's, destiny is clear in relation to the South African body politic: it must be disannexed, decolonised, and allowed to constitute itself into the independent state of Namibia. Its “Disengagement and Development” must envisage territorial separation.

But in relation to South Africa, secession by any of the communities inhabiting any of its four provinces would be nonsensical from the African point of view. And if territorial integrity is what we advocate – that is, African self-determination over all South Africa, from Messina to Cape Town, then this collective self-determination by the Sotho and Nguni speaking and Venda and Thonga speaking communities of RSA inevitably affects the destiny of the Sotho and Nguni speaking communities of former High Commission Territories; therefore, the geopolitical future of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland as presently constituted. We analyse this question under the leitmotif of principal political doctrines in RSA liberation movements.

Two principal schools contend: African National Congress (S.A.) and Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania. We call the former the “South African” school, and the latter the “Azanian” school. While the individual histories of these two political organisations is beyond the terms of our paper, it is pertinent to underscore that the origins of the “South African” and “Azanian” schools take us to the second half of 1940s – to the polemic between ANC Youth League (whose ideological centre was Fort Hare University College) and the Old ANC (which had connections with the Indian Congress and the Communist Party of South Africa). In 1949, on the initiative of ANC Youth League, the famous Programme of Action was adopted: it was a programme which enshrined ideas of black majority rule and black leadership. In 1955, at Klipfontein, ANC adopted the Freedom charter as its programmatic document – a charter that propounds the

perspective of multi-racialism. On the basis of the Freedom Charter, the Congress Alliance – Alliance of ANC, Indian Congress, Coloured People's Congress, Congress of Democrats – was formed.

Talking more specifically, therefore, about the “South African” and “Azanian” schools, we are dealing with the general lines outlined by the 1949 Programme of Action and the 1955 Freedom Charter with the former emphasizing “Black Leadership”, “Black Power”, “Black Consciousness” – what the PAC calls “Azania” – and the latter laying stress on “Mutual Accommodation”, “Mutual Acceptability”, “Racial Co-existence” – what the ANC calls “Multi-racialism”. The former underscored the land – its reconquest from settler Europeans; the latter, though touching upon the land, and calling for its nationalisation, emphasizes segregation in social affairs and landownership.

Whatever the rhetorical argumentations, one way or the other, the centre of attraction in both lines is the place and role of the African in the new epoch. In short, the core issue is transformation from present reality into some other ideal one, with the African as the decisive factor.

In many respects, within the context of multi-racialist socio-political milieu African collective self-determination is untenable, to put it mildly. Such a perspective – essentially sanctifies the present political geography of RSA with its four provinces. It further takes the validity of the settler-colonial doctrine on races for granted in violation of the conclusions of anthropology and ethnology, particularly in relation to so-called “Coloureds”, who are basically an African people of mixed racial origin. Besides, the political economy of “local” imperialism – according to which, on the land question, all landowners and commercial farmers are of European stock – rules out any multi-racial landownership under nationalisation, that is, when – through state ownership of land – all private holdings will be abolished and the land will belong to the people. Geopolitically, the multi-racialist perspective fails to take us beyond the political-geographical separation of RSA from former High Commission Territories. This is the weakness of the “South African” school, however plausible its anti-apartheid efforts in practical activities.

The Meaning of the Azanian School

The strength of the "Azanian" school, as opposed to the "South African" school, consists in its grasp of the African ethos, be such a grasp intuitive or spontaneous or, in certain respects, not satisfactory in ethno-historical substantiation.

Azania, it is argued, is the "original" name of the sub-continent and must therefore replace the present settler-colonial appellation of "South Africa". It is further argued that the name "Azania" derives from the Arabic or Greek reference to the African eastern coast as "Zenj." Historico-linguistically, the word "Zenj" seems to have led to the appellation of "Zanzibar" – the East African island which is now part of the Tanzanian State. For our purposes, word-morphology and syntax are of less concern; nor are we indeed interested in researching into any possible contacts between the Nguni and Sotho people and Greek scholars of Arab mariners at any time in antiquity – for there's no evidence of such. The crux of the matter is that a given political movement – spearheaded by PAC, BPC, SASO – has adopted this name to highlight a particular line whose basic tenets are African self-determination and black majority rule within RSA. Self-determined, under African rule, South Africa can politically become Azania, that is a "blackman's country." Such is the content of the line of the "Azanian" school.

The political merits of the line are undisputed, especially, when combined with an anti-imperialist political economy. Nevertheless, there are conceptual difficulties which must not fail our notice.

If present RSA, taken political-geographically, is what Azania consists in, then the Azanian geopolitical concept falls short of sub-continental African unity embracing both South Africa and former High Commission Territories.

It therefore fails to envisage reunification of homogeneous communities because it consciously or unconsciously overlooks ethnology in its treatment of political history. It violates necessary continuity between pre-colonial and colonial history, and is thus unacceptable as an ideal perspective at face-value without further qualification. To the extent to

which Azania is confined to geographical limits of present South Africa, the "Azanian" school geopolitically reduces the line of 1949 Programme of Action to the line of 1955 Freedom Charter. The question is as follows: either South Africa (RSA) is conceptually reducible to Azania – in which case there is identity, or Azania conceptually embraces South Africa together with former High Commission Territories. In the latter case there can be no "Smaller" or "Greater" Azania – only One Azania from Caprivi Strip to Cape Town. But if such be the case, then PAC, BPC, SASO would have to be transformed into transterritorial organisations – meaning: they would have to accept their South African (RSA) organisational essence and renounce it, the better to acquire a truly Azanian profile. Equally, political organisations in former High Commission Territories would have to renounce their respective Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana organisational confines and put on an authentic transterritorial Azanian form. Both options are impossible. Therefore, in terms of sub-continental African unity, the Azanian movement remains essentially a South African (RSA) movement. In so far as it fails to engulf former High Commission Territories it is geopolitically "provincial" – however political-economically decisive the role of RSA as the epicentre of "local" imperialism. And being provincial, in the sub-continental context, if allowed to overlook ethnic relationships within the political economic framework in its treatment of political relations, it runs the danger of getting bogged down by regionalism while professing adherence to Pan-Africanism. The same applies to similar organisations in Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland – they may embrace regionalism.

The Azanian concept, we must emphasize, has tremendous rallying force as a forum for African self-determination. But judged from premises of the theory of Pan-Africanism (or African Unity) and principles of socio-economic transformations – problematics of "Disengagement and Development", – it is not without inevitable limitations relating to world outlook, ideology, and the philosophy of changing from one (lower) state of being to some other (which is higher). The challenge lies in establishing optimality of conceptual content and form and that requires analysis and synthesis –

a given exercise in fundamental thinking. This is why there's a certain feeling, in some of us, that there's inadequacy in our political synthesis: neither "South Africa" nor "Azania" are adequate.

It is our contention that the Southern Bantu ethos boils down to "Chamohia": "CHA" for Chaka, "MO" for Moshoeshe I, "HIA" for Hintsia. Chamohia, the land and/or ideals for which the empire-building Chaka, the federalist Moshoeshe I, and the militant Hintsia struggled and died.

Chaka, Moshoeshe I and Hintsia were the founders of the three kingdoms that more than another shouldered the struggle against Anglo-Boer colonialism; and, in the process, they laid the foundations of the movement for African self-determination in the sub-continent.

We are indebted to Chaka, Moshoeshe I and Hintsia for the sub-continent's efforts to forge a meaningful anti-colonial unity: Moshoeshe I alliance with Chaka (during 1820's) and his alliance with Hintsia and Krela (during 1840's and 1850's). They are the founders of Nguni-Sotho unity.

Being founders of our initial statehood, its passionate defenders against foreign encroachment, at the sametime founders of transterritorial African unity, from the standpoint of ethnohistorical and political continuity they are the foundation stones of the anti-colonial statehood we dream of namely, integration of African lands into one state.

Geopolitically, Chamohia is undisputedly RSA and former High Commission Territories all combined. Its history is the History of the Africans in Southern Africa. Its essence is the monolithic unity of the black people of Southern Africa. The conditions for its being are African rule and political-economic integration of the sub-continent. The workingman – be he a migrant labourer or a settled proletarian – epitomizes the Chamohian essence principally because he is less regionalistic in his labour-productive activity and his spiritual make-up. And the clarion call for Chamohian unity is a call for worker's power.

6. Conclusion

The foregoing brings us to the end of our exploration. The theme is vast, ex-

citing, challenging. All in all, it is a problem that relates to the African – the African workingman in particular: his place in the system of “local” imperialism and his destiny. It is a theme that demands lots of compassion, originality, logical consistency and powerful vision.

Problems of the African in Southern Africa are not just regional, but finally affect the place and role of the negro

race in the universe; because much that relates to the final transition to Black Proletarian Power in this economically most developed part of the continent will reverberate worldwide on the standing of our long-suffering race. In a sense, nothing is a greater challenge to this race, particularly the part domiciled in Africa, than the transition from “LOCAL” imperialism to victorious anti-imperialism in this southern tip of the continent.

advent of Pan-Africanism in the 1940's.

Legassick and Hemson demonstrate that the theory of “racial capitalism” is not rooted in historical materialism by their contention that: “The British state, acting on behalf of British capital, intervened in 1900 to assume a hegemony in South Africa under which was created the foundations of South Africa's racial capitalism and the modern apartheid regime. Segregation was not invented by Afrikaners in South Africa.” (p. 3) Legassick and Hemson attempt to disregard two hundred years of colonialism in Southern Africa in which the white settler population achieved hegemony over the African population. To uphold the contention that the Afrikaners (the Dutch settlers) did not invent segregation is stupid. Furthermore, the British state and British capital worked hand-in-hand – as British imperialism – not to create racial capitalism, but a new colonial order – the so-called Union of South Africa. Certainly, the period between 1900 and 1910 opened white settler colonialism for further capitalist exploitation and imperialist domination. However, the white ruling class remained ascendant over the African masses; white settler colonialism was not replaced by racial capitalism. As for the modern apartheid regime, its foundations were created in the rising economic and political power of the Dutch settler community within the colonial framework.

In failing to base the theory of “racial capitalism” on a correct understanding of the development of the political economy of South African colonialism, Legassick and Hemson commit a number of elementary errors. The nineteenth century is described as a period in which the difference in wealth and power “were not as severe as they rapidly became”, because “the overwhelming majority of (South Africans), black and white, were agricultural producers” (p. 3). The brutal processes of primitive accumulation and the establishment of a wealthy and powerful white ruling class over the African masses are overlooked in order to cater to the “historical” justification of the theory of “racial capitalism”. In another instance, the impression is created that the colour bar and segregation were instituted by the British imperialists after 1900 to “divide the working class” and to reduce “working costs.” Clearly,

Neo-Marxism and the Bogus Theory of “Racial Capitalism”

In the 1970's the hegemony of the so-called South African “Communist” Party over revisionist analysis of South Africa has been challenged. One divergent trend has drawn its inspiration from Trotskyite, revisionist and reformist deviations from Marxism-Leninism that have originated in Europe and have been termed as Neo-Marxism. Such entities as the revisionist schools of Althusser and Poulantzas in France, the Trotskyite *New Left Review* in England, and “Euro-Communist” philosophers in various parts of Europe have distorted Marxist-Leninist theory to satisfy various petty-bourgeois political ends. The “Neo-Marxist” tendency in South African analysis has disregarded the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the national and colonial question, and has put forward the theory of “racial capitalism” in analysing South Africa. This apparently “ultra-revolutionary” theory betrays the aspirations of a handful of white leftists to play a leading role in the Azanian liberation struggle.

“Neo-Marxism” and the theory of “racial capitalism” have been upheld in the writings of the dubious, white South African pair of Martin Legassick and Harold Wolpe. (Remember the trial of ANC-leader Nelson Mandela in 1964) *The Review of African Political Economy* (RAPE), No. 7, September-December 1976, and the second in a new series of papers commissioned by the British Anti-Apartheid Movement – Martin Legassick and David Hemson, *Foreign Investment and the Reproduction of Racial Capitalism in South Africa* – comprise a departure from the line of the SA“C”P and a defence of the “ra-

cial capitalism” thesis. Wolpe, Legassick and Co. have replaced the incorrect SA“C”P analysis of “internal colonialism” or “colonialism of a special type” and formula of a multi-racial struggle for democracy, with equally erroneous ultra-left offerings. To anyone familiar with the correct analysis of the Azanian liberation struggle, the contention that racialism is a creation of capitalism and can only be overthrown by a proletarian revolution is a load of shit.

A colonial order

The false and bogus theory of “racial capitalism” contends that the “creation of contemporary forms of racial ideology and political forms of racial discrimination in South Africa was a consequence of capitalist development”. (Legassick and Hemson, p. 1) Such a theory discards the principal contradiction between the white ruling class and the toiling black African masses – engendered by colonialism – that characterizes the current South African social formation. Instead, the capitalist mode of production and the contradiction between capitalists and the working masses has been wrongly promoted from a secondary position to serve the theory of “racial capitalism”. Consequently, the liberation movement is characterized as being “against racism or capitalism”: for democratization of the South African state in the 1940's and 1950's, and for the revolutionary overthrow of the apartheid regime after 1960. The theory of “racial capitalism” is incapable of explaining that the African liberation struggle has been waged in order to return AZANIA to the black working masses, especially since the

the division between the slave labour and subsistence wages accorded to black workers has always been the principal demand of the white settler colonial working class and has been accommodated by every form of colonial state. After 1900, the British imperialists facilitated the takeover of the mining industry by monopoly capitalism which expedited the reduction of operational costs and the acceleration of surplus value extraction. The colour bar and segregation were further institutionalized in the new colonial order as a function of the colonial economy, despite the preference of big capital for cheap black labour at most levels of the mining industry.

White Workers

Once committed to the baseless theory of "racial capitalism", one error follows another. The struggle of white mineworkers to resist an alteration of the job colour bars is depicted by Legassick and Hemson as a sign of militancy. The drawback was that "they did not fight the colour bar itself or help the African workers resist mining capital; they were encapsulated in the situation of racial differentiation which had arisen out of earlier class struggles in the mining industry." (p. 5). Such a ludicrous conception is completely contrary to fact. The white mineworkers have always resisted African advancement, since they have been diametrically opposed in colonial and class struggles. From their totally mistaken perspective, Legassick and Hemson proceed to conclude that the 1922 Rand Revolt was progressive (!), because it "created a situation in which political power passed to a government more prepared to advance the interests of national (sic!) capital as against foreign capital." (p. 5). What complete and total stupidity! Where are the colonized African masses in this conception? The 1922 Rand Revolt was reactionary in that it furthered the cause of the settler community as a whole – settler capitalism and workers alike. The political and economic advancement of the African masses was crushed.

In describing the stringent legislation against African urbanization in 1937, Legassick and Hemson fail to recognise a vivid manifestation of colonialism when it is staring them in the face. The South African colonial state was imposing its "way out of the situation where Africans were becoming

fully proletarianised", which "was to continue to use their labour power, but to deny them any social and political rights in the South African community and to separate the commodity labour-power from the household". (p. 6). The solution imposed by the South African colonial state was not indicative of racially-discriminatory capitalism, but of permanent exclusion from the South African community, i.e., white colonial society. The only alternative for Africans has been to smash the "South African community" and to construct an Azanian society in its place.

The prescriptions of Legassick and Hemson for international action against apartheid are stricken with a similar form of political blindness – the blindness of Trotskyites. British monopoly capitalist concerns are not seen as "British property, or South African property, but ultimately the product, and hence the social property, of the international working class." (p. 14) Such a formulation is a typical Trotskyite distortion of proletarian internationalism and the relationship among the international working class. Obviously, imperialist and colonialist capital (property) in South Africa is the product of the Azanian working masses and hence their social property. It seems that Legassick and Hemson take such a Trotskyite belief in order to justify continued interference in the Azanian liberation struggle.

The Trotskyite solution of Legassick and Hemson to the problem of the international solidarity of labour against apartheid and capitalism is drawn from the *Review of African Political Economy*: "the increasing internationalization of capital requires in the final analysis the increasing internationalization of labour, for the ability to hold workers to ransom by the threat of relocating production can be met only by international workers' solidarity... present developments call for the development of international unionism. This will surely be difficult, impaired by the existence of large international differentials and blocked at every step by the nationalist and racist ideologies so ready at hand." (p. 14). The Trotskyite failure to understand the national question and the manipulations of imperialism leads to an advocacy of the absurd utopia of "international unionism" and the "internationalization of labour" and their subsequent defeatist dismissal. The

struggle against capitalism must occur within each nation-state, as must the struggle against imperialism and its labour aristocracy which perpetuates the oppression of the Azanian labour masses. Only through these struggles can principled proletarian internationalism and international working class solidarity against apartheid be formed. Predictably, the theory of "racial capitalism" leads Legassick and Hemson to fallacious conclusions as to the approach of international solidarity towards the Azanian liberation struggle. The "South African working class" is seen mistakenly as the object of solidarity, rather than the Black Azanian workers and peasants. The approach of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) is criticised, but from the incorrect perspective that the ILO supports an organisation like the Trade Union Council of South Africa (TUCSA), which consider "themselves ambassadors for racial capitalism abroad" (p. 15). In fact, TUCSA (and the multi-racial SACTU) serves the interests of the white workers, and any other trade union organisation other than a purely Azanian union would do the same. Legassick and Hemson proceed from this point to criticize those who urge total isolation of South Africa and uphold solidarity with the workers of South Africa without making any distinction between the white settler colonial workers and the Azanian working class. The theory of "racial capitalism" and its peddlars are incapable of producing the only possible conclusion that South Africa must be isolated, and AZANIA upheld and supported – Azanian unions, e.g. BAWU, Azanian liberation movements, and the Azanian People's Liberation Army.

Trotskyite Interpretations

The special issue on South Africa that appeared in the *Review of African Political Economy* has been rendered totally counter-revolutionary by the bogus theory of "racial capitalism" and its adherents. The editors attempt to apologize for the fact that the articles concentrate on white South Africa, by claiming that "they seek to analyse the enemy, because that is a vital necessity and because that is an area in which it is possible for us to make a contribution" (RAPE, p. 2). If the European editors (including Ruth First of the SA"CP) and contributors are only capable of analysing

"racial capitalism" in White South Africa, why do they think they are capable of producing an issue on Azania (and Africa, for that matter) at all? From the articles in *RAPE 7* it is apparent that all concerned with the issue would have done better if they had kept their familiarity with Poulantzas and Ernest Mandel to themselves.

The article, "Class Struggle and the Periodisation of the State in South Africa", starts by professing faith in Poulantzas and his axiom that class struggle is the principal determinant of the state. How Poulantzas can be applied to South Africa and its colonial state is left unconsidered; the struggle of Africans as an oppressed class, people, or nation, is ignored. Instead, the four authors consider the secondary contradictions within the colonial ruling class and imperialism as determining features of the South African state.

By employing the false theory of "racial capitalism" and by clumsily distorting historical reality to fit their arguments, *RAPE 7*'s "gang of four" attempt to trace the contradictions between "imperial/foreign capital" and "national (sic) capital". The "Pact Period of 1924 - 1933" is portrayed as the years in which the colonial state was used to promote "national (sic) capital", without a proper analysis of the collusion of imperialism in this process. Even worse, the partnership role of the white settler colonial working class with its fellow white capitalists is completely distorted to convey the false impression that the white workers (and some blacks!) were deceived into abandoning the "class struggle" for a "non-productive alliance"! The simplistic and dogmatic structuralism of Poulantzas, combined with counter-revolutionary tendencies, prevent this little "gang of four" from correctly distinguishing between "national capital" and white settler colonial capital - dominated by imperialism and bolstered by the entire white South African community. In explaining the support of the entire "power bloc" for the repressive measures of the Fusion government, the white working class is divided into a "left" wing, interested in economic struggles, and a "right" wing, interested in the political and ideological struggles of Dutch settler fascism (the Broederbond, etc.), i.e., the preservation of colonialism. However, this "right wing" and other opponents of the "imperialist war" are portrayed as progressive and anti-

imperialists!! What typical Trotskyite logic in objectively allying with the fascism of Hitler, Verwoerd, and Vorster against the Soviet Union and Democracy during the Second World War.

The second article, "Capital Accumulation and South Africa", takes up the poorly explained "interpenetration" of capital after 1945 of the first article, but falters as a result of similar Trotskyite errors. The inability of "national (sic) capital" to develop a more self-reliant and mature economy is perceived as a common failing of non-Western capitalists because of the penetration of foreign capital. The white settler colonial capitalists are not portrayed as being divorced from any possible support from AZANIANS, and as being tied politically and economically with Western imperialism, and as being otherwise limited in their economic and political independence. Instead, the Trotskyite formulations of "racial capitalism" and a monolithically compradore bourgeoisie takes precedence.

Robert Davies and David Lewis in "Industrial Relations Legislation: one of Capitals's Defences", play the most despicably counter-revolutionary role in *RAPE 7* through their attempts to lump black workers and white settler colonial workers together. For authors, "Hindness and Hirst and Poulantzas" hold "that the state is the factor of cohesion in class societies and the place where the contradictions are condensed" (*RAPE*, p. 57). By inverting Marx and Lenin's theories on the state as an instrument of ruling class repression, these supporters of the bogus theory of "racial capitalism" are able to describe the industrial relations legislation and other activities of the colonial state as a mark of conciliation to white settler colonial workers. The acknowledgement of "trade union power" of white settler colonial workers is employed to prove that the South African colonial state - like any other state - has not been inclined to wage fierce class struggles with the working class! However, the fact that the white settler colonial workers were part of South African colonialism from the start has been ignored by Davies and Lewis in order to preserve their incredible logic.

The faulty construction concerning the South African state and white workers is then foolishly extended to encompass the African proletariat!

The South African colonial state has, supposedly, employed a combination of conciliatory (!) acts and repressive measures to contain African working class struggles at a lower level than those of the white working class! At one point, Davies and Lewis contend that the South African "bourgeoisie" was concerned that "the mere occurrence of strikes by whites might make more likely political class struggle by blacks." (*RAPE*, p. 59). 'Tis the old line. White leadership for the blacks, especially for working class struggles. The authors thus see "racial capitalism" as a disruptive device to keep white and black workers apart and support the Congress Alliance and SACTU as a "populist alliance in resistance to capital". So, despite all the Trotskyite contortions, it's back to the old line of the South African "Communist" Party: multi-racialism and white leadership for Blacks.

The Apartheid Strategy

Two articles on the Bantustans - one by Wolpe and Legassick - miss the central point of the *apartheid* strategy employed by the South African colonial state. Instead, the false theory of "racial capitalism" leads to much convoluted analysis on whether the economic function of the Bantustans is to provide a source of cheap labour or to marginalize the "surplus African population". Of course, the primary purpose of the *apartheid* strategy has been to prevent the increasingly powerful African masses from threatening the dominance of white settler colonialism. The Bantustan has constituted an integral part of *apartheid*, as a device to destroy the increasing unity of the African masses. Yet, this overriding political fact does not figure significantly in the abstract formulations of Wolpe, Legassick and the like. The subversive logic of the bogus theory of "racial capitalism" attributes the Black Consciousness Movement and the heroic June 16 Soweto Uprisings to a "lack of redistributive effort by the South African state". Once again, as in the long experience of *Ikwezi* with the racist errors of Trotskyite and other European "experts" concerned with Southern Africa, the power of the South African colonial state and imperialism are exaggerated, and the correctness and the intensity of the liberation struggle of the Black Azanian masses are belittled.

The series of four review articles on Trotskyite distortions of the national question in Azania have been persistent in emphasizing a few basic themes. From the perspective of most Azanians and Africans, the Trotskyites and their ilk do not pose a substantial threat to the revolutionary struggles on the continent. However, Trotskyites and their revolutionary-sounding formulas have been adept at worming their way into revolutionary struggles, especially among students. For a small number of Azanians, the ultra-left analyses of South Africa may be more attractive than the correct and mass-supported Pan-Africanist line or the bankrupt revisionist slogans. It is necessary to expose such inventions as "racial capitalism" as the counter-revolutionary clap-trap they are. Azanian patriots must be prepared for the splitting and wrecking activities of the Trotskyites, just as they have struggled against the white revisionists of the SA "C" P. Any attempt to split Azanians into "socialists" and "nationalists" at this stage of the liberation struggle amounts to Trotskyite sabotage. Azanian revolutionaries must closely study and learn from the legacy which Comrade J.V. Stalin created for other revolutions – in China, in Albania, in Vietnam, in Korea, etc. – in dealing with the Trotskyite menace:

"If we had not defeated the Trot-

skyites and the Bukharinites, we could not have brought about the conditions that are essential for the building of Socialism.

It may seem to some that the Bolsheviks devoted far too much time to this struggle against the opportunist elements in the Party, that they over-rated their importance. But that is altogether wrong. Opportunism in our midst is like a ulcer in a healthy organism, and must not be tolerated. The Party is the leading detachment of the working class, its advanced fortress, its general staff. Sceptics, opportunists, capitulators, and traitors cannot be tolerated on the directing staff of the working class. If, while it is carrying on a life and death fight against the bourgeoisie, there are capitulators on its own staff, the working class will be caught between two fires, from the front and the rear. Clearly, such a struggle can only end in defeat. The easiest way to capture a fortress is from within. To attain victory, the Party of the working class must first be purged of capitulators, deserters, scabs and traitors."

(History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) Short Course edited by a commission of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. (B), Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1939, p. 360.)

The Role of Students and Youth in the Changing Azanian Situation

By Bafana Buthelezi

(A paper prepared for delivery at the Southern African Universities Social Science Conference, May 13-15, 1978, Lusaka, Zambia)

I felt obliged to present this paper, because of the general quest of public opinion to be informed about the students and youth movement of my country, for reasons surrounding "Soweto".

This, however, is not irrelevant. It is quite appropriate in a conference of this nature, convened in this part of the world at this point in history that the students and youth movement of my country be given a forum.

I will refer to my country as Azania, a name popularly accepted by my people today. I shall specifically talk about

the students and youth of Azania, and their role in the struggle for Azania.

In speaking about the role of Black students and youth in the struggle for the liberation of Azania, I will start by tracing the beginning of our movement. The students and youth movement started in 1968 with the formation of the South African Students Organisation (SASO). The Black students who found SASO, formerly belonged to the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS). But as for SASO, she was never part of NUSAS from inception hitherto.

Black students who had been members of NUSAS, multi-racial organisation of university students, realized the ineffectiveness of multi-ra-

cial organisations when it came to taking positive steps in the direction of solving the Black man's problem of oppression. In solving their problem, Blacks had nothing to lose but chains, and whites had a lot to lose.

Black students also noted the anomalous situation where the whites oppressed the Blacks, and still wanted to control the Black man's response to this oppression. Behind the birth of SASO there was a realization, an awareness, a consciousness dictated by objective conditions in a society in which class affiliation was determined by race affiliation. It was an awareness of the incompatibility of the interests of oppressor and oppressed – in the context of our country, white and black. Our situation was, as it still is, one where oppression came from white settlers, making all whites belong to the oppressor group, for even white liberals benefited like all other whites from a system which ruthlessly oppressed and exploited the Black man. The oppressor being racist this had to be the case. Black Consciousness itself was an awareness by blacks of their socio-economic position in an oppressive white racist society. For Blacks are oppressed as a race, or rather as a nation; hence their struggle being that of National Liberation.

Like in all colonial situations, the oppressed were made to feel inferior and to glorify the oppressor culture. Black Consciousness was brought by the students as a weapon to destroy the feeling of inferiority, the element of fear, and break the mental chains that tied the Black people.

At the time of the formation of SASO, the Black struggle which had died out in the early sixties had been led mainly by white liberals. SASO took the position that Blacks should be on their own. The political position of SASO was enshrined in the SASO policy Manifesto, adopted in 1971. I will reproduce it partly. It stated that: "SASO believes that:

3 (a) South Africa is a country in which both black and white live and shall continue to live together;

(b) that the white man must be made aware that one is either part of the solution or part of the problem;

(c) that in this context, because of the privileges accorded to them by legislation and because of their continual maintenance of an oppressive regime, whites have defined themselves as part of the problem;

(d) that therefore we believe that in all matters relating to the struggle towards realizing our aspirations, whites must be excluded.

(e) that this attitude should not be interpreted by Blacks to imply "anti-whitism" but merely a more positive way of attaining a normal situation in South Africa;

4 (a) SASO upholds the concept of Black Consciousness and the drive towards Black awareness as the most logical and significant means of ridding ourselves of the shackles that bind us in perpetual servitude."

The policy Manifesto also stated that; 4 (b) iv. "the concept of Black Consciousness implies an awareness by the Black people of the power they wield as a group" and that, "Black Consciousness will always be enhanced by the totality of involvement of the oppressed people, hence the message of Black Consciousness has to be spread to reach all sections of the Black community."

Nature of Black consciousness

This shows why our movement consists of so many organizations representing all sections of the Black community.

These features of the SASO policy Manifesto are enough to throw light on the basis of the students' and youth movement's liberatory endeavour. I will quote other sections as it becomes appropriate in due course.

The emergence of SASO with her rejection of the role of white liberals in our struggle came as a consternation to the liberals. They wondered as to what was happening with the Black man now. They thought Blacks were beginning not to be grateful for white efforts to lead them to freedom. However, Black students continued with their call: **BLACK MAN YOU ARE ON YOUR OWN!**

The white racists were beginning to fear that their dreaded bogey of "swart gevaar" was becoming real. SASO continued under the leadership of its first president, Steve Biko. They immediately acted on their principle that "Black consciousness implies an awareness by the Black people of the power they wield as a group". This achieved Black Solidarity, first among the university students themselves, and then spread like fire in the Black community at large.

By 1972 Black Consciousness was already the main guide of students in their actions. Some people have said that Black Consciousness has limitations. This shows a mis-construction of Black Consciousness. Black Consciousness, like all consciousness is a state of mind, an awareness. It is either one bears it wholly or not at all – you cannot bear it to a limited extent. It is awareness by an oppressed man of his situation of oppression and that it is within his power to do something about it and that it is only himself who can solve this situation on his own: it is a psychological liberation, a consciousness that precedes every revolution, a national consciousness that makes an oppressed nation stand up and wage a national liberation struggle. The word "Black" in "Black Consciousness" does not make it limited, it only means that the oppressed man who bears it in our situation is a black man who is in a situation where colour is emphasized against him. Otherwise it is a consciousness whole in itself, of an oppressed man that he has dignity too.

Its relevance was seen from the speed with which it spread among Black people. Totality of involvement and solidarity were seen in action. By 1972 inferiority complex was now non-existent in the people.

At the University of the North, SASO member and SRC (Students Representative Council) President, Tiro, strongly spoke against the abominable system of Bantu Education. Making a speech at the graduation ceremony in 1972, he stated:

"Our parents have been locked outside, but white people who cannot even cheer us have the front seats. My dear people, shall we ever get a fair deal in this land of our fathers?"

The system is failing. We Black graduates are being called to greater responsibilities in the liberation of our people. Of what use will be our education if we cannot help our people in this hour of need? There is one thing the Minister cannot do; he cannot ban ideas from men's minds. The day shall come when all shall be free to breathe the air of freedom."

Ongopotse Ramothibi Tiro continued and emphasized that:

"the guilt of all wrongful actions in South Africa ... rests on those who do not actively dissociate themselves from

and work for the eradication of the system breeding such evils".

Following this speech, he was expelled from the university. All students joined in solidarity and made a walk-out, putting as condition for their return, the reinstatement of Tiro. All the Black students in the so called black universities in the country took it up ... Fort Hare, Ngoye (University of Zululand), and the University of Western Cape. The students believed in the "totality of involvement" and solidarity of the people; in the oppressive systems in which they found themselves.

O.R. Tiro became National Organizer of SASO and, in 1973 founded SASM ... junior SASO. The South African Students Movement (SASM) comprised of school students from Form V to the primaries. This was the realization of SASO's belief that to achieve the totality of involvement of all oppressed people, the "message of Black consciousness has to be spread to reach all sections of the Black community". The formation of SASM was a process of spreading it to cover the whole student community. The formation of NAYO (National Youth Organisation) in the same year completed the process of spreading it among the youth of our country. Now the students and youth movement was represented by SASO, SASM and NAYO. The whole youth was now mobilized.

O.R. Tiro was banned in 1973 and later assassinated by a parcel bomb while he was in exile in Botswana, where he was President of the Southern African Students Movement. His death was tragic. However, to those whose hands had apart in it re-echo his message: "the guilt of all wrongful actions in South Africa ... rests on those who do not actively dissociate themselves from and work for the eradication of the system breeding such evils."

The students and youth movement continued to gain momentum. The movement grew to represent all sections of the black community. In 1971 the Black People's Convention was founded, at the instance of SASO. The BPC was formed in a National Organisations Conference, where the broad masses of Azania were represented.

Immediately after its foundation BPC lost a leader in the hands of the enemy. It was Mthuli Ka Shezi who

died after warning some white men who were harassing Black women at Germiston station. He warned them that these women had a dignity too, and they had to respect it. These white men then plotted his death. He was buried with full revolutionary honours, in 1972; in the midst of freedom songs and clenched fist Black Solidarity salutes, he was laid to rest. The enemy followed him up to his grave. They went to destroy a clenched fist Power-salute that was built onto his grave.

We suffered casualties from the very emergence of our movement. BPC continued with the endeavour to "unite and solidify the black people of South Africa with a view to mobilizing the masses towards their struggle for liberation and emancipation, both from psychological and physical oppression."

The spread of Black Consciousness was now almost complete, with the coming into being of the Union of Black Journalists (UBJ), and later the Black Women's Federation (BWF).

It was strengthened and sealed with the mobilization of the Workers through the Black Allied Workers' Union (BAWU), and the Black Workers Project of SASO.

Just as the aim was to spread the message to all sections of the black community to mobilize all the people, so also was it to involve itself in all aspects of Black life cultural, educational, and even in sport. So the organisations of the black consciousness movement represent also all aspects of Black life and activity. Educationally, SASO formed the Literacy Project, culturally, we had the Medupe Writers Association. The religious aspect was not ignored: blacks had to know that if ever they have a God, theirs was a fighting God. We wanted to strip religion of its opium content; just as the oppressors used it to make the masses suffer peacefully, we also used it to make the masses revolt; to make them refuse to suffer peacefully. The people believe that if God does not exist in the ghetto, if he exists in the glittering mansions of the oppressors, then the gospel is a lie. This was the only way of destroying religion in a society where a great majority of the people were christians. What was important was to realize that colonialists used religion as a weapon of invasion and cultural domination, and then destroy it as such a weapon.

It is the particular situation and conditions that prevail in a particular society, that dictate the method of achieving this.

In the process of mobilising the masses, and spreading the message of revolution the students and youth encountered a lot of casualties. In 1973 the whole executive of SASO was banned and the members restricted to various parts of the country. Among them were O.R. Tiro and Steve Biko. However, such casualties were not unexpected. The enemy was hoping to decapitate and cripple SASO; but it was disappointed. These casualties too were not unexpected. Romothibi Tiro, while he was in exile in Botswana sent a message to a SASO conference at home, in which he urged members to continue to be prepared to face casualties which are concomitant with a struggle like ours.

Re-Africanisation of Minds

Amilcar Cabral once said:

"I remember very well how some of us, still students, got together in Lisbon, influenced by the currents which were shaking the world, and began to discuss one day what could today be called the re-Africanisation of our minds."

The re-Africanisation of minds is what we call Black Consciousness. Our concern has been to rid the black people of the element of fear and inferiority complex, which have been inculcated by the colonialists through their missionaries and later through their systems of education. These are weapons through which the black man was made to despise his culture, and so to despise himself. Black consciousness sought to destroy this myth, and bring psychological liberation to Blacks, and make them see through this fallacy; and tell the world, to use Cabral's words: Yes, we are Black. But we are men like all other men.

So long as settler colonialism continues to exist, blacks will continue to be oppressed as a nation. The Black middle class is as oppressed as the black proletariat, and as exploited. The black proletariat sees the white working class as part of its problem. It is interesting to note that the greatest white workers' strike in our history was a protest against an increment in the wages of Black workers in 1922. It is the indigenous people who constitute an oppressed and exploited class. Even

if Apartheid goes, and racial barriers are relaxed that would not render our problem less than that of settler colonialism. Such minor changes might come; with the enemy speeding up Bantustan independence, they may say to Blacks they will be treated like other white foreigners in the white area they hope to call their country, and not be discriminated against. They will do all they can to make the Black man accept that he is a foreigner in his own country. Such minor changes would only be an instance of the problem adjusting itself to the climate of a particular historical period. But the basic nature of the problem will remain the same.

In fact they have made many attempts to legitimize themselves, since they set foot on the soil of our mother land. You know as well as I do that the settlers are not indigenous in our country, but you also know of the various attempts they made from time to time to indigenize themselves in our country. For example, they claimed that the Zulu king, Dingane, signed an agreement giving them land ... a lie which they promoted to make their claim on our land appear legitimate. Over the years they continued adjusting their tactics according to conditions dictated by each historical period. So, in 1955 they engineered another document, making the same claim to our country, just like that alleged to have been signed by Dingane. Now they are using the Bantustan tactic. Nevertheless their status as settlers in our country has not changed.

Right now our country does not belong to all who live in it. It belongs to the indigenous people of Azania, although we admit that "blacks and whites live and shall continue to live together" in our country. The foreigners will stay on the terms of the indigenous people like everywhere else in the world.

There have been claims that SASO aims at driving the whites into the sea. This is not true we simply want to free Azania, not to drive whites into the sea. But this does not mean that if they decide to jump into the sea we shall stop them.

The settlers are now trying to carve up Azania in such a way that they accommodate themselves, an attempt at indigenizing themselves in Azania. Now, more than ever before they have started accelerating their phoney Bantustan independences. I am sure you understand as well as I do, the motive

behind the acceleration of Bantustan bogus independences.

After the heroic struggle of the people of Mozambique and Angola, Portuguese colonialism was given a blow out of Africa. This left South Africa without the blanket that kept her warm and comfortable while the Portuguese maintained Mozambique and Angola as buffers for her. Now she began to feel cold and to shiver at the feeling of insecurity. She even failed to defend the last shreds of her warm blanket in Angola.

The students and youth movement of Azania heralded the decolonization of Mozambique and Angola. The victory of Frelimo and the humiliation of South African troops in Angola, boosted and gave a fillip to the psychological liberation endeavour of black students and youth in Azania, and provided it with an example to point at in showing that the enemy is not invincible, especially because South Africa played a role both in Mozambique and Angola against the forces of liberation.

We saw our struggle as not being isolated from the entire southern African struggle. The victory of Frelimo was a point of victory to our common struggle, on the Mozambican front. All of us who are involved in the struggle for the liberation of the sub-continent are involved in one struggle.

When Frelimo took over, the students and workers of Azania held popular rallies under the leadership of SASO and BPC. The rallies came to be known as Viva Frelimo Rallies or Pro-Frelimo Rallies.

The movement organised the Frelimo Rallies on September 25, 1974, and went ahead even after a banning order was issued, banning the Rally. We felt that the independence of our brothers in Mozambique changed the face of Southern Africa, and that it was an important development in the liberatory endeavour of our people in this region.

"The Frelimo Rally acquired a symbolism for the Black Consciousness movement. It threw focus on the period of change. A change that is moving towards South Africa; towards those directly affected by the negative South African situation, since they are within it, Azania's black masses."

This is what SASO said about the rally. The success of the Rally shocked the racists and their police. Moreover,

they were shocked that the people were braving a banning order which they had passed to prevent the Rally from taking place. About the Rally SASO continued and said:

"The youth was there in vanguard role ... The workers were there too. Some of the workers also got bitten by police dogs, like the students. At the point of call Blacks from different walks of life 'automatically' converged as if to man their positions at the first battlecry. Perhaps this was the reason for the fear and over-reaction of the police".

The Rally, which was held at Curries Fountain in Durban, was followed by large-scale arrests and detentions of SASO and BPC leaders. Then followed the longest political trial in our country, under the Terrorist Act. The trial completed a year on the 4th August 1976. Dr. Manas Buthelezi and Steve Biko, both protagonists of Black Consciousness, were among those who gave evidence for the defence.

Those who were accused and tried were Saths Cooper of BPC, Nchaube Aubrey Mokoape, chairman of the BPC Durban Central branch, Zithulele Cindi, BPC Secretary-General, Nkwenkwe Nkomo, BPC National Organiser; Muntu Myeza, SASO Secretary-General; Mousiua Lekota, SASO National Organiser; Pandelani Nefolovhodwe, SASO President, Gaberone Sedisa, a SASO member and Strini Moodley, another SASO member. They all pleaded not guilty, but Zithulele Cindi, when he was asked to plead, said;

"We are charged with plotting violent revolution but it is we who have been the victims of institutionalized violence. If building schools and dams throughout the country, and trying to install a feeling of self-reliance among black people is terrorism, then I must plead guilty, but I do not believe it is Terrorism".

Mousiua Letota in his evidence denied the allegation made about the Viva Frelimo Rally that it "endangered the maintenance of Law and Order". Muntu Myeza gave evidence for five days. He told the Court, "We insist there must be change". He said that South Africa's pre-occupation with military build-up showed that it was "frantic, desperate and confused"; and that the white press and other news-media were made to swallow their words by the Frelimo victory -

they were had to stop calling Frelimo 'terrorists.'

Even in court they would not be cowed down by the atmosphere of terror. They raised their clenched fists and sang freedom songs as more fear was building up on the part of the "Law". When they were sentenced to prison terms on Robben Island, they made history by going on the island prison, refusing to be subjected to inhuman treatment.

The Viva Frelimo Rally was made by students, youth, workers, fathers and mothers and apart from the SASO/BPC trial following the rally, there was also a Black workers trial at the Heineman Electric Company in Durban who were charged for participating in the Rally under the Riotous Assemblies Act and the Industrial Conciliation Act. The Frelimo Rally instilled some fear in the enemy. In fact the Rally represented a historical land-mark in our mobilization effort in Azania.

However, whether Vorster liked it or not, Mozambique and Angola were independent, and as such, South Africa remained naked to the cold that was shot into their heart by the heat of revolutionary fire.

To make the situation more secure for themselves, they nervously tried to create another blanket around themselves that would keep them warm and comfortable ... another buffer zone. The Transkei was the first step in this direction, Bophuthatswana the second. Venda, on the Zimbabwe border is to follow; another one on the border with Mozambique is designed to come. White settlers, through this, hope to be ultimately secure and comfortable.

The acceleration of Bantustans must be seen in the light of the changing face of Southern Africa and of the strengthening insurrections by the Azanian people within. It is meant to deflect the tide of the people's resistance inside Azania and make it represent "built-in safety valves in the balloon of black frustration, through which the steam is let out so that the balloon should not explode in the face of the oppressor."

In the context of Southern Africa, South Africa will help the Bantustans have their own 'defence forces', so that when the forces of liberation launch, they meet these and South Africa comes in, to their 'aid'. Their role in the Unholy Alliance will be re-enacted here. This is a politico-military

and economic strategy. It is a grand design. Paper bombs are a child's play; they can't resolve it.

The students and youth movement of our country has a clear perspective of the dimensions of this problem. The role of students and youth in the struggle in Azania brought them to the grip of the iron hand of the enemy. They suffered many trials, assassinations, tortures and murders. But even in the face of this, they remained undaunted. Our movement and its members have been tried and tested and found to have an iron determination. The movement has a resilience that has made the enemy reach the tip of its desperation in a vain attempt to crush it.

Political Detainees not Intimidated

The enemy is even afraid to try people in its own 'open' courts. They prefer to detain them and to torture them even to death. In all the cases in which the regime brought people to court, it tried to win members to give evidences against other members. As far as the Black Consciousness movement is concerned such attempts never worked. There was the SASM trial, the NAYO trial, the Ngoye trial, where the 'State' tried without success to get some members to give evidence against other members. Each time it did so, members would turn out in the dock to be defence 'witnesses'. The trial of the UNION of Black Journalists (UBJ) is another example. Thami Mazwai refused to give evidence against Phil Mthimkhulu. He exposed the fact that he was forced to give evidence against his comrade, and that his conscience, would not allow it. There was no instance where a member gave evidence against his comrades, except in the Pietermaritzburg 'ANC trial'. Otherwise, the police tortured people to the extent of maiming them, and even murdering them in an attempt to make them 'State witnesses'. But people would not give in. You cannot bend a man who knows what he is fighting for, what he lives for and is prepared to die for.

In Steve Biko's case, the racist, fascist police intimidated, tortured members and virtually maimed them for life in a bid to make them agree to be State witnesses against Steve Biko. *They were trying to put Steve Biko in jail, most probably for life. Though they had banned and restricted him to King Williamstown, they still felt, to make his isolation complete, they had*

to put him in jail like Nelson Mandela; for Steve refused to be cowed down by the enemy, he refused to succumb, in spite of their banning order. For he believed that "leadership and security are incompatible."

We suffered untold casualties in the course of our struggle. Leaders were murdered in detention and assassinated in exile.

By killing Black leaders the enemy hopes to instill fear into the hearts of the people and demoralize them in general. They hope to stop them from involving themselves in the struggle. This they do so in vain. With the death of each leader or member, the people renew their resolve to fight on. The people have decided to be free; they cannot be stopped from becoming free.

Mapetla Mohapi, a SASO leader, was murdered on August 5, 1976, after 22 days in detention under the Terrorism Act. After they murdered him, the police manufactured a story that he hanged himself with a pair of jeans. Mapetla was a dedicated, quiet man. When he died, he had been banned for 3 years under the suppression of Communism Act. Our oppressors followed him up to his grave — they blocked and harassed people on their way to lay him to rest, and he descended into the grave in the midst of enemy violence. Yet his funeral was one of the biggest funerals of our heroes. It was compared to that of Chief Albert Luthuli.

The enemy withheld results of the post-mortem following his death, and detained doctors who carried it out, in order to make their pair of jeans lie prevail.

Luke Mazwembe of SASO also died in detention in September of the same year. The police manufactured the lie that he had torn a blanket and hanged himself.

The police always interfered with people at the funerals of members, for the funerals also demonstrated the mass support of the movement.

The casualties included Steve Biko. In spite of harassments, intimidations of people and roadblocks throughout the country, mounted by police to prevent people from going to the funerals, the mass of people who gathered to bury Steve Biko were over 20000. The people braved the police terror and refused to be cowed down. This sent shock waves into the hearts of the white government and through their

veins and made them to nervously start framing banning orders to ban the movement.

Amid clenched-fist Power salutes, freedom songs and shouts of Amandla! Power! Steve Biko was laid to rest.

Comrade Thlabanele of SWAPO warned the Boers that they would be hunted down and punished after independence.

Steve Biko's funeral was the second incident to shock the enemy after the Soweto uprising.

The Soweto uprising itself came with the largest number of casualties to be experienced at one go. The uprising came after some time of organising and strategizing by our students' and youth movement, under the leadership of BPC. Various branches of SASO, SASM, NAYO, took the responsibility of organising the campaign in their areas, throughout the country.

The campaign started in Soweto; but it could have started in Zululand also, and before June 16. Students at the SASO branch in Zululand (Ngoye) were on their toes from February 1976 and believed action was overdue.

Now came this Afrikaans issue, which affected students mainly in Soweto, the largest black township in the country, just off the city of Johannesburg. This forced enforcement of Afrikaans as a medium of instruction for 50% of the subjects in Schools, came at a time when students and youth were generally on their toes. They believed that time for conscientization was over, and that it was time for action. Black students and youth would not succumb or be made to accept what they basically reject. So it started in Soweto, with SASM members taking the lead, using the Afrikaans issue. Students formed the Soweto Students Representative Council (SSRC), which played a strategic role throughout the campaign. Tsietsi Mashinini of SASM took the lead in forming the SSRC, and then became its first Chairman.

Youth defy Police

From earlier than June 16, the youth and students were getting ready. On the 17th of May, students at Orlando West junior secondary made a walk-out. No policemen would be tolerated in the townships. On the 8th June, police came to Naledi High School at the Naledi township of Soweto. They

had come to arrest a student. The students at the school put up resistance, and set the police car alight and stoned the police. Two days thereafter Morris Isaacson High School joined. Telephone lines were cut.

Now came June 16. It was on a Wednesday. Students massed at 7.00 in the morning at Orlando West Junior Secondary School and got ready for a "go". They carried placards, some of which read: "BLACKS ARE NOT DUST-BINS;" "AFRIKAANS IS OPPRESSOR'S LANGUAGE".

They started moving down towards Orlando Stadium. As they moved along other mass groups from other directions converged with them. They covered a large area with clenched fists raised above their heads, freedom songs, and solid shouts of "POWER"!

Then police arrived in vanloads, with semi-automatic rifles, sub-machine guns, teargas and speakers. But they never talked to the students they talked to each other. They stood in front of the students. Students were waving their placards, raising their clenched fists and singing freedom songs. They told the police: "We don't want police here". A policeman threw a teargas canister at the students, obviously provoking action so they would start shooting. Among the students were very young children, far less than 10 years of age.

A white policeman took out a revolver, and aimed it at the students. He fired and then they all fired. The first shot killed Hector Peterson.

Sam Nzima of The World said:

"The first shot was fired before the children started throwing stones. Then absolute chaos broke out. The children ran all over the place and stoned the police." "... A white man was dragged from a West Band Board vehicle, beaten with stones, clubbed with sticks and left dead. He was later picked up by students and thrown into a rubbish bin. Some remarked: 'This is where he belongs'."

The targets of the campaign were well identified. The focus of the uprising was on the system as a whole — all the institutions of oppression and exploitation: the UBC's Bantu Administration Boards, Bantustans and the economy.

All offices of the Bantu Administra-

tion Boards, their beerhalls, bottle stores, were attacked and smashed, and burnt down with petrol bombs all over the country. On Friday, 18th June, the University of Zululand (Ngoye) was already sending smoke to heaven by 6.30 in the morning. In Cape Town the campaign was most intensified. The Black students and youth waged it right in the city centre, where police dare not shoot. Even teargas canisters, they are very cautious with them in the city and town centres, where their people are. In Cape Town city centre, a teargas canister thrown at students affected Tinie Vorster, John Vorster's wife, and they had to rush her to hospital immediately.

The campaign came at the time of the impending phoney independence of the Transkei. And the Transkei was the most heavily guarded of all Bantustans. Even in their celebrations there were more police and armed forces than guests. This made it difficult for the movement to hurl its petrol bombs on the Transkei Parliamentary Buildings and other targets.

The Bantustans of Bophuthatswana was attacked and their Parliamentary building burnt by petrol fire. That of Kwa-Zulu immediately and nervously removed students and banned them from its area in a bid to avert an attack.

The main source of revenue for the Bantu Administration Boards which administer Black townships comes from the sale of liquor and from rent. So the attack on the economy also meant the destruction of beerhalls, and bottle stores.

Black labour was withdrawn from time to time at the call of the students. The students communicated their calls for worker's strikes through leaflets, and on house to house basis. The latter method is the one that saved the campaign from being sabotaged when we started seeing strange leaflets being scattered around. These strange leaflets were not student's leaflets, and whoever wrote them was either utterly ignorant about the programme of the campaign, or was aiming at creating confusion among the people. While the people were going through an organised programme for liberation, these leaflets made calls which were inconsistent with the day to day programme of the campaign. Some people thought they were from the enemy, trying to create confusion and to break

the people's solidarity. Others thought it was the Inkatha movement of the Kwa-Zulu Bantustan, trying to create a Black Backlash, which it was wishing for.

These leaflets were later learnt to have come from an organisation based in exile, which was claiming that the campaign was organised and led by the leaflets (i.e. the shameless ANC-editor).

However, to avert the reactionary effect of these strange leaflets, the students told the workers how the authentic leaflets of the student's movement would look like. Moreover students went around spreading the message. In early morning hours they would go to railway and bus stops, to make sure that even the workers who could have been misled by the strange leaflets were given the right message.

Black Workers Strikes Begin

"Operation Azikhwelwa" was very effective, especially the 3-day stay-away calls. Workers gave 80% response to the calls for the full three days. It is only in the 5 day worker's stay at home calls where workers would respond at best for the first three days. They felt that at least they should get the last two days' pay to keep the pot on the stove. It was an acceptable point.

On workers' strike days, trains to and from the cities ran empty. Only nurses were exempted from workers' strikes. On the 15 September 1976, we had the biggest workers' strike in our history. 80% workers mainly in Johannesburg and Cape Town went on strike.

The effect of the uprising on the system was the heaviest country-wide blow to be delivered on it in an organised country-wide campaign.

The uprising made capital to flow out of the country. They began to send money out of the country in large amounts and in doing so evaded exchange control regulations; and also "on a large scale through firms paying deliberately inflated bills for imports and having the difference banked overseas".

Industrialists started urging the settler regime to immediately make concessions to ease the effect of the campaign on industry. They called for the improvement of the quality of life of urban Africans in order to "defuse the riot". Paul Scriven in Johannesburg reported about the workers strike that:

"Their absence has hit mines and factories and businesses all over the country even harder than the existing recession, and though the lost hours have not yet been totted up, the impact of the stay-away must be enormous."

The Transvaal Chamber of Industries urged John Vorster to make the following concessions:

- 1) let Africans run their own local government.
- 2) Boost spending on township facilities.
- 3) Drastically improve Black education
- 4) Let Africans build and buy their own homes
- 5) Scrap job reservation.

In fact they were favouring the easing of racial discrimination. What they wanted was merely to "defuse the riot". The West Rand Administration

Board then announced that Blacks would be allowed to buy and own homes in Soweto. But no amount of concessions would stop the campaign.

Even in the face of these concessions, the students and youth carried the campaign further. Students put a stop to schooling, and teachers resigned. The Black Community Programmes of the BPC took care of this part of it.

The enemy's dilemma was how to stop a man who has decided to be free, from becoming free. They could not shoot fear into the hearts of the people. The more people died, the more the people resolved to fight even harder.

Zinzi Mandela, daughter of Nelson Mandela, sums the situation up in a poem:

Role of Students . . .

He lay on the ground face down
 A hole in his back blood on his
 parched white shirt he fell with his placard and
 he fell with his fist as stone just out of his
 reach and the wind was soft and silent ruffling his
 trousers very slightly too slightly and Soweto
 was dark and Soweto was suffocating even the
 chimneys coughed elsewhere
 in every black street a similar sight tears fell from
 heaven tears fell from earth tears fell onto a million
 bodies soothing pains encouraging men shouldering
 women but still another sound was heard a shot had been
 fired a black policeman a boy a white policeman afraid
 disturbed somebody's journey peaceful to eternity
 O Azania
 When you are reborn in truth will you remember
 those who conceived you with a last
 choking breadth
 O Azania
 let me weep on your shoulder
 O Azania let me weep on your shoulder let heaven and the
 earth of suffering be one.

The poem gives a vivid picture of the situation. For, as the uprising progressed we lost lives left, right and centre. Indiscriminate shootings, tortures and deaths in detention were the order of the day. On the very occasions of burying those who had fallen we lost yet more lives. And while the enemy had killed close to a thousand people, they counted the number down at 179. To justify their low number, they buried people by night and dumped loads of corpses in the valleys. Not all people buried their relatives.

All these people who died are heroes in our struggle. They died in the quest for freedom. At the funeral of

Dumisani Mbatha, a school student, students showed the world the reason for their preparedness to die - if need be. They carried high above their heads, a banner bearing the message:

"FOR FREEDOM WE LAY DOWN
 OUR LIVES"

Mr. Hlaku Rachidi, the President of the Black People's Convention (BPC), which led the Black Consciousness Movement warned the enemy that they were faced with a new child:

"They are rejecting the impositions of the whole white establishment and system . . . The BPC interprets this as Black consciousness in the kids. It is

gut reaction, not lofty philosophy, and it reflects and articulates the feelings of the people".

As the campaign went on, the enemy did not respond only with killings. It also made strong propaganda aimed at breaking the solidarity of the people. They also organised migrant workers against the struggling masses. Some Black cannon foders helped in these attempts. The so called minister of justice, Jimmy Kruger, kept on shouting about a "Silent black majority" which was not involved in the uprising. A very vocal Bantustans leader echoed this claim, and said he represented a "silent majority". A silent Black majority has only been a figment of their imagination. All Blacks in Azania are clamouring for freedom, no one is silent, except puppets.

As for the Bantustans leaders, it was not surprising that they should team up with Kruger their master. In fact they are also waging a vendetta, against BPC, which led the movement. Shouting about non-existent Black majorities was aimed at creating a Black Backlash which they would use to say that SASO and BPC were poor at organising. They wanted to continue to believe that BPC did not have "even a semblance of a following", as they wished it did not. Blacks rejected the Bantustans leaders and their claim of being national leaders, while they remained "white government political servants, who live off the moneys extracted from the people through several taxes".

The claims by Kruger and some Bantustans leaders were meant to demoralize the people, and to kill the revolution. They were joined by claims from an exiled organisation that the campaign was the brain-child of its leaflets. This was an attempt to put lies into the pages of our history. Amilcar Cabral once said:

"Hide nothing from the masses of our people. Tell no lies. Expose lies whenever they are told. Mask no difficulties, mistakes, failures. Claim no easy victories . . ."

Shameful Behaviour of ANC-CP

I underline all these words. The scramble for credit, which emanated somewhere in exile was disappointing. Attempts to make the people feel their efforts disappearing like the sweat of a dog, are shameful. Our is a people's struggle, not that of an individual or a

clique. My people look with scorn at efforts to sacrifice the true facts of their history on the altar of self-aggrandisement.

I feel forced to quote what my people say about those who do such things. One of the last copies of the WEEKEND WORLD newspaper before it was banned on October 19, 1977, carried these lines:

"The ANC, an organisation once revered among township political activists has become something like an albatross around the necks of many people today. It is not only dead, but some people wish it was forgotten".

Aggrey Klaaste, President of the Union of Black Journalists (UBJ), continued and said,

"For the ANC is as dead among the younger generation as it has become unpopular among the older people in the townships. And the reasons for this are painful and manifold".

THE WORLD AND WEEKEND WORLD were popular papers in the Black townships, until they were banned. The editor Percy Qoboza was detained immediately after the papers were banned.

The statement represented the general disappointment of the people with mountaintoppism. Brothers and Comrades, I am not trying to enter into an argument with anybody. I am merely uncovering facts for you. People must be honest. In fact I regret that some are not.

I would not condone an attempt by SASO or BPC for example to spread leaflets claiming that SASO or BPC was formed in 1912. For this would be an attempt to put lies in the pages of our history.

There have been questions from the public out here, as to whether our exiled organisations were involved in the uprising. I think the answer is clear by now.

I will subtract nothing from this. The focus of my paper is merely to make an exposition of the students and youth movement of Azania, and to point out the forces they have to contend with.

The problem we are facing is not only the settler regime. But the whole international capitalist conspiracy,

which includes the financial institutions, companies and corporations which form the pillars, and indeed, the very life-blood of the system under which Blacks are relegated to being heavers of wood and drawers of water in their own country. Our students' and youth movement sees the white settler government and the foreign investors as constituting one problem.

We cannot, for example, reject dialogue with Vorster and enter into dialogue with Andrew Young - we know the dimensions of our problem. That is why BPC rejected dialogue with Andrew Young when he came to South Africa.

BPC passed a resolution in 1972, stating that, noting, "the vital role played by foreign investors ... in maintaining and supporting the economy of South Africa," and that "the system is designed for maximum exploitation of Black people ... therefore resolves to reject the involvement of foreign investors in this exploitative economic system".

The students and youth movement of Azania took the same position as a matter of principle. This guided the students and youth in identifying targets for the Soweto uprising, which brought a fever into the foreign investors, and made them start talking seriously about withdrawing. The movement shook the very pillars of the system. More so because the economy was experiencing inflation.

We must guard against involving the West in our quest for freedom in our sub-continent. Without the West (not only France and West Germany), South Africa would not have been able to take so many black lives. Western countries are waging their own struggle here which is not compatible with ours. The problem of Azania, Zimbabwe and Namibia is one, and it is the problem of Africa today. Therefore, my Brothers and Sisters of our Mother Africa, this is enough cause for the necessity for us to work out a common strategy.

If talking to the enemy bears any fruit, our region should be free now. I suggest that we close ranks to the exclusion of our enemies, and talk among ourselves about our problems, formulate our own solution; and reject

talks as a matter of principle, no matter whose proposals are involved.

Closing ranks means we must forget a regional solidarity around our problem, and only talk to the enemy on our own terms. Before Young, Vance and Owens leave Washington or London to sell talking here they must know which conditions they must meet.

Achieving regional solidarity means that even the Independent countries that are bordering on the problem areas of Africa should fit in: The formation of the Zambia Association for the Liberation of Southern Africa (ZALSA) is a positive development in this direction. If movements could develop on the same lines in Botswana and other countries bordering on the minority regimes, and base their solidarizing activity on similar principles, then they together with the liberation movements of our respective countries, would make our regional solidarity complete and sealed. The masses of all affected countries in our sub-continent, will know why they have to endure certain things from without their borders.

The students and youth movement of Azania see their struggle as being tied up with the whole Southern African Liberation Struggle.

I need not tell you that the students and youth movement of Azania has written a great chapter in the history of our struggle. Our students and youth movement has now characterized an epoch in African history.

Let me hasten to point out, before I sit down, that students in Azania are not so much students as they are something else. They the youth are essentially engaged in struggle. They state in the Black Students Manifesto that:

"We Black Students are an integral part of the Black oppressed community before we are students". This means our priority is to fight oppression, and then to study and "ensure that our education will further the preservation and promotion of what is measured in our culture and historical experience." Black students are "committed towards the building of our people and the winning of the struggle for liberation". In short: FOR FREEDOM WE LAY DOWN OUR LIVES.

Present Tasks of the Azanian Revolution

From "Isandhlawana"

Amidst the petit bourgeois opportunism of the Azanian liberation movements, other groups, sick and tired of the manipulative politics of these movements, are coming forward and attempting to offer some solutions to Azanian revolutionaries. This is a hopeful sign that new forms of revolutionary organisation might eventually emerge. We produce one such contribution from a Journal called "Isandhlawana", produced in Botswana. Although we have differences with the article — we certainly do not agree with its call for a United Front with the ANC-CP in exile, a counter-revolutionary outfit totally controlled by social imperialism — although we also make a difference between its leadership and rank and file — nevertheless we feel it is sufficiently thought-provoking to Azanian revolutionaries.

Introduction

This brief document is a direct result of the analysis shared by a group of Azanian revolutionaries for the last 5 years. The enriching, but sometimes trying day-to-day experiences that these patriots have undergone, have led them to hold certain views about the direction that the Azanian struggle should take. The reader will note that the patriots are aided by the scientific guidelines of the revolutionary theory in their dissection of the forces at play in the Azanian revolution. To reach this stage of applying the revolutionary theory in analysis, the Azanian revolutionaries have (and still are) undergone a constant struggle from within, a class struggle, to shed themselves of tendencies which in the ultimate prop up exploitation of the black workers (in particular) in Azania.

At this historic point, a document of this nature will definitely assist all genuine, sincere and militant Azanian patriots in meaningfully contributing in the long process of liberation. This written contribution will attempt to categorize, whether historically or socio-economically all the forces related to the South African situation, show how these categories relate to the struggle towards total liberation. This mammoth task of laying out the general strategy and the tactics, which change from time to time and with different levels of the struggle, has to be shouldered by all Azanian revolutionaries and patriots. Hence great detail in this document has been directed to the liberation movements. Rather than creating division and being vindictive against certain units of the broad liberation forces, the paper will put stress on working towards a long-lasting and principled unity of all

the forces of liberation. The forces of reaction, both black and white, locally and internationally i.e. within South Africa and their allies that is international imperialism, will be brutally exposed. Their oppressive and exploitative plots and structures will be mercilessly analysed.

This contribution is meant to be a basis of enlightenment and discussion among all patriots. It is subject to evaluation and constructive criticism by all well-intentioned Azanians and their friends the world over. The intensification of armed struggle against the settler regimes in Southern Africa, makes the situation to change by the day. In similar fashion, the contributions in this document are dynamic and not static. They have to be improved upon in relation to new developments of the revolutionary situation.

The Nature of Racist-Settler Colonial Oppression Short History:

The expansionist force of Dutch colonialism, geared towards the exploitation of raw materials from the Southern tip of Africa, among other regions, led to the coming of Dutch settlers into South Africa. There was rivalry and competition among the European colonial powers for portions of the continent. In the late 19th century, British colonialism, through military conflict and evil plans (which were even pursued by the missionaries of British stock) and through the development of the industrial revolution in Britain, soon became the no. 1 colonial power. South Africa was taken over as a colony and settlers of British origin increased in number. This meant a progressive deprivation of the indigenous Africans i.e. Xhosas, Zulus, Sotho,

Vendas, etc. of their land, cattle, their sole base of survival in their feudal way of life. The discovery of gold in the Witwatersrand, diamonds in Kimberly, and the opening of the ports in Durban, East London and Cape Town intensified the development of capitalism in South Africa. There was an abundance of cheap labour from the conquered and destabilised Africans.

The British capitalists, who are in full control of the actions of the British government, needed a formidable force to pursue their divide and rule policy to the suppliers of cheap labour, the natives, and to safeguard the smooth functioning of their interests in the territory. The white settlers, who backed the system of capitalism and who are party to stealing of the land with its riches from the Africans, were more than eager to play the role of police over their fellowmen's interests. The Afrikaners, who were the most cohesive unit among the settlers took over politically and militarily from Britain. The military, economic, social sponsorship that the Afrikaners received from Britain, particularly after the Second World War led to the legalization of apartheid in South Africa in 1948. This development of the oppressive forces is directly related to the growth of the nationalist resistance of mostly the Africans in South Africa. The black nationalists challenged the usurpation of authority by foreign forces, and, starting with moderate demands and methods, the intransigence of the settler regime led them to become more radical.

Analysis of classes in Azania:

An effective method of analysing the present nature of oppression, is one of analysing the classes among the settlers on the one hand; and the oppressed blacks on the other. The white settlers are not homogenous in relation to the oppressive racist-capitalist system. International capitalism with billions of dollars of interest and investments in South Africa are the source of capitalist exploitation. They are represented by multi-nationals IBM, FORD, SIEMENS, ANGLO-AMERICAN, BRITISH PETROLEUM, DATSUN-NISSAN, B.M.W., SANYO, PEUGEOT, TOTAL, PIONEER, FIAT, etc. According to 1973 figures, Britain was leading in investments (600 firms with R2,000 million,) U.S.A. (400 firms with R1,300 million) and to these imperialist forces are the national

bourgeoisie of both British and Afrikaner stock, of the stature of Oppenheimer, Barlow, Frametex, Luyt, Wassenaar and Schlesinger, with fertiliser, textile, insurance and banking interests. They are the owners of the instruments of production and they exploit labour of whites and cheap labour of blacks. They are the main force backing the Botha racist regime. *Racism, in as far as it creates inequality in job opportunities and labour conditions, serves the profit motive of these capitalists. However, in as far as it radicalises the masses and causes disruption of the socio-economic situation, e.g. Sharpeville and Soweto, these capitalists are interested in reforming racism. Hence the liberal programme of the P.F.P. appeals to the capitalists. Since the Info-Scandal, there has been more calls for "sweeping reforms" from this section of the bourgeoisie.*

The privileged upper crust is drawn from the top civil administrators, military officials, management personnel in industry and administrators of commercial interests. This petty-bourgeois class also includes the professional white and university intellectual. This intellectual has a secured future within the racist system, at the expense of the oppressed black. An apparent radical section here is the liberal intellectual, who through fear of the certain victory of the resistance movement, try to delay the victory by calling for reforms. He wishes that a new Azania not be realised during his lifetime. The white worker at the moment has been effectively hood-winked by privileges like job reservation and the right to strike. He is completely manipulated by the propaganda of the settler regime and believes that his "well-being" lies in continued trampling of the blacks. Gains of the resistance movement, i.e. a step by step dismantling of the oppressive regime, will create a crisis within capitalism and will sharpen the contradiction between the white worker and the bourgeoisie. The liberation war is geared towards the eradication of exploitation of one class by the other, irrespective of colour. The liberation struggle aims at creating the NEW AZANIAN.

Black bourgeois elements

The black sector of the South African population includes the masses which have been radicalised by the apartheid structure and the oppressive laws. This

is the section which is mostly interested in the socio-economic changes that the revolution would bring. However, the blacks hold different positions and stand as to the extent the revolutionary struggle must go. These positions reflect the differing class interests of various factions within the black camp. In order to weaken this black mass of people, the apartheid regime has structured them into Coloured, Africans and Indians. There have been attempts to move the Coloured and Indians nearer the settler regime through a series of laws and regulations which the regime hopes to promote into some loose 3 tier parliamentary system whereby whites, Coloureds and Indians are granted minimal privileges e.g. second class citizens able to live in towns, better pay, such that they can form an effective buffer between the racist regime and the freedom-hungry Africans. To a minimal extent this has resulted in an alienation of the Coloureds-Indians from the Africans. However, solidarity actions in Western Cape during the 1976 country-wide eruption and in Indian schools shattered this divisive tactic.

The stringent apartheid laws have progressively blocked the development of significant black owners of the means of production. A number of prominent African businessmen are to a large extent financially aided by the state-sponsored Economic Development Co-operation e.g. Zazi Khuzwayo. The little privilege to the Indians and to the Coloureds has led to a more wealthier bourgeois class here e.g. right to set up firms and shops in the towns. There are also the leading members of N.A.F.C.O.C. and the Black Bank, Vokwana & Motsuenyane who are openly in the service of international imperialism and the capitalist system. The mere removal of the official racist laws would provide opportunity for this class to entrench their narrow capitalist interests. The industrial development in South Africa has led to the increase in weight of the black petty-bourgeois class. There are the top civil servants who are filling positions in the Bantustan and Community Council bodies. They have gone to great lengths identifying with the settler regime for personal gain e.g. Mangope and "independent" Bophuthatswana. They are part of the system and destruction of the system means an end to their privileged positions. The top blacks in the police and the security branch are also alienated from the

front of the people. This applies also in the case of other sections of the black population; the Indian South African Indian Council and Coloured Representative Council with their Reddys and Middletons.

Part of the petty-bourgeoisie is the black in the professional work, in church leadership, the university intellectual (Prof. Kwgare) and in the teaching profession. This section has historically been spear-heading the nationalist movement. An end to racism and domination by the settlers would greatly improve their conditions of practice. In this, the national democratic phase of our revolution this is the section which has to be mobilised since they are in the leadership of many components of the broad front. However, a section of this category has adopted a compromising attitude towards the Botha regime and are presently plotting with the racists how to sustain apartheid e.g. those active within the Regional Urban Committee to tackle "urban problem". They are at present part of the division of the blacks between rural and urban. They are fighting against the overall aims of the nationalist struggle.

The black student intellectual, both at high school and university level, have amply showed their initiative in the resistance attempts e.g. the Soweto eruption with solidarity action among the Coloured and Indian intellectuals. Today we talk of the era of the Black Consciousness Movement. This historic era is a direct outcome of the student's efforts to sustain the resistance movement. These students do not receive real educative teachings in the socio-economic sphere, and are victims of an unstable future since they are not involved in the rigours of industrial and commercial toiling, they have time and energies to seriously study the historic trend of the Azanian struggle, the struggles of other people, Mozambique and Vietnam, and the revolutionary teachings, the socio-economic problems of their fathers and sisters. They will then understand the greater goals of the liberation struggle: the total destruction of the capitalist system in South Africa. They will develop from petty-bourgeois intellectuals into revolutionary intellectuals who can mobilise the most down-trodden blacks into positions of leadership within the resistance movement. They will have to re-orientate themselves out of the limited petty-bourgeois thinking

and way of life into the thinking of a non-exploitative NEW AZANIAN.

The Black Worker

The deepening capitalist crisis of South Africa is felt mostly by the black worker of African, Indian and Coloured stock in varying degrees. This class is daily harrassed by the racist regime through the influx control laws, group areas regulations, and inability to strike. They lead a miserable life in their tiny dwellings in location with no proper sanitary facilities, recreation and health facilities. Rather than have their trade unions officially recognised, the recent Wiehahn Commission has proposed greater official restriction on their activities. The African workers who are subjected to pass laws and migrant labour regulations have been excluded in these recommendations. They are the victims of job instability, unemployment and under-employment. No one can lecture them on the pangs of oppression and capitalist exploitation. Their incessant strikes and revolts, which are ruthlessly suppressed, indicate that they are more than eager to break their chains of oppression.

The day-to-day-struggle to satisfy the hunger of their families, has so far trampled on sustained initiative of this class in the liberation struggle. The leadership has for long been in the hands of the petty-bourgeois nationalists. It is the task of the revolutionary intellectual to politically mobilise this class; to make them aware of their historic mission, to incorporate them into organisational structures both at union level and at clandestine organisational level. Even at the national democratic phase, the level of oppression of the black worker pushes him to be the mainstay of the resistance movement. Further, he has the historic task of completely eradicating capitalist exploitation in Azania. Through organising consistent political activity and understanding the dynamics of revolution, the black worker has to work himself up into position of leadership within the resistance movement. The black worker will ensure the disappearance of exploitation of any section of the NEW AZANIAN people.

Contribution by Main Liberation Movements:

African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress.

The emergence of A.N.C. and P.A.C. in the history of our resistance movement played a very significant role indeed. They came into the picture after setbacks in the struggle dating back up to the Bhambatha rebellion. It is this movement which managed to restore back our national-consciousness and pride. They brought together all ethnic groups into one national organisation until later developments in 1959 resulted in the emergence of P.A.C. During this time the vast majority of blacks had almost lost hope of regaining back their usurped land and had tended to believe that white supremacy was here to stay. The illusion that Britain was going to help towards regaining the land was shattered when in 1913 a delegation that was sent to the Queen, after the British Parliament passed the S.A. Act of 1909, came back disillusioned. It was therefore clear that their liberation lay solely on their shoulders. This development also further proved that round table talks were not capable of producing correct solutions.

In 1950-52, anti-government campaigns were organised by A.N.C. against repressive legislation. This resulted in many people refusing to go to work, thus crippling the economy of the state. Many more campaigns followed thereafter. In 1960 the P.A.C. led an anti-pass campaign which resulted in the now famous Sharpeville massacre, where 69 blacks were killed and hundreds injured. It is against this background that we hail the genuine efforts made by these movements to bring about liberation. Also to be noted is contribution at liberation by other black organisations like I.C.U., APDUSA and others.

After the bitter experiences of 1960 to 1961 the A.N.C. formed an underground military wing called, "Umkhonto We Sizwe". This army was intended to counter the violent measures the settler-regime was applying to suppress people's peaceful resistance. There were also violent activities by Poqo, a peasant movement linked to the P.A.C. Pondoland saw several armed activities including an attempt on the life of Bantustan stooge, Chief Kaizer Matanzima.

In 1963 the settler-colonial regime panicking in the face of stepped-up black resistance banned the resistance

organisations. Many dedicated leaders including Nelson Mandela and Robert Sobukwe were jailed. The banning necessitated that the two organisations transferred their bases into neighbouring African states. Offices were opened in Tanzania, Zambia, Egypt, Algeria and other countries of the world. Military camps were acquired in different African states and socialist countries. The realisation by the A.N.C. and P.A.C. that armed struggle was the main solution to the problems of the Azanian masses was a major development in the resistance movement.

However these organisations failed to pursue the declared intentions of prosecuting armed struggle. The petty-bourgeois nature of leadership of these movements caused the failure to co-ordinate international support mobilisation with the intensification of the struggle at home. Instead the emphasis and stress was put in seeking solidarity in international forums like the United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity. With the home base left with no leadership to give direction to the struggle, no base was prepared for a long ongoing armed struggle. The absence of political mobilisation in S.A. resulted in the enemy gaining leverage in intensifying its programme of bantustan and other forms of intimidation. Also, little attention was given to the question of adopting a clear political line in the struggle. This lack of proper revolutionary theory made it difficult for the movement to clearly understand the demands of the situation in Azania. The tight grip of the petty-bourgeoisie in the leadership prevented the movement from developing beyond the nationalistic level in form and aims. Failure to solve minor contradictions within the movement, leading to many members deserting and forming splinter groups can be traceable to this problems.

Short-sightedness of this leadership to the necessity of preparing a political ground led to the disaster in Wankie (Rhodesia) in 1967. The shallow A.N.C. pact with Zapu with no clear knowledge of how receptive the Zimbabwean peasants and workers would be to the Azanian guerrillas en route to South Africa, led to the unnecessary massacre of A.N.C. armed militants. The notion of an invasion army which is not in direct contact with the oppressed masses at any historical point, negates the great principle of guerrilla

warfare. The power of the guerrillas lies among the mobilised masses.

The P.A.C. fell into the similar trap when it entered into dealings (military) with COREMO, a group sponsored by international capitalism with the approval of Portuguese fascism to counter Frelimo, resulting in the setbacks at Villa Perry, Mozambique. This was also to be case with Savimbi's UNITA in Angola. These serious mistakes actually reflects the lack of political clarity of the forces of progress and the forces of reaction in Southern Africa and the world in general. Who are the real allies of our struggle?

Black Consciousness Movement (B.C.M.)

B.C.M. came as a result of the continuing oppressive conditions in S.A. Coming after the tragic Sharpeville national uprising when there following a period of uncertainty and lull in mass-mobilisation following the suppression and ultimate outlawing of the two then main national political organisations, A.N.C. and P.A.C. This proves beyond any doubt that the oppressed will always find ways and means to fight back no matter how difficult conditions are.

Our struggle has since the turn of the century been dominated by white liberals of all shades, who beside not understanding our struggle concretely, always tried to hijack it and force our people to lose direction of their goals. Hence ours has been portrayed as a struggle for civil rights, for voting. The patronising role of liberals in our organisations contributed towards destroying the people's initiative and sense of self reliance. It therefore became necessary that this situation be redressed.

It was particularly in this regard that the B.C.M. addressed itself viz; trying to restore pride, determination and hope to a people degraded and dehumanised. Self-help projects, adult education campaign and other community development schemes were initiated. Can people lacking confidence in themselves hope to wage a protracted struggle for total victory over their powerful enemy? This was indeed something important in the history of the struggle where an attempt was made to get people asserting their identity in every sphere of social, economic and political life, especially after the devastating blows dealt by the enemy on the people after Sharpeville. The

activists of this philosophy covered many areas of black interests like the church, sport and mass media. Though the black press never took off (anyway the regime would have never allowed it), it would have neutralised in a sense the most banal of the regime's propaganda.

B.C.M. has definitely contributed to the Azanian revolution in many aspects. It has sought to unite all sectors of the oppressed communities under one black umbrella; and as opposed to the reactionary tribalism as trumpeted by the Gatshas and Sebes, for creating divisions and disunity amongst the oppressed and exploited. In whose interests are these divisions if not for the Botha-Viljoen clique? It is for this reason that the B.C.M. tried to address herself seriously to the question of bringing together under one roof all the people who are in contradiction with settler-colonial oppression. B.C.M. did not allow herself to be blackmailed and disorganised by confused elements who dogmatically undermined the existent concrete conditions in S.A. by calling for the inclusion of whites in the movement. It should also, however, be pointed out that the problem of black unity had been previously been attempted by Non-European Unity Movement. It should be clear here that we are talking about black initiative at black unity instead of machinations by white liberal "custodians".

Another field which was correctly identified by the B.C.M. militants was worker mobilisation hence the formation of Black Allied Workers Union (BAWU). This labour union was to 'teach' workers their rights because workers normally do not know their rights, they should be made aware that the factory struggle is but part and parcel of overall struggle for seizure of political and economic power. We also commend the consistent stand taken by the B.C.M. against foreign investments and multinational corporations; their correct stand on puppets and fascist-state created stooge bodies like bantustans and community councils, S.A. Indian and Coloured councils.

The wave of strikes that hit the regime from 1973 to 1977, including the heroic June 16 revolts, cannot be solely attributed to B.C.M., but its activities have certainly played a prominent and progressive role in the political preparation process.

October 19, 1977 saw the banning by the desperate regime of the main organisations constituting the B.C.M. Among these were the Black People's Convention and S.A. Student's Organisation, the main driving force of the movement. Meanwhile new organisations sprang up clearly identifying with the philosophy of Black Consciousness. These were some of the organisations: Azania Peoples' Organisation (AZAPO), Soweto Action Committee, Committee of Ten, Lenasia Action Committee, Masivelane Students Body.

B.C.M. and the Question of Armed Confrontation.

It will be recalled that the Apartheid regime initially tried to destroy the B.C.M. by eliminating the leadership through detentions without trial, banings and restrictions, assassinations e.g. Mthuli ka Shezi and Tiro, and through forced exile. It is at this period (1973) that the militants and activists of B.C.M. decided to temporarily and strategically retreat into neighbouring African states.

Increase of B.C.M. militants in the neighbouring states, particularly Botswana, led to serious attempts at working towards taking up arms against the fascist-settler regime. Bodies were created in these states to form the basis in realising this second phase e.g. the efforts of Tiro and other comrades in SASM. Resolutions taken by the militants internally towards the armed phase, led to more comrades leaving the country to coordinate these efforts. In exile they found themselves in a situation where the Azanian politics were dominated by rivalry mainly between the A.N.C. and P.A.C. Here they adopted a very positive attitude that of not taking sides with any of the two bickering organisations but pledged themselves towards fostering to bring them together. One of the serious questions which faced these comrades was whether the mother body at home, the B.P.C., had to come out and declare the taking up of arms (which would have led to their immediate banning) or whether the militants having correctly read the mood of our people should take the initiative. Different approaches to the solving of these questions led to the growth of different trends within the B.C.M. in exile. This resulted in certain militants joining the P.A.C. and A.N.C. as individuals and

others pursuing their studies in different parts of the world.

It should be noted that the declining A.N.C. and P.A.C. scrambled for the young militants of B.C.M., trying to inject their bodies with fresh blood and ideas. They went out on a recruiting spree with the A.N.C. claiming that the B.C.M. was its "youth wings". The A.N.C. initially showed intentions of consulting the B.C.M., but not as *equal comrades in struggle*. This was clearly based on their fundamental policy that they are the sole liberation movement in S.A. and they viewed the B.C.M., the new force, as supposed to fall under their control. This attitude of the A.N.C. made it difficult for militants to discuss with A.N.C. and created difficulties in finding the areas of co-operation between the two.

On failing to swallow the B.C.M., the A.N.C. then openly adopted a hostile attitude and started a slander campaign on the propaganda level against the B.C.M.

On the other hand the P.A.C. originally applied intrigues using favourable suggestions as to areas of co-operations with the B.C.M. These intrigues were exposed when later in document form, after thorough discussions and agreements with the B.C.M. militants, made a condition that the B.C.M. must pay allegiance to the acting-President of the P.A.C. This was in conflict with the clear stand of B.C.M. vis-a-vis A.N.C. and P.A.C. The unyielding stand of the militants forced the P.A.C. to toe a softer line.

There was always a problem of bickering and personality clashes between the B.C.M. leaders which was traceable back to S.A. and which spilt over into exile. This contributed in the development of different tendencies within the forces which had opted for armed struggle outside the two liberation movements. So that whilst the negotiations were continuing with the P.A.C., attempts to resolve these contradictions were going on.

Back in the neighbouring states, the trend which ultimately became dominant and influential, was the one which motivated for the pursuance of the armed struggle by a tight B.C.M. force, the Third Force. This was an outcome of a thorough analysis of the situation in Azania and the world. Only this new force which was in touch (direct) with the home situation could pursue the liberation process. It was

also the result of the painful realisation that the rift between the exiled S.A. liberation organisations was so wide that it might consume all the efforts of the militants of the B.C.M. era. The intensification of the revolutionary armed struggle inside the country, was to create conditions for the unity of not only the P.A.C. and A.N.C., but of the broad front of the black masses. The emphasis of the A.N.C. and P.A.C. in international mobilisation than the pursuance of people's struggle inside the country, had led to the decline of the image of the two organisations, particularly inside S.A. The intensification of the struggle internally was to reduce the movement of militants into exile for military training purposes; it would deprive the two organisations opportunities of recruiting the militants and diverging them from the struggle, in short it would minimise the conditions for rivalry and create better chances for a principled unity.

It was at this point that the conflict between the masses and the settler-colonial regime rose. Militants came into exile in greater numbers and this swelled the potential membership of the NEW force, the third force. This force at this point was showing its concrete existence. Political discussions, programmes, efforts to initiate self-reliance schemes, increase of allies amongst the masses in neighbouring states. Political cells were consolidated at home, with strides and setbacks, one of which resulted in the 1976 trial where 6 young men and 1 woman comrade were charged with, amongst other things, collecting information about possible military targets, and being *found in possession of communist material*. Elements within the B.C.M. organisation within the country related mutually with the Third Force and its revolutionary importance was being recognised by many militants. There was also an effort by this force to win friends among the progressives of the world for political, material and other aid.

As pointed above, the P.A.C. was more well-disposed towards the new B.C.M. force. After initiating new efforts, an arrangement was reached where under the united front principle areas of co-operation were to be utilized by the P.A.C. and the B.C.M. e.g. sharing of military experiences, access to educational facilities, exchange of information. The question of autonomy of B.C.M. in these dealings was

stressed and agreed upon. However these agreements were reached after strenuous efforts because of the existence of about 3 factions within the P.A.C., some controlling the diplomatic and political missions and others controlling the military and access to training camps. In the midst of these problems, some of the agreements were actually undertaken. These schemes, however, soon became a fiasco, mainly as a result of infringement on the autonomy of the B.C.M. force by the P.A.C. in the dealings. This no doubt reflected the extent of conflict within the P.A.C.

1976 brought in many B.C.M. militants and activists into exile as a result of the people's revolts, causing much confusion. There was a call to unify the B.C.M. activists in exile. The positive aspects of this move was the acceptance of the approach of the united front principles, but the imposing of an alleged mandate from leaders inside the country and the undermining of the initiatives by other components of B.C.M. particularly in exile, was a cause of failure of these attempts. This question of the mandate is alienated from the masses since it denies dynamism and dialectical process of the development of leadership from the people and their struggle. This is also the problem facing the A.N.C. which denies in a very unscientific manner, the right of other people to participate in the struggle outside its umbrella since it has the "1912 mandate". This is a sign of lack of confidence in the struggling people of South Africa, it is also amounts to outright denial of the resistance movement to develop to greater heights. It is a sign of power hunger and lack of political clarity. (Any sincere attempt at unity should take this into consideration.)

Unity and United Front

We have analysed briefly the present political situation inside and outside South Africa and have seen how the enemy has succeeded in subjugating the Black oppressed through its propaganda and state machinery and its divisive tactics. This method of divide and rule has been, and still is, used by all oppressor nations and colonialists. The divisive tactics of the enemy ensures, if not only to weaken the patriotic forces, mistrust, bickering and in-fighting within the enemy's subjects. Inside the country we hail the efforts by all patriotic forces to counter

the Bantustan propaganda that has been swallowed by some of the puppets.

Whilst the resistance movement of the Black oppressed is not defined on tribal lines, their differences are not based on any clear ideological line. Both inside and outside the country the resistance movement has succeeded in defining a broad programme in which all the patriotic forces would find their natural home.

United Forces

We recognize the fact that the present ruling class in S.A. is a product of colonialism, which, in order to realise their capitalist aims, have sought to subjugate the indigenous people of this part of the continent through naked racism. So that the fundamental contradiction is racism at this stage. The main tasks at the present stage is the fight for national independence, it is the struggle for the national liberation of the black oppressed. This programme involves broad elements, all those who have a contradiction with the present ruling class i.e. church groups, students, professionals and business men, chiefs (who have not sold out), workers and the masses in rural areas. Failure to unite the oppressed sections as one block will of necessity prolong or undermine the attainment of the national democratic liberation. So, in this sense, national unity becomes a precondition to national democratic revolution.

We are not here relegating the question of class struggle aside until this phase has been won. Neither are we wishing away the present realities of the S.A. situation in which Whites oppress Blacks, and want to see the whole question through the binoculars of class struggle. So that each so-called phase (arbitrarily defined for the purpose of understanding) must assume its respective place. The two struggles are intertwined but assuming prominence at different stages; in other words, there are no boundaries between the different stages.

The Liberation Movements.

Prior to the exiling and banning of the B.C.M. organisations and, to date, the failure of the liberation movements of S.A., the A.N.C. and the P.A.C., to come to any measure of unity, has dealt the Azanian revolution untold blows. Their differences have only ensured the dissipation of patriotic forces

and left the enemy to grow stronger by the day, of course, with the help of buttressing schemes of international monopoly capital i.e. economic aid, bank loans, foreign investments, technological and military co-operation with the S.A. ruling class. In the course of all this, claims and counter-claims have been made against each other, document after document written accusing one "faction" as wreckers of unity. We also see and witness the well-meaning efforts of African and International allies in trying to at least bring the two movements to some measure of co-operation bearing no fruit. And whilst this show goes on, the S.A. ruling class (now represented by the Botha-Viljoen clique) is busy perfecting its state and propaganda machinery, and the leading businessmen (internal and international) go chuckling all the way to the Swiss banks. The O.A.U. Liberation Committee has on several occasions called the leaders of the two movements to unite. And, as a result, some committees were set up (by the movements) to look into this question. Not that we undermine such calls from well-meaning allies, but the revolutionaries within these two liberation movements should better understand at this stage how this question should be approached if any lasting unity is actually the desired goal.

With different understanding of who our friends are, it would be political naivety to expect unity of P.A.C. and A.N.C. at the stroke of a pen. Neither can it be realised at a Conference table with the threatening eye of the Liberation Committee.

On the other hand, a broad United Front does not militate against Unity. We regard a United Front as a step towards unity, and it remains a first step. A broad front becomes a practical expression of the intention to unite the patriotic forces.

In practical terms it involves defining broad areas of co-operation which presupposes recognition of the right of a movement to exist (hence shedding off of chauvinism) and such co-operation could begin in

1. issuing of joint statements on issues commonly viewed,
2. cessation of cold war i.e. vilification and slander,
3. creation of a forum through which political issues could be discussed in an effort to raise the political understanding of members and cadres.

These and other steps could eventually lead to sharing of military training facilities, formation of a joint military command and complete fusion into one movement. This would mark a giant step towards turning the resistance movement into a deadly weapon to bring down John Vorster Square and cripple imperialism.

The Black Consciousness Movement:

B.C.M. unlike the two liberation movements never existed as a cohesive organisation outside the country. Since the first group came out into exile, the B.C.M. elements have developed in their thinking as to the tactics and strategy to be applied to attain liberation. But, true to the development of nature, theirs also has been unequal. Whereas nobody can say that there are definite entities or groups of widely different ideological trends within B.C.M., as we mentioned above B.C.M. is made up of different groups representing different trends of thought. With such developments in exile any initiative to unite these forces must take into consideration the right of individuals, groups and organisations to contribute to the struggle, and programme to unite these forces must be broad enough to accommodate all positive political development within the movement to greater heights. It is in this regard that we view attempts to unite the A.N.C. and P.A.C. without these necessary steps taken can only amount to no more than wasted efforts however well-meaning they could be. The only attempts with any measure of success, could be a broad clear programme that will appeal and satisfy the aspirations of the masses and combatants.

Unity:

Unity cannot be achieved from the top, cannot be imposed by the O.A.U. or its Liberation Committee or by the leaders of the various patriotic groups or forces and liberation movements. Hence the failures of such attempts. We hold the view that lasting unity can only begin inside the country in the political discussion groups or cells. This also can happen if the political understanding of the workers, students and the rest of the masses is raised. By raising the political understanding we mean nothing else than to arm the masses with the only revolutionary theory that can enable the oppressed

and exploited masses to identify the enemy, to understand the nature of their oppression and exploitation such that they (the masses) correctly define the essential and necessary methods to correct this situation. This is bound to develop a class-conscious movement that is going to champion the struggle within the country, a vanguard movement that is going to monitor the situation and direct the day-to-day direction (that) the above-board movement must take, give direction to strike actions and other forms of struggle.

This type of movement cannot be created in Europe, America, Tanzania or Zambia; but only inside the situation. The creation of such a movement is the only condition for a successful struggle that will be an answer to the millions of freedom-hungry Blacks. This is the type of movement that has been lacking in the S.A. war-theatre. Its total lack, its wanting, has resulted in the Sharpevilles and Sowetos. Whilst it still lacks, the youth and the workers of S.A. will still fall victims of the vicious state machine; the army and the police. Spontaneous acts of anger and violence, with no clear political objectives whilst they themselves are a sign of consciousness, reflect the absence of a vanguard movement. On the other hand revolution is a coolly-planned action with clear political objectives. Hence spontaneity and revolution have little in common.

Conclusion:

It is quite clear that B.C.M. as a Third force has been charged by history with the duty of playing a vital role in bringing closer all the patriotic forces to the people's Front. But cohesiveness of this forces and adoption of United Front principles (as with other forces) is a precondition to this unity. Failure to adopt these principles can only be interpreted as desire to preserve domination from above. Also of note here is that the broad front has no accommodation for elements who are part of the enemy or who allow themselves to be used by the enemy against the people.

Demands of the Present Situation:

At this point we feel it is a matter of necessity to briefly outline the demands of the Azanian revolution. It is on the basis of a clear understanding of the demands of our situation that we think all Azanian revolutionaries will effectively participate in the libera-

tion struggle. We choose to divide this topic into three areas, viz.

- A. The Demands Internally
- B. The Demands in the Independent African States Bordering with South Africa
- C. The Demands Internationally

A. Internally:

The mobilisation of the masses and the release of their combative potential is the basic necessity for confronting our presently superior enemy. What is required now is the mobilisation of the masses through revolutionary political consciousness. The broad bases of the masses must be grouped into various mass organisations and trade unions. This should enable every Azanian man and woman, young and old, to contribute daily and effectively to the liberation struggle.

The mobilisation of the masses requires a transformation in the style of our work and practice. We should make it a central tradition in our work to be always among the masses, to think with them and to subject our programmes to their interests, capabilities and energies. This means providing the masses with the facts about the new political situation, explaining to them our analyses of it, the reasons that led to it, and finally how we see the way out of this crisis. We should listen to their views and understanding of things. We should also ask their opinion about the programme of action. This should make it clear that this struggle is the struggle of the masses and that the cause is their own. We cannot think or plan or wage the struggle without this creative dialectical relationship between us and the masses.

The mobilisation of the masses does not solely depend on the use of the mass media (radio and press). The basic means of propaganda are the members of the political organisation who work deep among the masses and hold group meetings which explain to the people their responsibilities and how to fulfill them. The main key to the mobilisation of wide sections of the masses, is by pointing out the relationship between the problems of their daily life, and the liberation struggle which aims at total liberation. It is through the clarification of this relationship that an objective link is established between the people's daily struggle to solve their problems. This affirms the importance of mass organi-

sations and trade unions, and also the importance of a political programme that the revolutionaries put before the masses.

All our energies should be directed towards forming and consolidating militant Black trade unions. These are some of the few sections of the Black workers who should be organised in their respective trade unions: domestic workers, garbage collectors, mine workers, textile workers, sugar-cane growers and cutters, construction workers, exploited farm labourers, workers in the Cape Wineries, railway workers, roadworkers, etc. We want to emphasize again that the workers should be able to relate their miserable working conditions to the perpetuation of the fascist racist oppression. Patriotic professional people e.g. nurses in hospitals, doctors and teachers should be organised. National student bodies with regional committees should be formed. Township hawkers and vendors, taximen, church ministers and burial societies should be organised. These are the broad sections of the Black masses that constitute the dynamic force in our programme of confrontation with the fascist settler regime in South Africa.

In the above lines we have been addressing ourselves to the first part of mass mobilisation which is above-board political work. Existing above-board organisations must be strengthened and new ones must be formed. Continuing of above-board political work is a matter of historical necessity to counter the vicious enemy programme as championed by Gatsha and the Community Council puppets. With conscious participation of the masses in these militant organisations, the fires of the revolution are sure to be kept burning.

At this point we want to address ourselves to the underground movement into account, it becomes clear in our minds that there is no hope of regaining our land and ending our oppression and exploitation through round table talks or appealing to the normal senses of the regime. Total liberation and self-determination by the oppressed Black masses will only be realised through revolutionary armed struggle. This is not due to weapons, nor to any adventurism. It is due to the realisation that the Botha-Viljoen-Vorster clique, having arrogated all the political and economic power to itself, will not voluntarily

hand it over to the oppressed Blacks. Rich experiences of the Vietnamese, Chinese, Cuban and Mozambican people point to the fact that armed struggle is the only method of gaining total liberation. We, therefore, want to state clearly our unshakeable conviction that revolutionary armed struggle is the principal form of struggle that will resolve the contradiction between the Black masses and the oppressor settler regime. It is in this background that we call for the clandestine mass mobilisation.

Clandestine mass mobilisation consists primarily of the formation and strengthening of underground political cells. Their main task at this stage must be to acquaint themselves with the revolutionary theory (Marxism-Leninism). From a clear understanding of the situation they will be able to have a revolutionary relationship with the masses and conduct regular secret political discussions. These cells will be faced with the task of raising their political, fighting and psychological level and that of the masses.

It is from these cells that the revolutionary cadres and guerilla army are to be drawn. These are going to develop into bases for armed struggle.

These cells must maintain close contact with the above-board organisations and influence the direction of these militant bodies. The underground cells require a long, persistent, patient effort with a clear programme based on a clear vision of the struggle. Their prime task is to fight the petit-bourgeois mentality which sinks into pessimism in the face of difficulties, and wants an immediate solution, a ready-made victory. Thorough study of guerilla warfare and military science is essential so that the enemy must be dealt deadly blows every time a military operation is launched. When guerilla bases are built from these guerilla warfare is waged.

Ultimately, the revolutionary violence waged by these cells will in fact develop the mass mobilisation, because revolutionary armed struggle is mobilising and conscientizing factor in itself. Moreover, the practice of armed violence will facilitate the conditions for building a vanguard party and the united front. A mass-based revolutionary vanguard party will come out of the day-to-day struggle of the Black people, especially the Black working class and be formed by its advanced elements. It will be born and

matured through actual participation in the struggle. We therefore feel that the two above-mentioned points viz; mass mobilisation by the above board political organisations, and mass mobilisation by the underground cell network, should form the main area of involvement by the Azanian patriots, militants and revolutionaries in the Azanian Revolution.

B. Position in Neighbouring Countries:

In trying to make clear the position which the resistance movement must take in the frontline states, we choose to divide these states into two categories, viz; Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland on the one hand; and Mozambique and Angola on the other.

As regards Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland, we realise that these countries are led by the petit-bourgeois class. These countries are under direct control of Western Imperialism. Their economies are controlled by mainly British and American Imperialism. It therefore goes without saying that their political policies are also influenced by Imperialism. We are therefore not fooled by their anti-imperialist rhetoric. Moreover, their economies are closely interlinked with the South African economy. They depend on South Africa and Rhodesia for their basic commodities. This economic dependence on South Africa influences their political attitude towards the minority settler regime. This also determines their outlook towards the liberation struggle in Azania. While they claim to be against the settler regime, their strategy of resolving the contradiction with the racist regime differs with the overall strategy of the Azanian masses. Our strategy with these countries differs in the sense that they would like to see non-violent change and the creation of a reformist petit-bourgeois Black government in South Africa while we are calling for the violent total destruction of the fascist state and the creation of a new socio-economic system in Azania where there will be no exploitation of man by man. Added to this is the fact the revolutionary armed struggle in Azania will radicalize the suffering masses in these countries. This can ultimately lead to the taking up of arms by these masses against these regimes.

The relationship of these African petit-bourgeois regimes with their suf-

fering masses, their relationship with imperialism, and finally their relationship with racist South Africa, make them potential enemies of the Azanian liberation struggle. The example of what Kenneth Kaunda did to hijack the Zimbabwe revolution in 1975 must serve us with a good historical lesson.

Our tactic of making temporary rear-bases in these neo-colonial regimes must be applied with a full understanding of the political nature of these regimes. We must entertain no illusions about their support for the liberation struggle. It is in this background that we would like to make these following suggestions to all Azanian Patriots who find themselves in these African States;

i) We should work towards a greater unity with the African masses in these countries. The suffering masses in these countries are the true allies of the Azanian masses because they would like to see a radical transformation of their conditions and that of the Azanian masses. This unity must be based on and cultivated on a clear political understanding of the Azanian situation and the situation in these countries. It is essential to realize that the struggle in its totality, is the struggle of the African workers and peasants against imperialism. It is clear that any view of the Azanian problem must take into account the essential role that imperialism and reaction plays in the totality of Southern Africa. It must also consider the basic role of the Azanian masses in fighting these enemies. The energies of the Azanian revolutionaries must be spent on the task of forging an alliance with the African workers and peasants in these countries instead of struggling for recognition by the petit-bourgeois regimes.

ii) Secondly we feel that all Azanians who are studying or teaching or working in these countries (so-called refugees) must organise themselves. This means they must be organised into political discussion groups where they will be able to have discussions on a number of subjects concerning the Azanian situation and the international situation. This is a way of raising their political consciousness. This will help in formulating a uniform approach towards the revolution and further facilitate the formation of a united front. They should take advantage of their geographical proximity to Azania to maintain close contact with the militants inside Azania. Regular

political discussions must be conducted with militants inside the country. All these should be done with maximum security precautions without the blessing of the ruling clique in these countries. With maximum contact with the home base we can be assured that there will be a revolutionary even development between the militants outside and inside the country.

iii) Thirdly we feel that self-reliant schemes and projects should be started so that we do not depend on the funds from outside for carrying out the tasks of the resistance movement. In fact, these projects will enable a closer interaction between us and the masses in these countries. These are the broad tasks that we feel can be undertaken in the neo-colonial countries in trying to create and consolidate a rear base. We can learn rich experiences if we study the Palestinian Resistance.

C. International Alliances:

The struggle of the Azanian masses against the settler regime is a struggle for national independence. The Azanian masses are also fighting against the exploitation of their labour power which makes the capitalist system in South Africa flourish. This capitalist system is supported economically, militarily and politically by the Western Imperialist countries who draw large sums of profit by exploiting the labour of the Black masses through their huge investments in South Africa. These Western imperialist states oil and facilitate the machinery of the exploitation of the Black indigenous people.

Racism in South Africa is merely an instrument of national oppression and class exploitation. The struggle for total national liberation in Azania will weaken the chain of imperialism. It is in this background that we view the Azanian revolution as a parcel of the broad anti-imperialist struggles waged by other peoples of the oppressed and exploited countries of the Third World and the oppressed and exploited people in the capitalist countries in the West.

We therefore feel it is important to win over international allies who are going to support the Azanian struggle. The Azanian revolutionaries should try to make revolutionary relationship with the socialist countries, the national liberation movements in the Third World, and progressive proletarian movements and student

movements in the Western imperialist countries. It must be realised that the support given to the Azanian struggle by the national liberation movements in the Third World and the progressive labour and student movements in the Western capitalist countries, does not express itself in the form of material and moral support only, but also through strengthening and raising the level of the struggle against the ruling class inside their countries. At this stage of the Azanian revolution, we feel that we should marshal all our forces and energies towards the prosecution of the liberation struggle inside the country. We cannot afford to spend all our energies trying to mobilise the international opinion. In fact, the intensification of the struggle inside the country will win us more allies internationally.

We therefore choose to make the following suggestions in trying to gain international allies. We are in a rather fortunate position because there are Azanian patriots who are studying in African Universities and European colleges and universities. The task of international mobilisation lies on the shoulders of these patriots in different parts of the world, e.g. we are calling on the students who are studying in England to form discussion groups. These groups should propagate the ideas of the Azanian revolution and spread them to the progressives in England. This in fact can lead to the issuing of a monthly or quarterly newsletter which must be distributed in the Embassies of the Socialist countries and progressive labour and student movements in England. This should be the case in all other countries in Europe and Africa where the Azanian patriots find themselves. The same should apply in North America and Latin America. Once again this will

improve the political clarity of the patriots and facilitate the efforts towards a united front. These study groups can also raise material support for the liberation movement. We must minimize the expenses, like running huge offices in different parts of the World which can be very expensive. We can direct such funds towards the efforts being done at home. We must fight all petit-bourgeois attitudes which are geared towards making office-orientated organisations. This is how we can win friends and allies at the present stage of the struggle.

Conclusion

The above analyses of the present tasks of the Azanian revolution calls for a serious evaluation of the contribution of all Azanian patriots, militants and revolutionaries inside and outside the country. We must take full stock of the lessons of the historical development of the Azanian resistance movement. The struggle has had strides and setbacks and these must be thoroughly analysed in order to prepare for the present stage. We must also learn from the great victories of the Cuban, Vietnamese, Iranian and Mozambican people. It is by deep understanding of the totality of this picture that we can put the movement of our masses in the historical current of our era, the era of the victory of revolution. Ours is a difficult, complex and ruthless struggle. It requires a high degree of patience, sacrifice, toughness and hard work. We have an unshakeable conviction that if we adhere to these historical facts and base our actions on them, then victory is certain.

**TOWARDS A PRINCIPLED UNITY
OF AZANIANS!
PHAMBILI NEMFAZWE!
AMANDLA!**

Azanian Marxist-Leninists Respond to B.C.M. Communique

Elsewhere in IKWEZI we produce the views of a group representing a fresh and novel way of looking at the Azanian situation. Here is another small piece emanating out of criticism of some policies enunciated by the B.C.M. in London, representing similar thinking.

The analysis of the problems which have plagued B.C.M. both inside and outside South Africa is wrongly attributed to what is termed "Conflict of authority". In our view this is a serious

and dangerous misunderstanding of the problem.

Political struggles in general including serious factional struggles in our movement do not take place in a

vacuum. They are carried on under the intense pressure of social forces and reflect the level of class struggle to varying degrees. This law is demonstrated in a striking manner in the development of the present discussion within the movement. At the present moment the pressure of different class forces is exceptionally heavy. We must understand this for a start. Only then can we hope to approach an understanding of the present crisis in the movement. The unprecedented tension within the movement signals a conflict of principled political positions which are obviously irreconcilable. Mainly two camps within our ranks fight for different political and ideological interpretation of our struggle, different *methods, strategy and traditions*.

What has brought the movement to such a crisis in such a short space of time? Obviously it is not a suddenly discovered personal incompatibility of individual leaders involved, such trifles are symptoms and not the causes of the conflict. Nor can a conflict of this depth and scope be plausibly explained by the flaring up of old differences of opinion on the organisational tactics. In order to understand the real significance of this crisis it is necessary to look for more profounder causes.

For those who understand politics as an expression of a class struggle the basic causes are not hard to find. The crisis signifies a reaction in the movement to external social pressure. More precisely we see the crisis as the result of the pressure of bourgeois-democratic public opinion upon the section of the leadership of the movement. That is the analysis of the unrestrained struggle between the revolutionary cadres and the petit-bourgeois elitist tendencies within the movement.

It therefore makes nonsense to us for the problem to be defined as "conflict of authority" which we understand it to mean *lack of Bureaucracy*. We define the contending factions not by such abstract terms, we judge the factions not by the psychological fits of certain individuals but by the programme every faction fights to defend.

Elsewhere the conference report states "There is therefore an urgent need to correct the situation by way of providing a visible and concrete authority within B.C.M. This is the collective duty of all the B.C.M. members wherever they may be." This is an alarming drivel and twaddle, what is necessary is to continue the

debate on political programme for liberation not the creation of a bureaucracy for the "international Community". The crisis in the movement can only be solved by a democratically agreed political programme after a lengthy and intense debate. We cannot expect to agree and unite simply because we are black and South Africans. That would be to mystify and undermine very important problems underlying our liberation struggle.

Although we disagree with almost all the points presented by the B.C.M. group in London, we however welcome certain items in the report:

1. That B.C.M. outside South Africa can no longer await directives and mandates from the South African section of the movement since in anyway it has been rendered moribund by the regime there and B.C.M. in exile must be able to function without these hang-ups.
2. "Conference must also come to a clear decision on why and how the B.C.M. should if need be continue to exist outside."
3. We welcome whole-heartedly the holding of the conference of all B.C.M. members, so as to resolve issues on the order of the day.
4. Noting point 1 above and taking into cognisance the on coming B.C.M. conference, we wish to point out that Part-two of the report on *Projects and activities* be left to conference for debate and decision.

We wish to point out that if the London group still regards the B.C.M. as a liberation movement as we do, then it should concern itself with the process of liberation and in this respect the conference agenda is singularly inappropriate. The conference agenda as we see it should be concerned with:

1. The analysis of the political situation in South Africa.
 - i) *The re-assessment of BCM as a political movement in South African politics.*
 - ii) *The national question.*
 - iii) *The nature of the democratic national struggle and its place and role in our liberation.*
 - iv) *The leading forces in our struggle.*
 - v) *B.C.M.-liberation, ideology and political programme.*
2. *The restructuring of B.C.M. on the basis of the agreed political programme.*

3. *The prosecution of the liberation struggle through armed struggle.*

On Policy

We wish to disclaim any knowledge of what "positive neutrality" means towards P.A.C. and A.N.C. this issue should be left to conference to debate and decide.

We present here our political position as regards the struggle in South Africa. We cannot hope to liberate the people of South Africa on the only basis that we are black, that is to mystify the problem. It is true that black people in South Africa are exploited and oppressed but it is not true that they are oppressed and exploited *because they are black*. To see the problem this way is to see it through the eyes of Apartheid and necessarily the solution must follow along such lines which is an ill-conceived perception.

The source of black people's exploitation and oppression is the result of historical process of imperialism and colonialism which culminated in black people being separated from all means of production but labour, the only means of production the majority of black people can exchange for means of subsistence. This exchange is mediated through the ideology of apartheid in a capitalist economy which is itself the product of colonialism and imperialism.

The primitive accumulation of capital in the early stages of the development of capitalism in South Africa required extensive and intensive exploitation of labour. The capitalist acquired such exploitation through Apartheid ideology and the use of the state machinery, this ensured that the majority of black people could not own property and enjoy civil liberties like their white counter-parts. This is not unique in history. The Romans and the Americans used slavery in their respective periods of primitive capital accumulation, the Spaniards and the Portuguese used the Catholic church to perpetuate serfdom in Latin America and so goes history. The problem of black people therefore does not centre around the fact that they are black, but on the fact that they are the suppliers of labour which generates surplus value which fattens the pockets of the capitalists both local and international. It is therefore important to see our struggle in terms of the working people in South Africa, and our

political and ideological analysis must put the workers in the forefront.

The question of colour of course cannot be ignored in South Africa given the nature of racially structured socio-economic system, but this is a *tactical and interim issue which involves modus operandi and strategy*, not the political and ideological direction of our liberation process, those must be cemented in the revolutionary theory of the working class party. It will be the task of the party both to bring to the working class a true consciousness of its own interests and to organize and lead the struggle for state power.

In order to do this, this party must set itself the highest theoretical standards and be able to translate them into practice. It must wage a constant fight to lead the national democratic revolution, to seize state power through armed struggle and to prepare the advance towards socialism because that is the only way the workers of South Africa will ever be liberated. The party must develop an adequate understanding of the real conditions of our society, without this it will have no compass to guide its activities, but must necessarily respond pragmatically to every new development in the workers' movement and inevitably fall prey to bourgeois ideology.

tradition opposing the people of the world to imperialist and social-imperialist domination. The victory of the people of Kampuchea against Vietnamese invasion and domination will probably be the first victorious people's war of the world against social-imperialism and its allies. In Africa, will such a breakthrough come from Eritrea or from Angola? The teachings of those victorious experiences will be of crucial importance for the revolutionary transformation and development of the African liberation movement. We, African people, have to know the details of those struggles. The effective fusion of those teachings with the African liberation movement will be possible only through a mass realization of their correctness.

Problems of Fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the National Liberation Movement in Africa

By Kazu Wamba-dia-Wamba

It is crucially important at this time to do a Marxist study of the history of Marxism in Africa. The current complex and turbulent world situation summons African revolutionaries to produce a Marxist history of Marxist politics in Africa. What is *new* in the historical experiences of Marxist politics in Africa? How is this *new element* being articulated with the old and how is the resulting rational synthesis *arming* African revolutionaries to be better capable of confronting their tasks in the African liberation movement in the new context of the world situation? Is that new element consistent with what is new in the experiences of the world revolution? The purpose of such a study is precisely to sum-up some of the major lessons from the African peoples' struggles for national liberation over the last twenty or so years, to grasp what is new in those struggles and to draw out from all this guidelines for action required by new forms of antagonism against imperialist and social-imperialist domination. Of course, the teachings of the most advanced struggles of other peoples of the world against imperialist and social imperialist domination should orient such a summation. The study is the first step towards answering the crucial question: "In the complex and turbulent world situation of

today, what does it mean to be a Marxist-Leninist in Africa?"

The study would also resolve a number of other secondary questions. The unending nationalistic petit-bourgeois question, 'what is the relevance of Marxism in Africa?' would be silenced. Especially at this time when African bourgeois nationalism is proving itself incapable of providing for the basic elementary needs of the masses of African people. The "refutation of Marxism" not based on the real African experiences of Marxist theory and practice will be shown to be consistent with imperialist propaganda. False Marxist claims, by Africans, and proclamations of easy victory would all be theoretically exposed. Repeated practices of summing-up of the historical experiences of Marxism in Africa are therefore a necessary condition for further development of Marxist politics in Africa. The study would help us know where we are at in the struggle for the mastership of the contradiction opposing African people to imperialist and social-imperialist domination. Are we advancing or are we regressing? What *have we been doing wrong and what have we been doing right?* It helps us grasp and internalize the teachings of the most advanced experiences of the struggle for the mastership of the con-

This Marxist history of the African experiences of Marxism should deal clearly with at least three important problem areas:

1) the importance of Marxism for the victory of the real liberation of Africa and how Marxism has contributed significantly in developing the process of real liberation of Africa;

2) the major obstacles to the development of an African Marxist politics and the African response to the various transformations of Marxism in the world, including the crisis of the International Communist Movement; and

3) a Communist sum-up, - indicating errors, mistakes, deviations, etc. and their path of rectification - of some local concrete practical and theoretical African Marxist experiences. This should include a critical assessment of Nkrumah's and Cabral's theoretical and practical work, among other things. In different, both successive and overlapping, political conjunctures, Nkrumah and Cabral personified the leadership of the most advanced African mastership of the contradiction opposing African people to *colonialist* domination. Cabral introduced the practical and theoretical criticism and rectification of Nkrumah's work. (The rectification takes a Marxist form.) If anything we may say that the scarcity of Communist sum-ups, criticisms and self-criticisms coming out of the African liberation movement is an indication of the weakness of the fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the movement. Where is Nkrumah's self-

criticism clarifying for himself and for us his leadership mistakes which made it possible for pro-imperialist forces to topple his government? Is Lumumba's *Letter to Pauline*, a self-criticism or even a criticism of Congolese nationalists' mistakes which made it easy for imperialists to impose in the Congo a neo-colonialist solution? To grasp correctly (i.e. politically and scientifically) the major obstacles to that fusion may develop it further, especially after these obstacles have been overcome.

Of course Marxism is a science of laws of development of human societies. But it is, above all, the power that arms the subjective element, the capacity, in each epoch, to seize the active antagonism and generate the revolution as a real activity. It is through revolutions that Marxism develops. While it is important to know scientific studies of the laws of development of African imperialist dominated societies, it is even more important to know how the capacity of the African subjective element has been developing to seize those laws and revolutionarily transform those societies. Such a knowledge of the capacity of the African subjective element, in return, develops Marxism as a science.

Sponsorship and African Marxist-Leninists Movements.

Many important issues are connected with the successful accomplishment of such a study. Within the politico-theoretical problematics of the so-called "transfer of technology", issues raised by the "transfer of Marxism" especially through "revisionist" parties and their local African linkage (including their "ideological investments" such as publications) or through "international cooperation and student exchange" policies need to be studied carefully to clarify the main requirements of self-reliance in relation to the development of Marxism in Africa. In this connection, experiences of other countries will help us considerably. Was it accidental, for example, that the dogmatism of leftist lines against which protracted struggles were carried out in the Communist Party of China was personified principally by Chinese comrades trained in the Soviet Union? The various ideological tendencies in the history of the African Student Movement should be studied in some detail, in this very context. This may require us to study leftist movements of countries in which

African students or workers spend sometime. In addition, it would, for example, be interesting to study the process of transformation of the revolutionary Vietnam into an ally of social-imperialism. How is for Africa, the so-called "low level of development of productive forces" manifested concretely as far as the creation and advocacy of Marxist theory are concerned? What is the role of European self-styled "advisers in Marxism" for Africa or the genuine friends of African people? Why was Che Guevara unable, for six months, to make inroads in Zaire? How should proletarian internationalism be conducted in this area?

Marxist historical studies of the relationships between Western Communist parties and imperialism on one hand, relationships between Western Communist parties and African colonized and neo-colonized people on the other hand, must receive careful attention. In relation to the African liberation movements, Western Communist parties may prove themselves to have always been "revisionist". Similar studies, if there are not any yet, should be done to assess the relationship of Communist parties of the world with social-imperialism in their dealings with the African revolutionary movement. To what extent have some Communist parties of the world advanced or retarded the process of fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the African Liberation Movement? Lessons from African struggles may also open a general process of rectification of Marxism at the world scale.

Ways through which Marxism is passed around or "transferred" to African people (or put differently: how Africans come to Marxism) explains certain types of "ideological alliances" that are established between some social categories of Africans and certain forms of revisionism. Conversely the class position of Africans in specific class struggles determines the "form of Marxism" to which some of them are attracted to. With very little concrete analysis of concrete situations in Africa around which ideological struggles may be carried out, "ideological alliances" with some Communist parties or states become rigid. Of course, this "opinion" has to be verified through concrete historical analyses of real cases.

The "transfer of technology" has tended to lead to a "transfer" or a

reinforcement of the capitalist relations of production through which the "transferred technology" was produced and can be concretely applied, unless such a "technology" be internalized through a mass based problematic of social transformation. Class struggles over the transfer and internalization of "technology" decides everything about the efficacy of such a "technology": to intensify people's oppression or to improve their socio-material conditions. Without extending the similarity too far the "transfer" of Marxism implies the development, transformation or reinforcement of specific relationships of power depending on the nature of class struggles over its internalization.

While the knowledge of various "factions" of "Marxism" (Trotskyism, etc.) prevailing in imperialist or other non-African countries may be very useful to help identify the extension to Africa of those "factions", their concrete manifestations in Africa need still to be studied concretely *anew* in each concrete situation of class struggles. Unless reproduced through concrete class struggles in Africa the spread of those factions to Africa may not take place or survive. Different factions may appear in Africa as a mere result of concrete class struggles. It is important to understand and grasp concretely the social conditions which serve as "mediation or social material roots" of the ideas and practices corresponding to those "factions". The history of "fractionist struggles" inside the MPLA needs to be studied very carefully in this context. Nito Alves group may be physically eliminated, but its political line may still survive if the rectification process fails to deal with the real social base of the line.

Self Reliant African Marxism-Leninism

The history of the liberation movement of Congo-Zaire has had problems which are at the center of the weakness of its process of internalization of the revolutionary theory. Certain 'Communist parties' were allowed to *sponsor* specific "socialist compradore individuals" (e.g. Soumialot Gizenga, Mandungu, etc.). This sponsorship made it very difficult for genuine self-reliant leadership to emerge in the movement. The genuine fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the Congolese anti-imperialist movement in Zaire has

suffered a lot from those practices by some "Communist parties" or "Socialist States" to sponsor "revolutionary individuals" whose claims to (or domination of) the leadership of the movement has tended to depend on such a sponsorship. This may explain in part why the number of Marxist-Leninist cadres is very small in a movement that developed into armed struggle since 1963. The class struggles in the movement which took the form of struggles over the contents of the sponsorship led in some cases to the assassination of fine cadres.

"Marxism-Leninism" has tended to be understood as an expression of the concrete relationship between the leadership of the movement and specific "Communist parties" or "Socialist States". Some "sponsored individuals" behaved as if they had no accounts to give to the Congolese people and had all accounts to give to their sponsors. Their attachment to those sponsors was viewed as the real proof that they were in fact "revolutionary". "Self-reliance", paradoxically, has often tended to be understood as an expression of "total ideological alignment to the Communist Party of China and its State". In other words, "self-reliance" has been practiced as a "style of speaking" required in order to be firmly sponsored by the People's Republic of China. Of course, the process of rectification has been going on. The crucial relationship which must exist between the Communist Parties of the world, the "Socialist States" and the African Liberation Movement; a relationship that is conducive to a revolutionary fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the movement. In the struggle for leadership of the liberation movement, in some countries in Africa, the adherence to a form of 'Marxism' has tended to be a function of a real or expected "sponsorship from a Socialist State" *No concrete analysis of the concrete situation is usually made except for the embellishment of the "style of speaking" which is consistent with the opportunistic desire for sponsorship.* Of course, this is a certain class appropriation of Marxism-Leninism; we feel that its organizational implications which make genuine appropriation of Marxism-Leninism difficult by the movement need to be analyzed specifically.

We often hear from some "leaders" of the African Liberation Movement that "Marxism is a tool". What this

often means is that "Marxism is a way of gaining sponsorship in the struggle". It is extending too far the meaning of the word "tool" to call the proletarian world view a tool. Of course, social-imperialism, whose main material form of sponsorship is the exportation of military equipment and its operators, exploits and entertains such class ideological attitudes. It is necessary to determine the local social base of social-imperialism in Africa. In some "revolutionary movements" in Africa, it is amazing to see the organizational separation of "manual labour" from "mental labor".

On one side one finds "Marxist-Leninist cadres" polishing the speeches of the leaders, doing research and analysis, and on the other side, "revolutionary leaders", doing neither research nor study of their own, reading speeches and analyses done by others. The technical assistance system that develops to deal with the division, makes of self-reliance a mere joke. *Without any belief and confidence in the African illiterate people, these "leaders" cannot but seek for "material sponsorship" and thus open the country to social imperialism.*

We may learn a lot from an analysis of the concrete variant forms of "christian ideological investments" (Missionary work, etc.), for example, and their corresponding social bases. Why, for example, are some African social categories or strata "attracted to" (or derive more spiritual meaning from) Lutheran rather than Baptist churches, Evangelical rather than Pentecotist churches, Catholic rather than Protestant churches? How did different missionaries (and other organic intellectuals of the church) spread their religious teachings? What specific impact did they make on the various African social strata? The critique of religion as a political problem has to be done yet in Africa. To what extent, for example, did the Church's leadership role in the liberation movement (e.g. in Zimbabwe) complicate the fusion of Marxist-Leninist with the movement? The mass uprising of Jan. 4th, 1959, in Belgian Congo, dealt violently and firmly with Catholic missionaries but hardly touched the protestant ones. The Congolese masses of people must have perceived a certain difference in the respective practices of different missionaries... etc.

African Proletarian Ideological Hegemony

Are there in Africa today social bases which are readily "the material roots" of Marxism? Pro-imperialist intellectuals (from Negritude to Authenticity) leave no room for historical analysis before answering this question dogmatically in the negative, as they do. They claim that Africans are religious through and through, as if that makes *one immune to oppression and capitalist exploitation.* Or are they saying that Africans are exploitation-loving people? If they were religious through and through why is the missionary work so intense? Those intellectuals also claim that Africa is *naturally* neither a capitalist continent nor a Communist one. Of course, they fail to explain the historical causes and the present motive force of the African capitalist underdevelopment. Proving that African cultural past (corresponding to an African variant form of the Asiatic mode of production) is anti-capitalist is proving nothing in relation to the present cultural forms corresponding to a neo-colonial capitalist exploitation. Doesn't the muleist "Maoist" experiment in Kwilu (Zaire) prove that African masses of people can transform their passive resistance into an active resistance and take up arms to overthrow oppression and exploitation? Why is it that "Marxist ideological investment" (publications, study groups, workers cells, etc.) is often treated as *foreign* to Africa while "pro-capitalist christian or Islamic ideological investment" is claimed to be "African"? Probably European feudal intellectuals would have claimed that capitalism was foreign to Europe. Protracted Communist sum-up of African concrete experiences of Marxist politics and learning from other people's struggles will settle some of those questions. For Marxism-Leninism to emerge as the leading force (proletarian cultural hegemony) in African cultures, it is required of African revolutionaries to engage in, among other things, a protracted Marxist critique of the dominant ideological, philosophical and theoretical positions of the dominant African pro-imperialist or pro-social-imperialist politics. Such a critique should lead to the development of ideological, philosophical and theoretical positions corresponding to a revolutionary African politics. This has to be, among other things, a Marx-

ist systematization and concentration of the cultural ideas emerging in the mass resistance movement against colonial and neo-colonial States (the material tendential condensation of imperialist / social-imperialist domination).

That is how among other things, the African people will be freed from the chains of the imperialist ideological domination. The ideological unity of the African masses of people develops through that proletarian-led process of smashing, step by step, those imperialist ideological chains. A *"Marxism" that is not rooted in the ideas emerging in the mass resistance movement will find it difficult or impossible to fuse with the African Liberation Movement*. The political autonomy of the masses of African people against colonial and neo-colonial States (or neo-colonial projects of State), the supreme objective of African revolutionaries in the present conjuncture, depends also on the development of that ideological unity.

Theoretical Poverty of African Marxism.

The theoretical or philosophical poverty (what Cabral called "ideological deficiency") even among African "revolutionaries" has been appalling. (Lumumba was at best a Rousseauist i.e. an idealist in philosophy, Nkrumah was at best an empirio-criticist i.e. an "idealist materialist" in philosophy, etc.) Since philosophy is the method with which one thinks i.e. how one grasps reality, the development of guidelines to revolutionary activity needs careful attention. Even among self-styled African "Marxist-Leninists", the "theoretical spontaneism" – taking the philosophical forms of empiricism and (metaphysical) dogmatism still plays havoc. This is also a function of how Africans come to Marxism. (Even the so-called "African philosophers" suffer from this "theoretical spontaneism" since they act as if to "think was to repeat what Western bourgeois philosopher-masters said"). The African long waited Marxist-Leninist counter-attack against the metaphysics of Negritude, Authenticity, Communalism, Humanism, African Socialism, Consciencism, Pan-Africanism, etc. is just starting timidly to develop. Where is, for example, the African Marxist-Leninist position in/on the so-called "African

philosophy"? The cult of scientificity (theoreticism: "science or technology decides everything") in Hountondji's work is consistent with economism and modern revisionism ("the accelerated development of productive forces decides everything"). There is too much instrumentalism in the consideration of African culture or ideological ideas among African Marxist-Leninists. Ideologies, ideas, whether dominant or dominated are reflection of the real material conditions of domination/oppression and of mass resistance. They are reflection of power forces and as such have social bases. To say that ideas express relationships of power in society or that ideas correspond to social bases, does not mean that "ideas are tools for action". To understand ideologies, one must start with ideological struggle, with practice: wherever there is oppression there is resistance. It is resistance which lays bare oppression and domination. The development of a dominant ideology takes the form, historically, of a theoretical reaction to resistance. It is against the rise of mass cultural resistance in the "second independence movement" and the beginning of its fusion with Marxism-Leninism (both through the student movement-UGEC and the armed struggle) that Mobutus Authenticity ("authentic nationalism") is a theoretical response. "Authenticity" has therefore to be studied in its dialectical relationship with the ideas emerging in the liberation movement. To simply say that Authenticity is a tool that Mobutu uses to maintain his power, does not help us understand the power relationships it reflects.

The African critique of the political economy of African capitalist underdevelopment, not rooted in the ideas emerging in mass struggles against capitalist relations of production, still smells academism (the bourgeois form of theoretical work whose principal tenet is the denial of class struggle – at least in theoretical work). The critique of the Soviet "non-capitalist path of development for the Third World" has to be done from the perspective of concrete struggles against that "model" in the countries where it is being imposed. *Concrete African Marxist-Leninist theoretical formulations corresponding to the national democratic revolutionary politics (necessarily in popular languages) are still scarce*. Isn't this an indication of how removed African Marxist-Leninists are from concrete

mass struggles against imperialist/social-imperialist domination through neo-colonial states or projects of State?

African revolutionaries have done, so far, very little to transform the system of circulation and conception of ideas (mass media, schools, etc.). Important cultural or theoretical creations (Sembene's films, etc.) of African progressive forces are either banned from the African countries or are couched in languages or symbolic forms less accessible to the masses of African people. This is also a reflection of how African intellectuals become revolutionary – after having gone abroad i.e. after having become removed from the masses of African people. *The process of what Cabral called "re-Africanization" of African revolutionary intellectuals is not just an attitudinal one but also physical*.

We have cases, in Zaire, of "revolutionary intellectuals" joining the liberation armed struggle from abroad and leaving it after few months to become priests or supporters of the regime. Imperialists have very often, better access to ideas produced by "African revolutionaries" than African people themselves. *Very little effort is being done to facilitate the access of "progressive" ideas and methods of work to the large masses of African people*. Very often, the progressive character of ideas, requiring sound Marxist-Leninist analysis, is taken for granted. Even this elementary question requires, to be resolved correctly, a concrete liaison between revolutionary intellectuals and the fundamental masses (proletariat and peasants) of African people.

Translation and transcription of important works of revolutionary theory and experiences of others in popular languages and symbolic forms have yet to be done massively. This is just a beginning step; the real appropriation, understanding and concrete and creative implementation require paradoxically a real political mobilization of the masses of people. We need to know what has been done and is being done in this area. We need to internalize the lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in these matters. Struggles over these questions are also integral part of the struggle against neo-colonial states (and through them against imperialist social-imperialist domination which organizes presently alphabetization programmes.)

It is sad to see that even African revolutionaries are not yet struggling successfully, as they should, for their own political / ideological autonomy. *Within a year or so, some African "revolutionary students" groups have gone from a pro-Soviet stand to a pro-Chinese stand to a pro-Albanian stand with no other reasons than the fact that the groups to which they are ideologically aligned have done so. In the meantime no real analysis of the African struggles has been done.* Small groupism (e.g. 4 Zairean students in Canada proclaim themselves to be a M-L party!) is not the kind of political autonomy we are talking about. Small groupism is the material basis of localism (a failure to have a global view point). Genuine political autonomy of revolutionaries is based on their concrete link to the fundamental masses of people where they get their clues and help develop the political autonomy of African people or the revolutionary camp. Those questions may be clarified through a Marxist study of the history of fusion of Marxism with the African Liberation Movement.

Albania's Opportunism

The revolutionary (proletarian) conception of politics – systematized by Marx/Engels on the basis of the teachings of the early proletarian class frontal wars against the bourgeoisie, clarified by October Revolution under the leadership of Lenin and developed further by the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution – aims at the *destruction, step by step, of the State* (the concentrated form of all phenomena of domination) *as such* and not at its *reinforcement*, for Communism. Marxism is not a State principle. Marxism refers to class politics, to revolution. Marxism always develops against the State; it is the movement of the long march, step by step, towards the non-State, Communism. The main teaching of the Cultural Revolution is that Marxism wants the destruction of the Socialist State as well. This is the core of Maoism. This is a central and sensitive issue. The misunderstanding or the refusal of this issue led even Socialist Albania to break from the People's Republic of China but *also* from Maoism. (We underline *also* because those 2 are not the same thing). Let us deal briefly with this problem which is now at the center of the ideological struggle among African Marxist-Leninists.

Albanian comrades still cling to the now obsolete Stalin's notion of "socialist camp" whose reinforcement was seen as an expression of the reinforcement of socialist States. They miserably fail to grasp the new element in the current international situation and they dogmatically raise old revolutionary principles. They fail to practice materialist dialectics in analysing what they call "world reaction". They refuse dogmatically notions such as "Third World" which denote real forces in relation to historical tendencies of the world and to the question of the threat of world war. Where are their concrete analyses of the concrete situation of the present international situation? They are in fact trying to defend, through a geopolitical neutralism, the protection of the Albanian State from an effective entanglement in the present major world contradictions and above all, from a possible military confrontation with the USSR. Thus, they are leaning towards making up with the USSR. They have almost fallen into the Soviet ideological game of labelling some States reactionary or non-Marxist to justify its "humanitarian rescue invasion". From Czechoslovakia (1968) to the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea the same line of justification of the operation was given: those countries are run by reactionary non-socialist and non-Marxist forces. (When will the Soviet Union "liberate" the U.S.A.?). That is why Albania supports completely Vietnam in its war of aggression against Democratic Kampuchea and criticizes China for having raised against the USSR the genuine question of frontiers. Albanian comrades fail completely to grasp the significance of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution for Marxism. They denounce China and Mao (as do Cuban, Vietnamese and Russian "comrades") as having never been neither Marxists nor Socialists. In view of the fact that Albanian comrades aligned themselves with the Chinese comrades in the split (1963) in the Communist International Movement, we require of the former a honest (materialist, dialectical and non-arrogant) selfcriticism for having selected the "non-Marxist, non-Socialist" side. Albania, it seems, has not had her own cultural revolution. "The continuation of class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat" is understood here as a form of reinforcement of the Socialist State and not as arming the people, through the

proletarian leadership, against the Socialist State for the realization step by step, of Communism. Albanian comrades see Mao's break from Stalin's conception of "Socialist State" (as the core of the socialist camp and as the motive force, through technological and scientific development, of Communism) as a *movement* away from Marxism-Leninism. This is a crucial element of the ideological struggle: What is Socialist revolution? Does it aim to a reinforcement of the Socialist State or does it open the process of destruction of the State per se? What does it mean to say, as the USSR claims, that "20% Communism has been reached"? Is it purely accidental that Cuban, Vietnamese, Albanian and Russian comrades have the same understanding of China and Mao? Our view is that Albania is moving dangerously away from Marxism-Leninism. Defending old principles by mere persistence and providing no real analysis and concrete solutions to issues posed by the new international situation is at best idealism.

Against Albanian present idealism, we take position for Maoism. While Albania rejects the "theory of the Three Worlds", she provides us with no real theory to help us grasp what is new in the World situation. Of course, the theory has some basic problems which confuse some of those who fail to grasp it dialectically. The theory provides a *correct* analysis of the World situation insofar as this analysis is made in relation to the threat of world war and thus with States as the principal actors in view. In the face of the danger of war, the question "what is to be done" is posed to Parties, proletariats, peoples, countries and States by that risk. The national question becomes an essential political question for everybody. The "3 Worlds theory" is an answer to the question, "how are countries of the world distributed in relation to the dynamics leading increasingly to the threat of war?" It deals with actions of States in relation to the threat of war. The class character of the analysis is therefore secondary. Each State, including imperialist ones, can consider it as a correct description. That is why the word "country" is used (countries of the Third World, second world, etc.). A country is neither a nation, a State nor a people; it is all of them. It is the country which involves in war. "What is the character of the war?" is not dealt with. Is it people's war, conven-

tional war, is it conducted by the proletariat or by the bourgeoisie? The theory does not explicitly explain that because it says nothing about the class character of the national question.

Africa's "Artificial Liberation Fronts"

The "theory of the 3 Worlds" therefore, is not a political line of the world proletariat as it is conceived from the perspective of States. It says nothing about the central question of each proletariat: the proletarian organization of the people to master its political antagonism with its bourgeoisie. The two major theses of the theory are *not* political directives to revolutionaries *per se*.

1) The Third World is the principal anti-superpower and anti-war force. We must support everything which unifies it.

2) The second World can be allied with. We must support everything which opposes it to the 2 super powers and which draws it closer to the Third World. Here the Marxist-Leninists who supported the French legionnaires in Zaire whose action in no way was opposed to the U.S. imperialism or in line with anti-superpower and anti-war forces were not really consistent with the theory as they pretended.

In practice the objective of the Chinese diplomacy is to form a united front against the *most* dangerous super-power, the USSR. Instead of the *three* worlds, in the eyes of the Chinese, it is the future *camps* in the war which count. If the main axis of the war camp is a progressive alliance between the U.S.A. and China, this is not really new. Against the Nazis, Stalin entered into an alliance with Western imperialist countries. The Vietnamese more than anybody else should know how difficult it was for revolutionaries to join the French colonialists when they were asked to join them to fight the Japanese. Their political autonomy was crucial to maintain. Why should the revolutionaries of the Third World, for example, be required to enter into an alliance with American, European and Japanese imperialism which oppress, exploit and plunder their people and countries now? What was the situation of the liberation movements when U.S. imperialism was the rising super-power? In other words, why should revolutionaries act as if the fundamental principle: "either the revolution

will retard the war or the war will provoke revolution" has been reduced to the principle: "war is inevitable now"? The Chinese diplomacy does not take into account neither the revolutionary and progressive public opinion from the Third World or the second world nor the workings of secondary contradictions. How should, in the present situation, the subjective element of revolution be developed? *While imperialists and social-imperialists are preparing for war, how should revolutionaries prepare for revolution?* Marxist-Leninists of the Third World and second world who have been following closely the Chinese diplomacy as a revolutionary line have tended to become powerless and chauvinists.

The issue is central in the development of Marxism in Africa in the present world situation. We cannot but raise few problems related to it. We hope that debates on the issue will be pursued from the point of view of the African possible responses to the question, what is to be done?

It is not Marxist-Leninist to trust *any* State (be it Socialist or not) as the guardian of the revolution. More specifically, even the Socialist State should not be taken as a model, a source of political directives to world revolutionaries and proletariats. Marxist-Leninists must develop their political autonomy by relying on their own forces to analyze the situations in which they struggle. How have African revolutionaries been struggling?

The realization of the much needed "ideological revolution" (Lenin's terminology) or "cultural revolution" (Mao's terminology) among the fundamental masses (proletariat and peasants) of Africa, for example, should not be conceived of as a State business. This explains in part why the African State-based revolutions and parties have been incapable of developing the political autonomy of the people, the real basis of the anti-imperialist/anti-social-imperialist revolutionary camp. A State-based revolution reinforcing continuously the State against the masses, has tended in Africa too, to be a fertile ground for imperialism and above all social-imperialism to sow on. That is why imperialists and social-imperialists are finding it easy to foment civil wars to reinforce their positions in countries which are thus led to "invite" them to intervene. It is not really the State *per*

se which is the guarantee of democracy, it is people's political autonomy which modifies the nature of the State. "Artificial liberation fronts" are being created and entertained in exile from where they are encouraged to invade and "liberate revolutionarily" their countries. At this moment Africa has few countries without any imperialist armies of occupation.

The number of State-proclaimed "Marxist-Leninist Parties" is increasing in Africa. At the same time though African people have been becoming more aware of the danger of those Parties. The experiences of Parties such as these have often contributed to discouraging African people's confidence in, or receptivity to, Marxism-Leninism. While talking in the name of "the workers" or of "Marxism", some African "revolutionary parties" are known to have systematically forbidden African workers from striking i.e. from organizing their own political autonomy. A Marxist history of the African process of formation and building of political parties (Marxist or non-Marxist) will help clarify some of those questions. After all, the development of the political autonomy of the African masses of people, is above all the process of building of a party, a front or a people's army of the new type. What is new in this process in Africa? How is this new element articulated to the new element in party, front or people's army building movements of the World? This is a crucial question for the transformation of the African working class into a political class with a project of State and Society and able to lead the people's liberation camp against neo-colonial States and projects of State and thus against imperialist/social-imperialist domination.

Applying Dialectical and Historical Materialism to Africa

Even with Marxism-Leninism, African people must have access to and internalize, the most advanced teachings of Marxist-Leninist experiences. The revolutionary leadership that repeats constantly the mistakes already rectified elsewhere in the World, acts with an artisanal method of work and lacks a global view point on World revolutions. It is through the activities of its State on the World scale that a people develops its consciousness of the World situation. In a zone of tempests, a State is drawn into a situation of con-

vergence of the World major contradictions. The duty of the revolutionary forces is to step up the development of the subjective element to the level required by that convergence. In the case of Zaire, for example, it seems like objective conditions for the overthrow of Mobutu's regime are increasingly developing to the point of convergence of all the contradictions. But, the subjective element is still seriously underdeveloped. It is that uneven development which keeps the regime going and the masses of people over oppressed. It is through the liberation front with its people's army that the people masters the antagonism against all imperialism. The nature of the Party that serves as the leading core of the liberation front determines the democratic character of that front. How, in the World today, can a party that really leads and not harasses the people be built? Which African most advanced experiences should we take advice from?

Our main concern is to seek with *African revolutionaries the necessary clarification of what is the correct Marxist politics in Africa in the present complex and turbulent international situation dominated by the threat of World War III. As we saw above, even counter-revolutionary politics passes now as Marxist-Leninist politics. We cannot do this simply by juxtaposing a set of principles against other sets of principles – the idealist method of work of the Albanian comrades who fail even to explain historically their vacillation towards the People's Republic of China. As Marx puts it in his *Theses on Feuerbach*: "The question whether objective truth is an attribute of human thought, is not a theoretical but a practical question. Man must prove the truth, i.e. the reality and power, the this-sidedness of his thinking in practice. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking that is isolated from practice is a purely scholastic question."* Through a concrete analysis of the concrete situation, we must grasp, as Marxist-Leninists, the concrete historical developments in Africa as well as in the world. Outside of this perspective, it is impossible to characterize correctly the history of Marxism in Africa. This is, in fact, applying dialectical materialism and historical materialism to Marxism in Africa.

To apply dialectical materialism to Marxist theoretical work in Africa, is

to grasp the struggle between idealism and materialism which is the motive force, the driving contradiction of the development of that work. Marxism too as philosophy is determined by the struggle between idealism and materialism. Real revolutions develop Marxism. While the application of dialectical materialism to Marxism itself informs us on the form of its driving contradiction, the application of historical materialism to Marxism itself informs us on the content of that contradiction. To apply dialectical materialism to Marxism in Africa is to ask: "In the production of the necessary concepts for the cognitive appropriation of the African situation, have African Marxist-Leninists always been consistent materialists and dialecticians? In this context, for example, we may ask: is *Consciencism* of Nkrumah consistent with dialectical materialism? Is Communalism consistent with the theoretical position corresponding to the genuine liberation of Africa? Is *Consciencism* of Nkrumah a real systematization of theoretical ideas emerging from the African People's liberation camp and corresponding to the genuine liberation of Africa? Is the dialectics contained in *Consciencism* an idealist or a materialist one? This perspective forces us to consider *any* theoretical work (bourgeois, petit-bourgeois, peasant, Marxist-Leninist, etc.) as being fundamentally an outcome of and a concentrated expression of the struggle between idealism and materialism. It is not enough to be Marxist-Leninist (i.e. to proclaim oneself as such) to be consistent materialist and dialectician. Even Marxist-Leninists, who don't struggle vigilantly to be dialectical materialists, take idealist and/or metaphysical positions.

To apply historical materialism to Marxism itself means to ask: a) what is the concrete *content* in each conjuncture of the struggle between idealism and materialism within Marxism? For example: the philosophical positions against Maoism being taken by Albanian comrades prove to be essentially idealist and metaphysical. In other conjunctures, say before the Cultural Revolution, those positions would not necessarily be idealist and metaphysical i.e. they are idealist and metaphysical in relation to the present concrete situation whose law of motion they fail to grasp. To apply historical materialism to Marxism also means b) to ask, what is today the *revolution* which

materializes the most advanced experience of the victorious mastership, by the proletariat, of the contradiction bourgeoisie/proletariat? For Africa, this implies that we must find out what is the *national democratic revolution* or *the national liberation struggle* which materializes the most advanced experience of the victorious mastership by African people, of the contradiction African people/imperialist and social-imperialist domination. Since the contradiction, bourgeoisie/proletariat, is *ultimately* the driving contradiction of African societies we must also determine the most advanced African experience of the African mastership of the contradiction bourgeoisie/proletariat i.e. the most advanced struggle against capitalist relations of production in Africa. This may also prove to be the most advanced experience of the fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the African liberation movement. We may concretely ask whether or not Cabral's "class suicide" and his extension of the concept of the motive force of history are consistent with historical materialism and whether or not they advance us in our struggle for African liberation.

How did Marxism come to Africa and which concrete practices has it guided so far? Which African Marxist experience (theory and practice) is the most advanced one and which should serve as our orienting perspective in analyzing the history of Marxism in Africa? Contrary to the claims of some Ethiopian students that they were the most advanced Marxists in Africa because they had the deepest knowledge of Marxist classics, only the teachings (theory and practice) of the most advanced African Marxist experience of the mastership of the contradiction opposing African people to imperialist and social-imperialist domination – and within it the driving contradiction bourgeoisie/proletariat – which constitute the most advanced African Marxist politics. Have those Ethiopian students produced such an experience? The task of the Marxist analysis of the history of Marxism in Africa is also to identify the most advanced experience. In Southern Africa, in Eritrea, in Ethiopia, in Angola, in Zaire, in Uganda, in Congo, etc., where definite anti-imperialist and anti-social-imperialist struggles are developing. Which are they and how to characterize the most advanced struggle? This key question can only be resolved by grasping *what is new* in the

current world situation and thus what is new in Marxism-Leninism itself. What is the highest stage of development reached by Marxism-Leninism and which experience incarnates it? Angola, Ethiopia, Vietnam, Kampuchea, etc.: one major lesson: you don't struggle and win genuine liberation against one imperialism by relying on another; genuine victorious national democratic revolution against imperialism/social-imperialism is not gained by relying on the so-called "Socialist States" either. The experience of the valiant people of Kampuchea is very crucial here and so is perhaps that of the Eritrean people. In this context too, the unfolding Iranian revolution needs to be studied with the utmost care.

The Worker-Peasant Question in Africa.

It is the new element in its articulation with the old, which allows us to decide on whether or not we are advancing, regressing or retreating. It is through that articulation also that we know which aspect of the old should be retained and which one corrected or rejected. Since the October Revolution to the Kampuchean national democratic revolution and beyond, the question of the relationship between the Socialist State and the workers/peasant class alliance has been *central*. The reinforcement of the bureaucratic structures of State, the solution to the gap between cities and the rural area, to the ideological gap between workers and peasants etc. seem to gravitate around the question of the peasantry. how to concretize the class alliance between workers and peasants? This question implies another one: how to co-revolutionize workers and peasants? Under Stalin's leadership the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dealt with the question in a way that reinforced the bureaucratic structures of the State. The Vietnamese comrades are accusing the Communist Party of China under Mao as having defended more the peasants rather than the workers. This misses the point of how concretely through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution with its revolutionary committees of triple alliance, for example, the Chinese comrades tried to confront squarely the question in a way that had not been done before. The worker/peasant class alliance does not imply a program of "workerization" of peasants nor does it mean a program of "peasantiza-

tion" of workers. It is not how to revolutionize the peasants alone, *but* how to co-revolutionize workers and peasants. Without going into too much detail on a central and difficult question, let us say that the form of the proletarian leadership in the class allied workers and peasants majority will determine whether or not the bourgeois (or neo-colonial) State will be destroyed or reinforced. We believe that the most important lessons on this matter are coming from the great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and its creative implementation, the Kampuchean national democratic revolution. The character of the contradictions our African countries face, which are similar to those faced by Kampuchea, allows us to understand the significance of the Kampuchean experience. Isn't the Eritrean struggle close to the Kampuchean experience?

The "transfer of technology" to Africa leaves African countries not only with obsolete and obscurantist "technology" but also with a reinforcement of the imperialist social-imperialist relationships of domination, unless African people dominate the process of conception of new forms of technology appropriate to the requirements of their socio-material conditions. Similarly failure by Africans to master what is new in Marxism-Leninism in its African and World development and on the basis of the real requirements of the African people's struggles in the context of the new situation of the World, may leave them with obsolete "teachings" of Marxism. To be Marxist is also to be able to grasp and appropriate cognitively the *newness* of the new situation of the World in each conjuncture, to act correctly on it and *not* to repeat and defend with the most rigorous persistence the old principles.

What is Marxism? Why in Africa? And why not in Africa? Those are major and crucial questions in our time. *In the name of Marxism, many so-called Marxists still dominate, exploit, alienate and oppress the majority of the people of the World generally and of Africa particularly, instead of fighting for their liberation against all forms of oppression and exploitation.* In the name of spreading Marxism, many people commit themselves to doing business for huge profits. In the name of Marxism, many people engage themselves in spying for imperialism and social-imperialism and in destroy-

ing the genuine revolutionary organizations. In the name of Marxism, leftist missionaries are touring countries where masses of people have successfully struggled for their own freedom – trying not to learn from the experience but to deny or confirm the "Marxist nature" of those struggles and victories. In the West, for example, a number of people have emerged as "Marxist theoreticians" of the struggles of the peoples of the Third World. In the name of Marxism all kinds of sectarian groups, from Trotskyists to anti-Leninists, have specialized in judging other revolutions and other struggles determining which are genuinely Marxist and which are suffering from a deadly bureaucratic disease. A whole theory of "how to make revolution" has been developed by people who do nothing except talk about other people's revolutionary failures.

Anti-Marxists have been spreading "Marxism" as a preventive tactic to make real Marxism impossible to have roots in Africa. In the name of the crusade against Communism and Marxism in Africa, governments, multi-national or transnational firms, churches, secret societies, philanthropic organizations, foundations, mercenaries, "technical assistance", military aid, academics, peace-corps, etc. have gone to Africa: sucking her blood, her resources, her civilizations and cultures ... We, African people, have mostly dead heroes: Lumumba, Moumié, Mulele, Ewandié, Afana Osende, Amilcar Cabral, Nkrumah, Ben Barka, Sobukwe, etc. ... Yes, this is a crucial question for us, African people, today too: What is Marxism? We have briefly tried in the previous issues of *IKWEZI* to examine the question. We hope to pursue this in the future. But, whether or not Marxism will have deep roots in Africa is not altogether a *voluntaristic question*. Marxism is the proletarian world view which is consistent with and the guarantor of the real liberation of the oppressed African people. While the subjective conditions for such a liberation are still weak, the objective conditions, as an expression of the relationships of forces at the World scale which moves Africa towards the frontline of the weakest links of the imperialist chain, are increasingly ripening for major victorious national and democratic revolutions. It is precisely that contradiction (weak sub-

jective development/ripe objective conditions) which calls for the development of Marxism-Leninism in Africa and the acceleration of the fusion of Marxism-Leninism with the liberation movement. The political autonomy of the proletariat and revolutionary forces of Africa, the consequence of such a fusion and development, is the condition for the victory of the struggles for national and democratic revolutions. In Africa, it is true, the working class movement and the liberation movement have not developed consistently. Under the domination of imperialist trade-unionist movements (AFL-CIO as the leading element) and attendant economism i.e. under the imperialist oppression through neo-colonial States and trade unions, the African working class movement has not been successful in developing a genuine political autonomy. In most cases, its influence in the liberation movement has not been determinant. That situation has weakened the necessary penetration of Marxism-Leninism in the liberation movement. These questions should be studied with the careful attention they deserve.

The New World Situation: Decline of U.S. Imperialism

Before concluding this introduction, let us say something about the major trends in the new world situation and their impact on the African liberation movement.

The World hegemony of U.S. imperialism that was consolidated after World War II came to an end with its defeats in Korea (1953), then in Vietnam and Kampuchea (1973-1975) and more recently in Iran (1979) – assuming the revolution in Iran will develop to the next stage of the development of a genuine democratic Iran. Internally serious blows were struck by the militant Black Liberation Movement and the mass anti-war movement – including the anti-bureaucratic, anti-state surveillance and oppression (CIA, FBI) movement. The internal crisis of advanced capitalism in which overproduction, in a wild search for profits, resulted in a prolonged stagnation occurring simultaneously with inflation weakened the U.S. further. The position of the dollar (stable from 1934 to 1971 and decreasing in value since, after a number of devaluations) reflects the crisis of the U.S. hegemonic imperialist domination even within the

so-called "Free World". The struggle to maintain that domination, especially in the face of the rising hegemonic expansion of the Soviet Union forces the U.S. to accumulate the preparation for war. In the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia, U.S. imperialism is in the retreat counter-attacking defensively.

While preparing for the revolution, progressive forces must not minimize the threat posed by U.S. imperialism. Either the revolutionaries defeat it or imperialist hegemonic struggles develop into a World war: imperialism cannot be reformed. Many revolutionaries, in Africa and elsewhere, are confusing the task of States and those of the revolutionaries. While States may enter into State alliances to stand up against the rising hegemonic super-power (this is the central objective of the "theory of the Three Worlds") revolutionaries don't align themselves with States to prepare and do the revolution: They must work hard to develop the political autonomy of the people in a revolutionary camp led by the proletariat organized in the leading core of the whole people (the Party). It is incorrect for revolutionaries to say that we must support Mobutu and his regime against the threat of social-imperialism etc. The experience of Democratic Kampuchea is enlightening here.

The Soviet Union on the other hand, the first experiment in socialism where the proletariat held control for almost 40 years, has degenerated into what the Chinese comrades have called "the restoration of capitalism" whose development has led to social-imperialism (the highest stage of development of a State bureaucratic capitalist formation). Now the Soviet Union is based on the economic laws that govern all imperialist countries and therefore has the same inflation, crisis, unemployment, general social decay, and drive for imperialist expansion as the condition for ensuring its extended reproduction. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 signalled the entry of the Soviet Union as a new imperialist super-power on the historical scene and opened the *new phase* of the imperialistic period we are in. Directly or through allies, the Soviet Union has been pursuing its hegemonic expansion in Africa, in the Middle East, in South East Asia, etc. The Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea after having concluded a military pact with the Soviet Union and South Yemen's aggression

in the North are the latest activities of the Soviet hegemonic expansion.

There have been cases of collusion with U.S. imperialism especially in dealing with revolutionary movement e.g. the great campaign to isolate Democratic Kampuchea. It was Senator McGovern of the U.S. Congress who first asked for an invasion ("humanitarian invasion") of Kampuchea to "save the Kampuchean people". In relation to Kampuchea, Cuban propaganda, U.S. propaganda, Vietnamese propaganda, Soviet propaganda, "Afrique-Asie" propaganda, etc., were all in agreement. So far, the following are among the first countries to have extended diplomatic recognition to the regime installed by Vietnam in Kampuchea: Ethiopia, South Yemen, Angola, Mozambique, Afghanistan and Cuba.

The fact that the USSR has started successfully a socialist transitional process of social transformation, the fact of the memory of Lenin and the Soviet use of Marxism-Leninism as its ideology have created a lot of confusion in the International Communist Movement. Until now some people, especially those who seek State alliances to do the revolution, still believe that the activities of social-imperialism constitute the form proletarian internationalism takes in our conjuncture. It took a long period of intense struggles against the counter-revolutionary tendencies within the Communist Movement and becoming dominant in the Soviet Union and its allies before the inevitable scission of the Communist movement took place in 1963. Those struggles were principally led by the Communist Party of China under the leadership of Mao Zedong and the Labor Party of Albania under the leadership of Enver Hoxha.

The great Proletarian Cultural Movement constitutes the concentrated expression of the break in the Communist Movement sharpening the line of demarcation between Marxism and false Marxism, Revolution and Counter-Revolution. Today, all those Communist Parties who never understood the significance of the Cultural Revolution and rejected its teachings are proving themselves to be counter-revolutionary and pro-social-imperialism. The Vietnamese aggression in Kampuchea is a decisive event for clarifying the demarcation line. Should we be surprised that Angola has supported the Vietnamese action? Here

too it is a mistake for revolutionaries to think that the state – be it Socialist or not – is the guardian of the revolution.

The inter-imperialist contradiction, the danger of World War III, the national question are the dominant questions of our time. Their class character being indirect and sometime difficult to grasp, makes it difficult, even for Marxism, to feel at ease with the treatment of the great contradictions of our present World situation. The contradiction opposing imperialist preparations for war and people's preparations for the revolution does not develop in a way that facilitate the class analysis.

Africa has been the scene of intensification of struggle. The general thrust of national democratic revolutions, dominated by the anti-colonial wars of liberation in the south, in the west and on the Horn, have been made

more complex with the intervention directly and indirectly of the super-powers and their allies. Judging from the developing new picture of zones of influence on the continent, the distribution of imperialist armies of occupation, we may say that we are contemplating a new *redivision* of Africa by hegemonic imperialist super-powers.

Maoism, the Marxism of our time, arms us to grasp the logic of forces which is unfolding. It is precisely Maoism which allows us to grasp the main directive of our revolutionary tasks: dare to fight against the cult of State (even Socialist State), dare to struggle against neo-colonial States through which imperialism and social-imperialism exercise their hegemonic domination. Militate for the development of the political autonomy of African people!

They observe:

“... The fact that their existence (being) not prohibited (and) at the same time not registrable, and... therefore excluded from the machinery of the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1956, serves as an incentive to foreign labour and political organisations to aid them (Black trade unions) overtly and covertly. Added to this is the fact that other non-labour organisations regard these unions as vehicles of change, using them also in matters other than those purely labour in character.” (1.10: Commission)

They are worried by the visits of foreign trade unionists to South Africa, and the reciprocation of such visits by the Black trade unionists. This is well expressed in the following Section:

“Apart from the financial support, it is abundantly clear that Black trade unions and associated organisations are receiving strong moral support from abroad.”

7. *Consolidation* of capitalist exploitation of the Black people by the creation of an elitist sell-out Black middle class.

“Probably the single most important element common to Riekert and Wiehan is the desire to win selected Black allies to the side of the ruling white minority – not all blacks, but those whose labour gives them a passport to the central economy. The Government thus has finally acceded to demands from the business sector – greatly stepped up after the Soweto upheavals in June 1976 – to build up and stabilise a black labour aristocracy and a black middle class in the major cities and towns. Put at its crudest in a memorandum by one business organisation to the Prime Minister, *this is seen as a means of buying off materialistically minded blacks in the hope they will then back the whites against the “irresponsible economic and political ambitions” of black agitators.* (cf. “THE GUARDIAN” 22.5.79).

Back Ground:

It is the view of the Black Allied Workers' Union that the creation of the Commission emanates from the fear of a repetition on a larger scale of the militancy that the Black workers displayed during the 1973 Strikes and the Stay-at-home Strikes of 1976, in identification with the peoples aspira-

The Wiehahn Report and the Black Worker

B.A.W.U's Report

This report is one of the most monumental frauds ever attempted on the Black workers of South Africa.

It is an attempt to rape the Black workers' minds into believing that the racist regime has now reached a point of change of heart; and are now sincerely wishing to break the Apartheid socio-economic barriers by introducing legal integration of workers in various industries. The hood is put on the Black workers' face. The whole Commission report and recommendations are calculated to contain and restrict workers by:

1. *Prohibiting* those Black trade unionists and unions which have declared their intention and determination to follow political liberation objectives and programmes of action;
2. *Bringing* those Black trade unions that are allowed registration under the rigorous control that will emasculate any form of militancy in them;
3. *Protecting* the White worker even more intensively than before.
4. *Excluding* 'migrant workers' belonging to the independent African states – including even those who

come from the so-called independent Homeland states.

5. *Excluding* foreign Codes of Conduct that are aimed at pressurising the multinational companies into practicing fair labour policies, vis-a-vis the Black worker.

“...the persistent growth of the multinational influence, particularly in the field of labour, is bound to lead to a peculiar proliferation in our labour system – alien labour practices of the multinational enterprises”. (cf: 1.16.4: Commission).

6. *Monitoring*, excluding or controlling any foreign financial assistance to Black workers; and the training of Black trade unionists by foreign trade unions.

The Commission states that: “... from the evidence it is clear that these unions (unregistered) are enjoying financial and moral support on a broad front ...” (cf. 1.10)

It also expresses the fear of foreign influence on the Black trade unions which might be detrimental to the political and economic stability of the state.

tions and demands for the total change of the "existing system" of Apartheid. The dominant role played by Black trade unions during these historic events, shattered the whites' belief that Black unions were toothless and without support from Black workers in all sectors of employment all over the country. It is this solidarity that the above quoted paragraph (7) would like to destroy for the *purpose of divide and rule*.

The Black worker has become a focus of the White Government's intentions of absolute control. The Black worker is feared. He has the potential power to paralyse production and thus destroy the economy. 80% of the total labour force is Black. It is essential that the Commission must make recommendations that would neutralise or break the power of the oppressed Black workers to liberate themselves from both economic exploitation and political oppression.

"(i) The Black worker and his organisation came to be perceived as a possible means of achieving change in South Africa ... not only in the economic conditions of the Black worker himself, but indirectly also in other spheres; and

(ii) the strikes and labour unrest of 1973 brought the position of the Black worker and his organisation under the focus of international attention, giving rise to a preoccupation among pressure groups and various institutions, including trade union organisations, with Black trade unionism and the conditions of employment of Black workers." (cf. 3.27: i, ii).

We subscribe to the views expressed in the "GUARDIAN" 22.5.79, that the new approach to the industrial labour relations has some military implications. A recent defence White Paper talked of the need for a "total strategy", while a paper just published by the Institute of Strategic Studies at Pretoria University urged the Government to adopt "strategic-economic programming for national defence".

Zimbabwe is about to fall. Namibia's liberation is inevitable despite the bombing of Angola. The last bastion of colonialist repression (South Africa) must therefore, prepare for its 'doomed' survival. The Bantustan policy occupies a central role in the strategy for self-protection and survival. Having shifted and fragmented the Black population for effective con-

trol, labour must also be regulated and controlled under the guise of "legal recognition" of Black trade unions.

We can further ask: How permanent is "permanent or fixed employment?" The periodical sending of Blacks back to their 'homelands' is the essential factor for the Apartheid policy of Separate Development. The creation of a 'permanent' settled Black community in the so-called white South Africa would be in contradiction of the trend, essential element for the Existence of the Apartheid White community. The creation of the so-called 'permanent employment' for Blacks, would also be in contradiction of the horizontal mobility of Black workers in search for better working conditions and living wages as their skills improve.

In our view, the creation of the so-called "permanent employment" is calculated to produce docile Black workers who will not challenge their employers and the White status quo.

The resettlement of the Black population from the so-called 'Black Spots' in the 'white areas', to the Bantustans goes on unabated. The best example of the shifting of Blacks is that of Cross Roads in the Cape - where over 40000 people were to be resettled in some Bantu Homeland. This is causing hardships to both the worker and his family.

The unemployment, estimated at about 2 million Blacks, and the victims of the pass and the Influx control laws appearing in the Magistrate courts at an estimated crowd of 1000 daily, are being thrown into the Homeland. Coupled with this is the Riekert strategy of erecting 'laagers' around towns (urban areas) to keep the Bantustan people out of the 'White' South Africa. Population resettlement, and manpower usage and control, are important factors in military defence. Professor J.C. Van Zyl, is reported to have stated in his Paper of "Strategic Economic Programming for Defence," an emphasis that the efficient use of manpower will be crucial in the case of insurgency at South Africa borders and unrest in the townships.

It should be borne in mind that the Wiehahn recommendations are meant to be a *facade* to the world. The whole basic idea is to ensure the economic and political safety of Whites in South Africa. It must be done and achieved by mobilisation and proper control of

Black workers and their trade unions. Force cannot be applied in the process of harnessing Black workers - as this has often had disastrous end. Subtlety must be resorted to so as to put a hood of 'legal recognition' and fairdeal over the eyes of the unsuspecting Black masses.

Ban on Construction and Control of Black Trade Unions with Political Objectives and Others:

The prohibition on political activities by trade unions is contained in paragraph 3.110, on page 38 of the Commission Report:

"...the existing provision of the section 8 (6) of the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1956, which prohibits a union or employers' organisation from affiliating with or granting financial assistance to or incurring expenditure in connection with a political party ... should not only be retained but reinforced ... the extension of the prohibition to bodies not included in the provision should be provided for by proclamation."

The extension of the above clause, Section 8 (6) of the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1956, to cover Black trade Unions, is motivated by the scarring observation that:

"Black trade unions are subject neither to the protective and stabilising elements of the system nor to its essential discipline and control; they in fact enjoy much greater freedom than registered unions, to the extent that they are free if they so wish to participate in politics and to utilise their funds for whatever purpose they see fit." (cf: 3.35.5: Commission).

The suggestion by the Commission to impose a legal prohibition and control of the Black workers' 'political' activities is aimed at driving a death blow to the Black political movement such as the Black Consciousness and the Liberation movements. These movements can only be effective and successful if they are actively supported - both physically and financially - by the masses of Black workers. (NB: Blacks have no political parties to send candidates to Parliament.)

It is almost impossible for Black workers to confine themselves to industrial relations and labour needs (wages, work conditions and legal recognition of their trade unions), to the total exclusion of their national

needs. They can never be 'free' within the industrial set-up and enjoy the so-called workers' rights without first attaining total national political freedom.

Registration:

Paragraph 3.87.7 in page 34 of the Commission, give the Industrial Registrar the power to register a union if, in his opinion:

"... the organisation is a bona fide union which in composition and objectives is relevant to the legitimate needs of the employer-employee relationship in the undertaking, industry, trade or occupation concerned." (cf: 3.87.3: Commission); and if there is "any factor which would serve to maintain peace and harmony within the undertaking industry, trade or occupation, and the national interest in general." (cf: 3.87.7: Commission)

This is obviously calculated to exclude any trade union whose policies are inimical to the Government.

The purpose of the clause is to exclude a number of Black trade unions who are part of the pressure group movements whose objectives are not for the preservation of the Whites' economic monopoly and social status quo.

There can never be "peace and harmony" in the industrial or private sectors until the whole of the Black nation is emancipated from political oppression and White domination. Black workers can never stand idle and promise "peace and harmony" while the struggle for national liberation is going on. They cannot trade-in their freedom for cordial industrial relations, registration and legal recognition.

Protection of White Workers:

White fears are echoed in a reference to the Botha Commission on page 17 of the Report; the main are:

i. Swamping of White workers resulting from great numbers of Black workers:

"Black workers far outnumber the workers of other population groups and would swamp existing unions, dictate union structure, distort wage patterns and endanger the position of non Black workers in the economy." (cf. 3.30.2)

Because of their racialistic attitude to life, Whites are scared of Black

numbers in the Industry. They do not see these persons as workers, but as racial units that would endanger the existence of the White racial group in South Africa.

ii. Use of Black trade unions by "political agitators" with the resultant disruption of industrial peace.

"The admission of Black trade unions to the industrial relations system would expose both the unions and the system itself to infiltration by political agitators and thus pave the way for the introduction of foreign ideologies (perhaps Communism or Socialism which are detrimental to Capitalism).

The disruption of industrial peace likely to ensue would cripple the economy and, in the long run, the country as a whole." (cf. 3.30.4: Commission).

iii. Use of "Umbrella unions" in times of strikes is also being feared by the White capitalists.

"Because Blacks are mainly unskilled workers, their only likely form of organisation would be a general workers' union constituting an umbrella organisation covering many industries. A strike initiated by such a union in one industry could well escalate and paralyse all industries." (cf. 3.30.8).

The 1973 and 1976 Workers strikes must have been very fresh in the minds of the Commission. They fear the strength and effectiveness of some of the present Black trade unions which are developing in the form of 'umbrella' or 'general unions'.

On page 29, paragraph 3.69 of the Commission Report, the Commission suggests that in the case of multinational unions, constitutional safeguards would have to be embodied as a *safeguard against the fear of being swamped* by another group, and a union having to *sacrifice its identity and traditions*."

This suggestion has, however, been superseded by the Government's decision not to allow the formation of 'mixed' (racially) trade unions.

In page 34, paragraph 3.90 of the Commission Report, the Commission states "a serious implication of the restructuring of the industrial relations system in the bargaining process in industrial councils – which are legally

and otherwise the system's most important point of fusion of employer – employee relations – *will have to contain safeguards and guarantees against a particular interest group dictating the process of decision – making at the expense of the other groups.*

(NB: Blacks can never gain without Whites losing some of their exclusive privileges.)

Job Reservation:

Job Reservation is to be blatantly retained in the mines. Over 500,000 Black mine workers are affected by this. It is an obvious reaction to the 1922 Mine workers strike, and a concession to the recent O'Kiep Mine workers' strike over employment of Blacks in skilled work. The Mine Workers' Union is a powerful reactionary instrument. (cf. p 43) Change in the mines would have been meaningful even in a historical sense. The Mines and Works Act, 1911, was the first statute to introduce statutory Job Reservation.

The abolition of Job Reservation will not be effected by the repeal of Section 77 of the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1956. That power to remove the job reservation is vested in the White unions by paragraph 3.137.1 and 3.137.2, on page 42 of the Commission Report.

Protection of Multinational Companies:

Multinational Companies must be retained in South Africa under all costs. The call for divestment from South Africa must be invalidated by the creation of an impression that industrial relations are changed for the better. Multinational companies must feel that there will be definite economic stability which is the required factor for safe and profitable investments.

If the multinationals do not continue to reap the massive profits they will obviously be tempted to pull out of a country that is politically unstable and unpopular, if not unsafe. The establishment of, and according of recognition to Black trade unions will make the adoption of the foreign Codes of Conduct redundant. It will be argued that Blacks have now the right to collective bargaining through their legally recognised trade unions. Foreign companies will now be required to abide by the new laws recommended by the Commission.