

# INKWEZI

NORDISKA  
AFRIKAINSTITUTET

1980-11-11

UPPSALA

£ 1.40

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

NUMBER 15

OCTOBER 1980



## DOWN WITH THE NOTORIOUS FREEDOM CHARTER!

"Azania is not a prostitute. It is an African country. Only a prostitute can belong to "everybody" or to "all". Azania does not belong to "all" – oppressor and the oppressed, dispossessor and the dispossessed, robber and the robbed. Azania belongs to the Black peoples. The facts of history are clear on this issue. There is no intelligent Blackman except those who are brain-washed by the "multi-racial" politics of the "liberals" who accepts this sell-out document. Self-determination and majority rule are the only solution to nearly 400 years of foreign minority racist settler colonial rule in the country of our forbears."

### Role of the Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa

A SHORT HISTORY OF COLONIALISM IN SOUTH AFRICA; A MARXIST-LENINIST ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL QUESTION; INDEPENDENT ZIMBABWE AND ZANU'S GREAT VICTORY; A HISTORY OF FRELIMO'S STRUGGLE; HOW THE FREEDOM CHARTER WAS SMUGGLED INTO THE ANC; THE MAJORITY BLACK NATIONALIST TENDENCY IN AZANIAN POLITICS; THE NEED FOR A BLACK PEOPLE'S CHARTER; ETC.



## Contents

Political Mobilisation is Equally Important as Armed Struggle	
<i>Peoples Movement in Azania in Upsurge</i> .....	p. 1
The Black Nationalist Tendency .....	p. 2
Brief Notes .....	p. 4
The Freedom Charter – By David Dube .....	p. 6
Lenin: Apropos the Freedom Charter .....	p. 8
A Brief History of Azania – By Dabi Lenkululeko .....	p. 9
The Role of Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa .....	p. 14
Kampuchea Atrocities Refuted at U.N. ....	p. 27
A Good Marxist-Leninist Analysis .....	p. 28
Independent Zimbabwe – By Lutz Plümer .....	p. 40
Brief History of the Mozambiquan Revolution – By Peter Meyns .....	p. 44
<i>Soviet Union Plunders Namibian Resources</i> .....	p. 49

## Support IKWEZI: Become an IKWEZI Sustainer

In these days of confusion on the Left IKWEZI has suffered as a result. Our position as a Journal relating to the Azanian and Southern African struggle is peculiar. We are dependent solely on sales abroad as we do not receive a single cent for the copies that we send to Africa. Our problem has been that many left-wing bookshops do not pay us for the copies that they purchase.

IKWEZI works within the mainstream of the PAC, BCM and other Black nationalist organisations that are free of any kind of imperialist manipulation. *IKWEZI* also holds a firm position on social-imperialism as the leading imperialist power of our time and has consistently exposed Soviet activities in Africa and elsewhere.

We are a Marxist-Leninist Journal based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Zedong. We are dedicated to the success of the proletarian revolution in Azania under the leadership of the working class.

In this fifth year of the production of IKWEZI become a Sustainer. Fill in the enclosed form and send it to us.

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

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

## Political Mobilisation is Equally Important as Armed Struggle

The Black nationalist tendency which is the majority tendency in the Azanian liberation struggle represented by the PAC, BCM, ANC (AN), etc. must begin to place equal stress upon political struggles as upon armed struggle. They must abandon a mechanical attitude towards armed struggle and understand the dialectics between mass mobilisation and the armed struggle.

Azania today is going through a period of mass struggles that intensify yearly. The difference between the present mass upsurges and those that took place during Sharpeville is that the current ones occur in the midst of great revolutionary changes in the Southern African region, the most recent of which was Zimbabwe. This combines with the emergence of the Third World as the greatest anti-imperialist force in history, the crisis of imperialism itself and the rivalry between the two super-

powers that aggravates all national and class contradictions. The Black Consciousness philosophy has also inspired the Azanian peoples with pride and defiance, and helped them to shed Uncle Tom attitudes.

But we have not as yet been able to initiate the armed struggle in any significant way, although PAC forces at one time attempted to lay the basis for such a struggle until Leballo deliberately smashed it. Our notion of the armed struggle does not go beyond the concept of starting bases in the countryside and combining this with sabotage activities in the cities. This mechanistic attitude to the question of the armed struggle resulted in cadres being trained and then sent into the country on suicidal missions that got nowhere. This was the Che Guevarist "go to the mountains" approach to guerilla warfare which does not rely

upon, involve and mobilise the masses from the very beginning. This is a lunatic approach to the question of armed struggle and peoples war. The period of mass political upheavals through which Azania is presently going through creates favourable conditions for the launching of the armed struggle. It psychologically prepares the masses, strengthens their unity and awareness. And the deepening of the political struggles around a whole number of democratic issues gives strength to the peoples movement and their political organisations. It also deepens the contradictions in the enemy camp, as it is already doing.

It is very important for the exile movements to lay emphasis upon the political struggle that are occurring in the country over a whole number of issues.

## Peoples Movement in Upsurge in Azania but Lack of Revolutionary Party

The mass upsurges of students and the spate of workers strikes all over the country reveal the revolutionary ferment of the peoples movement in the country that shows no sign of abating despite the repressive measures of the fascist-colonialist government. Since Soweto the Azanian masses both in the countryside and cities, and amongst all three Black groups have launched one mass movement after another around democratic demands. The students and youth of course were in the forefront of these demonstrations but inevitably they were always supported by the people. In Cape Town the militant student strikes were joined by workers strikes in the city. The Black Consciousness Movement has successfully spawned a new generation of uncompromising young revolutionaries and even though they are not tightly welded together by a correct revolutionary ideology relating to the struggle, nevertheless they have shown a remarkable capacity to launch one mass campaign after another and to show a fierce degree of defiance of the authorities. Gone are the days in Azania when the people

stood in awesome fear of the white man.

Students and youth have always played a vanguard role in the Azanian struggle and every fresh period of defiance started with them. But the current generation of youth and students is probably the most militant and determined produced in the history of the liberation movements. Their actions are mainly spontaneist but even within this restriction they have shown a degree of organisation, too. But they have made one notable contribution to the struggle which no other liberation movement ever made, that was to bring the three Black groups — the Africans, Indians and Coloureds — close together as Black people. The appearance of the Indians on the political scene is particularly welcome since they have been passive for a long time.

The spate of workers strikes are reminiscent of the days of the ICU when African workers organised themselves into trade unions all over the country. The strikes are provoked by the high cost of living and the

economic recession in the country. They are mainly inspired by the demand for higher wages but the Black workers realize that this is linked to the right to form trade unions, a question over which there is a great tussle between the government which is determined to stamp out any kind of independent Black trade union movement, and the Black workers. Through the Wiehahn Commission the government attempts to control the trade union movement being fought for by the Black working class. In the case of the Municipal workers strike the police came down heavily upon the strikers and their leaders. But it was interesting to note that the Johannesburg City Council was ready to recognize the minority union of Ngwenya, which was prepared to be part of the white union, whilst they would not negotiate with the union led by Mvusi which consisted of the overwhelming majority of the workers. Mvusi was subsequently arrested and tried. The Black workers strikes will continue into the future and the struggle for better wages and trade union rights will be one of



the main democratic issues in the country. Herein the international trade union movement can play a positive role in giving support to their struggles. Some Western governments, too, are calling upon their national companies to comply with the Black workers demands for better wages. This conglomeration of forces is conducive to carry out the struggle in this field with greater vigour and almost certainty of success. But the tragedy appears to be that there is no central direction to the workers struggle – a sad commentary on the lack of revolutionary leadership inside the country.

In this pregnant situation the ANC-CP, which is the minority political tendency in the country is attempting to capture the leadership of the struggle, trying to buy off leaders of the Black Consciousness Movements, splitting and dividing them and setting up another multi-racial student body in opposition to AZAPO. But its most despicable act was in the Free Mandela Campaign. Everybody knows that the

last thing that the ANC-CP in exile wants is Mandela to be freed. Mandela is more useful to them inside Robben Island than outside.

Its political role in Azanian politics was shown by its feverish attempts to promote the Freedom Charter, a vile document that betrays the legitimate nationalist aspirations of the African peoples. The Freedom Charter was largely supported by the white mass media and all kinds of whites of liberal persuasion. The "Golden City Post" which is controlled by the Anglo-American multi-national corporation gave full support to the Charter. All the Black collaborators from Bishop Desmond Tutu to Gatsha Butulezi came out in favour of the Charter. Gatsha Butulezi could even quote a banned person, Mandela, with impunity. Amongst the multi-racial collaboratorists there has been the same attempt to revive that great panacea of our problems, a National Convention.

Whilst the Freedom Charter was be-

ing promoted by the white mass media there was at the same time a campaign to discredit the Black Consciousness Movement by criticising it for not opening its doors to whites. Once again the views of the racist establishment and the ANC-CP co-incide.

The South African government has been making all kinds of promises of changes in the wake of the mass upheavals. But it received its biggest blow in its failure to setup a Presidential Council because neither the Indians nor the so-called Coloured would participate without the presence of the Africans. There has been all kinds of crazy schemes like setting up a separate Natal regional multi-racial government under the leadership of Gatsha Butulezi, an extended version of the Bantustan system.

In this dynamic political situation the Azanian masses lack the leadership of a genuinely revolutionary organisation to mobilize and give direction to their struggles.

## The Black Nationalist Tendency is the Majority Tendency in the Two Line Struggle in the Azanian Revolution

The Azanian liberation movements and groups are distinctly divided into two different political lines, which bitterly struggle for the soul of the Azanian masses. This two-line struggle is represented basically by the ideological beliefs of multi-racialism and the African (Black) nationalist line which regards the struggle for one of the self-determination of the African people in the country of their birth. The former is represented basically by the African National Congress of South Africa and the latter mainly by the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania and the Black Consciousness Movement.

The ANC of South Africa lays stress on the races (including the fascist whites) living together and regard the struggle as fundamentally a struggle against racialism. They would refuse to use the word white racialism because this would antagonise the whites in South Africa. They speak of the struggle against apartheid, of creating a "non-racial democracy," and for them the struggle is equally against an alleged but non-existent "Black racialism" and "Black chauvinism", (There is no material base for "Black racialism" in South Africa. The material base of white racialism is the national and class

oppression of the Black peoples). This line also tends to liquidate the question of revolutionary African nationalism and equates it with "racialism". Because of this approach the ANC is basically a reformist organisation since its stress is basically upon integrating the Blacks into the white status quo on the basis of bourgeois equality. For the ANC milk and honey will flow the day that the Blacks and the whites sit together, eat at the same restaurants, etc. Because of this approach too the average ANC member is always crying out how oppressed he is and begging the world to take pity on him and come and help him. ANC type literature is always biased in this way. Of course we cannot separate the ANC from the control and the role that the white led South African Communist Party plays in it. Ever since the SACP rejected the correct Comintern thesis of the "Black Republic" in 1928 it has always interfered in the Black liberation movements with the sole intention of making the country safe for whites, and holding back the revolutionary militancy of the African peoples. It continues this role up to this day and many knowing Azanian revolutionaries regard the SACP as an extension

of BOSS.

The ANC line is supported therefore in the cities by the petit bourgeois integrationists and opportunists amongst the Black peoples. In the white camp too it is supported by those who realise that the ANC is the one organisation that will guarantee their power and privileges for them. This became evident during the recent attempts inside the country to promote the Freedom Charter, when the English dominated mass media went all out to support it.

### ANC-CP's International Support

Internationally also the ANC line tends to be much more popular especially in the West European countries. Most of the white sympathisers in these countries like the ANC talk about multi-racialism. It makes them feel good and safe and panders to their own prejudices on the question of the problem of white racialism. It is also the line that most revisionist, trotskyites, social democrats, liberals and trade unionists in the West like to hear. These political lines which are the dominant tendencies in the Western countries also liquidate the national question. Their positions on a number of political issues is basically bourgeois-liberal.



They would like to evade the question of white racialism altogether and to regard it as a mere offspring of capitalism. Their basic tendency on the question of the black-white question is integrationist, which means effectively the blacks integrating into the structures that basically serves the whites. The revolutionary tendency is that which leads to Black (National) autonomy or self-determination. The ANC-CP line is therefore also related to a particular type of Socialism which liquidates the national question and which regards racialism as a mere offspring of capitalism.

The ANC line is also fundamentally supported by the two superpowers. It is certainly supported by imperialism which regards it as a safe bet in the country. The ANC's Freedom Charter guarantees the colonial nature of the country. Of course imperialism would like the organisation to be led by its direct agents and here it clashes with the Tambo wing of the ANC which is closer to the Soviet Union. The two superpowers and their agents realise that the ANC is a safe bet but both of them struggle to bring it closer to them. They look upon the ANC as bringing about that kind of non-racial reconciliation in the country which will safeguard their interests. Therefore the politics of multi-racialism is the politics of imperialist interests.

Centring around the ANC-CP there is a whole international conspiracy to keep South Africa within the imperialist camp. The anti-apartheid struggle has become something like big business for many "internationalists." Various aid and relief organisations know and understand the name of the game and therefore consciously give support to the ANC-CP set up. If they smile upon the Black nationalist tendency it is only in order to eventually discredit and destroy it. The recent evidence about the IUEF reveals that there was a conscious policy being pursued to win the BCM into an alliance with the ANC and that certain people were chosen inside the BCM to undertake this. Is it wrong to say that the ANC itself did not know about this. Where do these aid agencies get their monies from to throw around to our so-called leaders. They come from the coffers of Imperialism itself. The link between any national liberation movement and relief organisations is always a case of money. Because Azanian revolutionaries do not practise self-

reliance and prefer handouts to serious organisational tasks that will help them solve their problems – the character of petit bourgeois politics isolated from mass movements – they fall easy prey to these pro-imperialist aid organisation. Azanian revolutionaries lack elementary intelligence knowledge to be able to undertake serious intelligence work on so many of the aid organisations and individuals who come disguised as journalists, academicians, etc.

#### The Black Nationalist Tendency

The Black nationalist tendency on the other hand which is the majority tendency in the country represents the vast number of organisations – not only the PAC and the BCM – but also AZAPO, SAYCO, ANC (AN), etc. Some of these organisations are groups in exile and have no mass organisations inside the country, but nevertheless together they are the predominant tendency in the Azanian struggle. This tendency stands foremost in describing the South African situation as a colonial situation – white settler colonialism. This tendency also bases itself on revolutionary African (Black) nationalism. The beginnings of this tendency is not only to be found in its nationalism as embodied in the writings and figures of Sobukwe and Steve Biko, but also in the writings of Malcolm X, Franz Fanon, Marcus Garvey, Nkrumah, etc. It is against all forms of foreign domination, it represents the exclusive interests of the African peoples. It takes a firm position on the Land Question. In the concrete conditions of the Azanian struggle there is a M-L radicalising tendency within the mainstream of this line. It is from here that the future elements of the Marxist-Leninist Party of Azania will emerge. This tendency is more patriotic and closer to the feelings and needs of the African masses. The Black nationalist tendency is closely linked to the anti-colonial struggles fought by the African peoples from the time that the first white man entered the country. With the exception of the ANC-CP most of the Azanian organisations have been Black nationalist in orientation. The APO (All African Peoples Organisation), the ICU (Industrial and Commercial Workers Union), the Non-European United Front, the Non-European Unity Movement, etc. have all had this tendency in Azanian politics. It is not only the major tendency today but it also represented

the majority tendency throughout Azanian politics. But this tendency is not very popular. Its language of Blackness is not very much welcomed amongst the international community. And it is often very much slandered, as being racialist and chauvinistic.

But the Black nationalist tendency is far from being racist. It is in essence, politically, anti-colonial and anti-imperialistic. Because in South Africa class and race run parallel, black consciousness is also class consciousness. The Black person suffers from both national and class oppression. This tendency tends to reject white participation in Black politics because most whites – if not all – still carry with them germs of cultural superiority and do not leave behind their colonial habits. For them there is a need to re-educate themselves, and this can only occur when they are fully integrated into Black society. Sitting down and having discussions with Blacks in their plush homes does not constitute integration. It is just another form of assimilating the Black man. No matter how much whites are sympathetic to the Black nationalist cause they must not be allowed to join our organisations, not until the state power of the white colonialists are smashed and they become integrated into the state structures that we control. Until then they will always play a divisive role, dismissing our nationalism and wanting to push us in a "socialist" direction. But this brand of Marxism dismisses the most important question in the Azanian Revolution, that of the restitution of the country and the land to the dispossessed African peoples.

One of the weaknesses of this tendency though is that it does not realise adequately that white racialism itself is the product of colonial and imperialist oppression in the country, and that we cannot truthfully destroy it unless we destroy colonialism and imperialism altogether. For tomorrow there can be applied the multi-racial solution where racialism will be brought to an end but where the colonial and imperialist structures of domination over the Blacks and especially the workers and peasants will remain. This multi-racial solution will benefit a handful of petit bourgeois Blacks mainly and some skilled Black workers but for the large majority their conditions of life will not have improved much. It places too much emphasis on the racialist question and less on the national struggle



against colonialism and imperialism. Whilst it is understandable why we are concerned with the psychological dimensions of white racist oppression, à la Fanon, nevertheless we must see it within the perspective of the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle. With the destruction of the latter white racism will have no material base to flourish. The black nationalist line must increasingly take a Marxist perspective on the national question. In this way it will be

able to approach the whole question of white racism correctly and not become too burdened with psychological aspects of white racism to the extent of ignoring the colonial and imperialist structures that breed white racism.

Of course the Black nationalist tendency also suffers from lack of organisational ability which the ANC-CP has a greater mastery of. One reason for this in terms of exile politics of course is that the ANC is very rich

and can entice people and bribe and buy them off. The black nationalist tendency has little money and lesser resources to fall back upon. But this is a situation that the majority tendency must correct. The Black nationalist tendency must work closely with one another. The Pan-Africanist Congress is the key in this alliance. These organisations should make their resources available to one another and develop their propaganda line accordingly.

## Brief Notes – End of the Road for P.K. Leballo

### NEED FOR A PEOPLE'S CHARTER

The Black nationalist tendency which is the majority and leading tendency in Azanian politics and which is represented principally by the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania and the Black Consciousness Movement (together with other bodies like African National Congress (African Nationalists) SAYCO, etc.) needs to come together to draw up a Black People's Charter to define the nature, tasks and goals of our national liberation struggle. All these organisations subscribe basically to the same political philosophy based on defining the national struggle as an anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle for self-determination by the dispossessed African peoples. Such a People's Charter will focus on how our People view the struggle for liberation. Since it will represent the views of the majority of our people it will put paid to the multi-racialists and their international backers in the camp of the two super-powers. This should be undertaken by all the organisations which subscribe to the same common beliefs based on self-determination. Such a step, too, will help to create in a more realistic and dynamic way the United Front of all these organisations. Whilst these organisations at this stage will maintain their separate identities they will at the same time subscribe to a common People's Charter. This will also help to draw them closer together.

Most of the black nationalist organisations currently do not have a full programme defining the nature of our struggle. This applies to the PAC as much as to the BCM. The PAC in particular needs to update its programme. The Black People's Convention sometime ago at Humansdorp put

forward a programme based on Black Consciousness. But it was too limited in its scope. The Black People's Charter should not only be a critical summary of past programmes, it should also be able to summarise the past 80 years of struggle – its weakness and inadequacies – and show the road forward. The Charter should embody all the rich experiences of the past 80 years of struggle when we abandoned the road of armed struggle undertaken by our forbears and took the path of constitutional struggle. Basically the Charter must:

(a) Clearly spell out the nature of the national struggle as an anti-colonial struggle and not as an anti-apartheid struggle. It should define the Africanist nature of our struggle. The Land Question as symbolising the re-possession of our country as a country of the indigenous African people must be spelled out. It must reject the multi-racial concept of South African society as the face of continuing white and imperialist domination. The Black minorities, the so-called Coloureds and the Indians, must be called upon to fully identify themselves with the struggle of the African peoples as the basis of their own political and social emancipation. The Africanist nature of the struggle is the principal aspect of the national struggle. Neither the Indians or the so-called Coloureds have any basis for territorial claims and both their national and social emancipation is dependent upon their identity with the African people.

(b) It must also spell out the anti-imperialist nature of the struggle. The South African white colonial bourgeoisie is a junior partner of Western Imperialism and the relationship between Western Imperialism and the South African state is a semi-colonial one. 80% of South Africa's economy is

controlled by imperialist combines. The national struggle is therefore anti-colonial and anti-imperialist.

(c) It must define the democratic tasks of the revolution in the fields of education, labour, etc.

(d) In short the Black nationalist tendency must define the national democratic revolution but it must make a clear distinction between the betrayal of the struggle for self-determination by the Freedom Charter and its own Charter.

**Forward to the Black People's Charter.**

### THE MEANING OF THE WORDS "BLACK" AND "AFRICAN" IN THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE.

The majority Black nationalist tendency in the Azanian struggle interchangeably uses the word Black and African. IKWEZI feels that we should use the African more regularly as it is more appropriate, and deals with a very definite entity, the aspirations and goals of the oppressed indigenous African nation which is the main thrust of the liberation struggle. Blacks is more amorphous and is very much a reaction to the concept of white as it relates to the history of our political oppression in the country of our birth. This is not to say that the word Black does not have a political value. Since everything that is associated with white is upheld in South African society and correspondingly everything that is associated with Black is derogated, Black Consciousness therefore has a definite value in instilling pride and dignity into our people. The use of the word Black also helps to incorporate the so-called Coloured and Asian peoples with the Africans, so that as Black people suffering a common political oppression, they can fight



together more effectively. And here the Black Consciousness Movement has done a magnificent job in bringing the three groups together on a realistic political basis, something that no other political organisation has been able to attain.

But one of the major tasks of the national struggle is to return the country to the indigenous African people. The African people who comprise the overwhelming majority in the country is not only the vanguard force in the struggle for national liberation, but it is also their political destiny which is the key aspect of the national struggle.

African is a definite entity and unlike the word Black not a reaction to something else. The term "Africanism" is used in the context of our struggle because the language of multiracialism and non-racialism tends to reject the reality of the African entity in the name of non-racial and human values. This is a distortion. The African peoples have been occupying the country for thousands of years. They have a *distinct culture, history, traditions* in the country all of which have been denied and negated by the colonialists. Therefore we are engaged in a national struggle to put right these historical crimes committed against our people. Living in an African country, everybody, whatever his nationality is an African. And while the vast and overwhelming African majority is brutally oppressed the duty of everybody is to identify with that struggle. This is the highest political morality in Azania today. The liberation of all in our country is related to the political and social emancipation of the African peoples. The oppressed African nation is the main force and vehicle of change. And while the oppressed African people repossess their country and assert its leading imprint in all aspects of Azanian life at the same time they will incorporate all that is best from other civilisations and cultures. In other words Africanism is not only an assertion of the legitimate political, social and cultural rights of the oppressed African nation but it also incorporates other human values. That is why Sobukwe stated that in Azania it is very possible for a white person to become the Prime Minister of the country. But he will do so as an African living in an African country.

The concept of Blackness can incorporate Africanism. Certainly the Black Consciousness Movement has done

so. It observes Heroes Day which was inaugurated by the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania. The BCM adherent very often thinks as an Africanist. And leads the Indian and so-called Coloured members in the same direction. It takes up firm anticolonial positions with regard to the national struggle. But its Africanism needs to be more specifically spelled out.

#### **THE END OF THE ROAD FOR P.K. LEBALLO.**

P.K. Leballo's ignominious end took a sudden twist when he was ordered out of Nigeria recently. He attempted to make a breakthrough at the recent OAU Conference in Freetown, Sierra Leone, but his credentials were turned down and he was hastily put on the next plane to Nigeria. He was warned in Nigeria not to engage in any political activities after the government gave full recognition to the PAC as constituted at the moment. He was only given status as a refugee. Leballo has been attempting to peddle himself in some parts of Europe through the assistance of some cranks with big ambitions, who are not in anyway linked to the PAC but who make all kinds of fantastic claims. But the days of Leballo in Azanian politics and in Africa is finished. He can never put his foot in any part of Africa as a legitimate representative of any Azanian organisation, least the PAC. His expulsion was welcomed by almost all African states who long suspected him as a BOSS-agent. Those who associate and peddle this man as some kind of leader must beware of the wrath of the Azanian masses who have suffered bitterly from his destructive legacy. Leballo has been trying to give the impression that former members of APLA are solidly behind him, but this is a lie. During the height even of his power with APLA members he had merely won over about a very small minority who tried to terrorise the rest into supporting him. One of his last dastardly acts on the occasion of the commemoration of Sharpeville when he was booed by rank and file members in the presence of diplomats from a host of African and Third World countries, and told to leave the PAC as he was "destroying it", was his attempts to punish some of these members of the PAC. A truck load of his "supporters" that he was taking down to deal with these members overturned, and four of them died.

Without even informing any member of the Central Committee or officials in the Dar Office he tried to bury them. This was the man who divided, split and confused the PAC in order to maintain himself in power at all costs, and who always had some sycophant to toady to him. During the 18 years of his leadership in exile the PAC did not make a single positive move except to engage in demagoguery and rhetoric. His removal now paves the way to overcome the destructive legacy he left behind.

#### **PAC UNITY CONFERENCE: PUT TOTAL END TO LEBALLOISM**

One of the immediate tasks of the PAC after the removal of Leballo is to make the Conference scheduled to be held in April next year to be a Conference of Unity of all capable and dedicated PAC members, and a firm resolve to relate more effectively to the struggle inside the country. The Conference should be so organised that it will be representative of all the various *PAC groups and individuals that are not motivated by personal ambition but by sincere dedication to the revolution and the struggle.* There is obviously little place in the organisation for those whose history in the PAC has been reminiscent of Leballoism. The Conference should review the 20 year history of the PAC and the Azanian struggle since Sharpeville, should update the Programme of the PAC relating to the struggle inside the country, should lay equal stress on the question of Political Mobilisation and Political Struggle as the Armed Struggle, should tighten up Intelligence work, and should vitalise all the Departments of the PAC so that they work in a co-ordinated manner and put an end to personal empire-building, an aspect of Leballoism. It should put an end to any kind of financial abuse which was the result of the Leballo era and which was one of the principal causes of the abuse that took place in the organisation. There should be no question of removing the present Central Committee. Rather it must build upon it, making it more efficient by bringing in other capable people and manning the various Departments so that they work more effectively and undertake the tasks that have to be undertaken. Responsibility and accountability which was lost in the Leballo era must be re-instituted.



## The "Freedom" Charter and the People of "South Africa"

By David Dube

In recent months the so-called "Freedom" Charter has been exhumed from the grave in which it was buried from the moment attempts were desperately made to adopt it in June 1955 at Kliptown near Johannesburg.

The "Freedom" Charter was discredited as long ago as 1955. It is the most notorious document ever to be produced in the entire colonial history of Africa. It is a fraudulent document which attempts to betray the national aspirations of the Black people of Azania (South Africa).

It is not surprising therefore that liberal newspapers in racist South Africa have been allowed to publish this treacherous charter by Pieter Botha's Government while newspapers for the Black people have been refused permission to quote Mangaliso Sobukwe the PAC leader, whom the racists killed in February 1978 after imprisoning him on Robben Island and detaining him in Kimberly without trial for 15 years.

A dead man cannot be quoted, but a "Freedom" Charter can be reproduced by white papers and ignore the fact that the doomed Charter is the document of a supposedly banned organisation. A fishy exercise that must be carefully watched by Azanian patriots!

Why do the whites promote this Charter? Because the "Freedom" Charter ignores the fact that the people of Azania were dispossessed in the same way that the people of Zambia, Zimbabwe, Kenya and Mozambique were. The "Freedom" Charter covers up the fact that there has to be self-determination by the Black people who are indigenous to the Azanian soil. This issue cannot be glossed over in the name of "multi-racialism" which in any case has always meant white domination even by the so-called "liberals."

The Black people lost their sovereignty in 1910 when the British colonialists "transferred" the country of the Black people to the Anglo-Boer settlers. That "transfer" by their own English common law principles was invalid. (No one can give a better title than he himself possesses. *Nemo dat quod non habet*).

International law itself as contributed by the independent African

States has recognised this fact; hence the Pan Africanist Congress and the African National Congress have been given the status of observers at the United Nations – while the credentials of the racist "government" of South Africa have been questioned.

Thieves cannot give a valid title to other thieves. The land therefore belongs to the Black people. The "Freedom" Charter is a negation of the Africans' right to self-determination in their own country which was taken from them through armed robbery and invasion. Indeed, Shaka, Moshoeshe, Hintsa, Sekhukhuni and the national heroes of the Battles of Keiskama Hoek, Sandile's Kop, Thababosiu, Isandlwana, Blood River and other numerous battles of national resistance must have turned in their graves when they saw the "Freedom" Charter hoisted in front of the oppressed and dispossessed sons and daughters of the soil.

The "Freedom" Charter was not drawn by the dispossessed and oppressed Africans of Azania, but by white liberals (disguised as Socialists and Communists) out to perpetuate and protect their own interests. It is no wonder that at Kliptown in 1955 an Indian Yusuf Dadoo (currently Chairman of the SACP) the representative of the merchant class South African Indian Congress and an English priest, Father Huddlestone were honoured as "heroes."

Chief Albert Luthuli himself then President-General of the ANC did not know who drafted the "Freedom" Charter and criticised it. Indeed, he admits in his book *Let My People Go* – "The Freedom Charter is open to criticism ..."

The late Chief also said, "I can only speak vaguely of the preparations which went before it, not because I was excluded by the ban from all but, top-level decisions, but because of illness ... The main disadvantage from which preparations for this suffered was that local branches submitted their material for the Charter at a very late hour – too late, in fact, for the statements to be properly boiled down into one comprehensive statement. It was not even possible for the National Action Committee to circularise the draft Charter carefully. The result is

that the declaration made in the Charter is *uneven* – sometimes it goes into unnecessary details, at other times it is a little vague."

### Who made the "Freedom" Charter uneven?

It is not surprising that Chief Luthuli admits in his book, "Congress did not unanimously adopt the Charter ..."

Now a document which even a substantial number of ANC members could not accept is being projected with a religious zeal as being the basis for "freedom" in Azania. In fact, this document is neither national nor proletarian when it comes to reflecting the national aspirations of the dispossessed or the interests of workers and peasants of Azania. It is clearly a sell-out document!

Commenting on the "Freedom" Charter, Jordan K. Ngubane, author of *An African Explains Apartheid* and former influential ANC leader who brought Chief-Luthuli to the leadership of the ANC to replace Dr. James Moroka in the early fifties says:

"People who sat in the inner councils of this alliance (Whites, merchant class Indians and ANC leaders at Kliptown) stated privately that the ANC tended to accept instructions rather than to participate decisively in the formulation of policies. Dr. Wilson Conco who was for a long time Luthuli's deputy in the ANC, presided over the Kliptown gathering, in 1955, which produced the Freedom Charter; but on his return (to Durban), he said he had seen the document for the first time at the conference. And Chief Luthuli himself had not known who had drafted the charter. The co-ordinating Committee of the alliance was a matter of fact not the real originator ..."

Yet today, this discredited neo-colonialist document is being paraded before the people of Azania and of Africa to deceive and divert them from the objectives of self-determination and restoration of their country which was stolen from their forefathers by the descendants of Jan Van Riebeeck and British settlers with the connivance of British imperialism in particular, and Western imperialism in general.

It is significant to note that it was the Kliptown "Freedom" Charter which precipitated the break-way of the Africanist bloc or the Youth League of the Congress from the ANC in 1958 and the formation of the Pan



Africanist Congress on the 6th of April 1959.

It is also important to observe that no Azanian movement of political consequence such as the Black Consciousness Movement, SASO, Black Peoples' Convention, Azania Peoples Organisation, Black Civic Association, Azanian Students Organisation etc. ever subscribed to this Judas' document, the "Freedom" Charter.

Indeed, speaking on behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress, and the dispossessed people of Azania in 1959, the sublime, incorruptible and indestructible Mangaliso Sobukwe said:

"The days of European domination of Africa are numbered. Even in South Africa the writing is glaringly on the wall for those of our European rulers who can see and decipher it. For exactly three hundred and seven years today, the African people have been criminally oppressed, ruthlessly exploited and inhumanly degraded. They have in the past, as they do now, declared themselves for freedom. They reject white domination in any shape or form.

They are unflinchingly determined to wrest the control of their country from alien hands. They are determined to exercise the most fundamental of human rights, the inalienable right of indigenous people to determine and shape their own destiny.

To the African people there can be no room in any way or in any part of Africa for any non-indigenous peoples who deny to the indigenous populations their fundamental right to control their own material and spiritual interests effectively. *South Africa which is an integral part of the continent, is the inalienable heritage of the African people and its effective control is their undoubted and unquestionable birthright.*"

### Sobukwe on the "Freedom" Charter

Commenting on the authors of the "Freedom" Charter, Sobukwe said, "Following the capture of a portion of the black leadership of South Africa by a section of the white ruling class the masses of our people are in extreme danger of being deceived into losing sight of the objectives of our struggle. This captured leadership claims to be fighting for freedom when in truth it is fighting to perpetuate the tutelage of the African people. It is tooth and nail against the Africans gaining the effective

control of their own country. It is fighting for the "constitutional guarantees" or "national rights" for our alien nationals.

It has completely abandoned the objective of freedom. It has joined the ranks of reactionary forces. It is no longer within the ranks of the liberation movement.

These 'leaders' consider South Africa and its wealth to belong to *all* who live in it, the alien dispossessor and the indigenous dispossessed, the alien robbers and their indigenous victims. They regard as equals the foreign master and his indigenous slave, the white exploiter and the African exploited, the foreign oppressor and the indigenous oppressed. They regard as brothers the subject Africans and their European overlords.

They are too incredibly naive and too fantastically unrealistic to see that the interests of the subject peoples who are criminally oppressed, ruthlessly exploited and inhumanly degraded, are in sharp conflict and in pointed contradiction with those of the white ruling class.

Citizen Toussant once remarked that: *'When anybody, be he white or mulatto, wants a dirty job done, he always gets a blackman to do it.'*

The so-called leaders after doing a dirty job namely, seeing to it that the African is deprived for all time of his inherent right to control his country effectively; of seeing to it that whatever new social order is established in this country, the essentials of white domination are retained, even though its frills and trappings may be ripped off. This attitude has been labelled multi-racialism by their white masters. They have even boldly suggested that being a multi-racialist is a virtue!"

The Kliptown "Freedom" Charter literally surrenders the country of the African people and their wealth to the notorious descendants of Jan van Riebeeck.

One Azanian leader has described the "Freedom" Charter as a "colossal political fraud ever perpetrated upon the oppressed, exploited and degraded people. It clearly bears the stamp of its own origin! It is a product of the slave mentality and colonialist orientation of the White middle class of South Africa."

This patriot concluded, "The land belongs to you (Africans). Whosoever

tries to stop your seizing it, pour petrol over him with one hand, and light it with the other."

Saboteurs of the Azanian Revolution have interpreted African self-determination and majority rule in Azania as meaning that the P.A.C. and Black consciousness-oriented Black organisations stand for: "Drive the Whites to the sea!"

Of course, this is rubbish. Where in Africa have whites ever been driven to the sea after African majority rule was attained? Only racists have always driven themselves out of Africa to the sea! Even these were begged to stay on, be citizens of a genuinely independent state and help build the new free nation.

Indeed, as can be seen from the representatives of white settlers like Peter Walls of former Rhodesia and Pieter Botha of racist South Africa, to compromise with these colonial forces and agents of imperialism in Africa on the land question is a naked betrayal of the people of Azania. The racists firmly believe in white supremacy. *The Whites in South Africa must be told unequivocally that the right of Azanians to self-determination in the whole country on the basis of one man, one vote is not negotiable nor can it be based on neo-colonialist charters.*

### ANC's Betrayal of 1949 Programme of Action

The principle of self-determination and African majority rule is of course, not "racialism reversed"! It is democracy as understood in Western Europe where the Whites come from. The numerical superiority of the Africans must be taken into consideration and the fact that the country belongs to them. "Bantustans" and the "Freedom" Charter are not a creation of the Africans, but of neo-colonialist forces and those they manipulate to confuse the true national aspirations of the African people.

The "Freedom" Charter is a complete departure from the 1949 Programme of Action. This programme was initiated by great leaders like Antony Muziwakhe Lembede, Mangaliso Sobukwe and other political giants of the Azanian liberation struggle. The programme stood for self-determination and genuine in-



dependence of Azania not the bogus 1910 so-called "South Africa independence".

Abraham Tiro the Azanian martyr killed by a racist bomb in Botswana never subscribed to the "Freedom" Charter. At the time of his death he was SASO acting permanent organiser. Speaking at the fourth annual conference of SASO at Hammanskraal, he urged delegates to be positive and consider the country (South Africa) as a Black state which belonged to the Black people.

He explained: "This should not be construed as anti-white. It only means that in as much as Black people live in Europe on terms laid down by whites, Whites should be subjected to the same conditions."

Steve Biko one of the illustrious leaders of Azania, addressing himself on the political situation in racist South Africa said: "The biggest mistake the black world ever made was to assume that whoever opposed apartheid was an ally. For a long time the black world has been looking only at the governing party and not so much at the whole power structure as the object of their rage. In a sense the very political vocabulary that the blacks have used has been inherited from the liberals. Therefore, it is not surprising that alliances were formed so easily with the liberals.

Who are the liberals in South Africa? It is that curious bunch of non-conformists who explain their participation in negative terms; that bunch of do-gooders that goes under all sorts of names – liberals, leftists, etc. These are people who argue that they are not responsible for white racism and the country's inhumanity to the black man; these are the people who claim that they too feel the oppression just as acutely as the blacks and therefore

should be jointly involved in the blackman's struggle for a place under the sun; in short, these are people who say that they have black souls wrapped up in white skins ..."

That is not the language of a charterist! It is a language that represents the oppressed and dispossessed people of Azania.

Biko continues, "Above all, we black people should all the time keep in mind that South Africa is our country and that all of it belongs to us. The arrogance that makes white people to travel all the way from Holland to come and balkanise our country and shift us around has to be destroyed.

*Our kindness has been misused and our hospitality turned against us. Whereas whites were guests to us on their arrival in this country they have now pushed us out to an 13% corner of the land and are acting as bad hosts in the rest of the country. This we must put right.*" (From Biko's book, *I Write What I Like*).

The Charterists are insulting the intelligence of the Black people. Genuine patriots and revolutionaries must reject this reformist Judas Iscariot's document with the contempt it deserves. And fight for the true liberation of their motherland as the people of Zimbabwe and Mozambique did.

In fact, it was on the basis of the "Freedom" Charter that the 1964 Survey of the South African Institute of Race Relations discovered the then strength and representation of the Black parties and those of the "liberals" in South Africa. The position was published as follows:

Party	PAC	ANC	Lib.	Pro- gress.	C. O.D.
	%	%	%	%	%

character of democracy. This excerpts are from Lenin "The Renegade Kautsky and the Proletarian Revolution".

### Can there be Equality between the Exploited and the Exploiter?

Kautsky argues as follows:

(1) "The exploiters have always formed only a small minority of the population". (P. 14 of Kautsky's pamphlet)

That is indisputably true. Taking this as the starting point, what should be the argument? One may argue in a

For	57	39	31	30	18
Against	29	41	47	43	42
Undecided	14	20	22	27	40

There is no doubt even today that when the "Freedom" Charter is explained to the people of Azania, this Judas Iscariot charter shall suffer a more ignominious defeat than it did in 1964. The Azanian people are now more politicised and more conscious of what they really want in their country. No neo-colonialist scheme will deceive them.

Azania is not a prostitute. It is a Blackman's country. Only a prostitute can belong to "everybody" or to "all". Azania does not belong to "all" – oppressor and oppressed, dispossessor and dispossessed, robber and robbed. Azania belongs to the Black people. The facts of history are clear on this issue. There is no intelligent Blackman except those who are brain-washed by the "multi-racial" politics of the "liberals" who accepts this sell-out document.

Self-determination and majority rule are the only solution to nearly 400 years of foreign minority racist settler rule in the country of our forefathers.

This is no time to pander to the racial arrogance and bigotry of the racist and "multi-racialists" – which is racialism multiplied. The blood of the fallen heroes in the battles of national resistance and at Sharpeville, Soweto and other places is too precious to be sacrificed on the altar of the neo-colonialist Judas "Freedom" Charter. Shame to the authors, peddlers and collaborators of the notorious Charter.

Cursed be all who are conspiring to sell the right of Azanians to self-determination to imperialism and its agents for 30 pieces of silver.

## Lenin: Apropos the Freedom Charter

The notorious "Freedom" Charter makes a great play about democracy and equal rights for all, the exploiters and the exploited. Drawn up mainly by the white hacks of the South African "Communist" Party this document overlooks the class inequalities on which the economic, social and political structures of South Africa are based. Here Lenin gives a telling reply to those who talk about democracy in general without looking at the class

Marxist, a socialist way; in which case one would take as the basis the relation between the exploited and the exploiters. Or one may argue in a liberal, a bourgeois-democratic way; and in that case one would take as the basis the relation between the majority and the minority.

If we argue in a Marxist way, we must say: the exploiters inevitably transform the state (and we are speaking of democracy, i.e., one of the forms of the state) into an instrument of the rule of their class, the exploiters, over the exploited. Hence, so long as



there are exploiters who rule the majority, the exploited, the democratic state must inevitably be a democracy for the exploiters. A state of the exploited must fundamentally differ from such a state; it must be a democracy for the exploited, and a means of suppressing the exploiters; and the suppression of a class means inequality for that class, its exclusion from "democracy".

You see, the relation between the exploited and the exploiters has vanished in Kautsky's argument. All that remains is majority in general, minority in general, democracy in general, the "pure democracy" with which we are already familiar.

The exploiter and the exploited cannot be equal. This truth, however unpleasant it may be to Kautsky, nevertheless forms the essential content of Socialism.

Another truth: there can be no real, actual equality until all possibility of the exploitation of one class by another has been totally destroyed.

The exploiters can be defeated at one stroke in the event of a successful uprising at the centre, or of a revolt in the army. But except in very rare and special cases, the exploiters cannot be

destroyed at one stroke. It is impossible to expropriate all the landlords and capitalists of a country of any size at one stroke. Furthermore, expropriation alone, as a legal or political act, does not settle the matter by a long way, because it is necessary to *depose* the landlords and capitalists in actual fact, to *replace* their management of the factories and estates by a different management, workers' management, in actual fact. There can be no equality between the exploiters — who for many generations have stood out because of their education, conditions of wealthy life, and habits — and the exploited, the majority of whom even in the most advanced and most democratic bourgeois republics are downtrodden, backward, ignorant, intimidated and disunited. For a long time after the revolution the exploiters inevitably continue to enjoy a number of great practical advantages: they still have money (since it is impossible to abolish money all at once); some movable property — often fairly considerable; they still have various connections, habits of organization and management, knowledge of all the "secrets" (customs, methods, means and possibilities) of management,

superior education, close connections with the higher technical personnel (who live and think like the bourgeoisie), incomparably greater experience in the art of war (this is very important), and so on, and so forth.

And in these circumstances, in an epoch of desperate acute war, when history has placed on the order of the day the question whether age-old and thousand-year-old privileges are to be or not to be — at such a time to talk about majority and minority, about pure democracy, about dictatorship being unnecessary and about equality between the exploiter and the exploited!! What infinite stupidity and bottomless philistinism are needed for this!

Kautsky talks about anything you like, about everything that is acceptable to liberals and bourgeois democrats and does not go beyond their circle of ideas, but he does not talk about the main thing, namely, the fact that the proletariat cannot achieve victory *without breaking the resistance of the bourgeoisie, without forcibly suppressing its enemies*, and that, where there is "forcible suppression," where there is no "freedom," *there is, of course, no democracy.*

## A Brief History of Azania

by Dabi Lenkululeko

This is an article from a forthcoming book to be called, "The Fall of South Africa and the rise of Azania", by M. Pheko, to be published by Daystar Publishers in Zambia. The book is a series of stimulating essays concerning the name Azania, but which goes into a thorough history of the colonisation of South Africa.

AZANIA is known as "South Africa" to many, although when constitutionally defined the South Africa state excludes people of African origin. An African is not a South African by law of the South Africa state but Europeans are. This has caused a lot of confusion with many overlooking this fundamental factor and going to the extent of claiming that the Africans there are independent simultaneously with the European settlers, that Africans do not need to fight for national sovereignty and self-determination but to fight only against racism.

It is in the midst of this confusion that a name was suggested for the country in order to distinguish the South Africa state, a settler colonial state, from the country and its people, the Africans. The country was named AZANIA.

### Current Borders of Azania

The borders of Azania are as follows:

- (a) Namibia to the north-west,
- (b) Botswana and Zimbabwe to the north, Swaziland and the People's Republic of Mozambique to the north-east,
- (c) the rest is surrounded by the Indian Ocean in the east and the Atlantic Ocean in the south and west.

### Azania Precolonial Times

To speak of precolonial Azania is in a way inaccurate because the present borders are of recent (origin) and were drawn (up) in the interest of the colonial masters. It is fitting therefore to speak of Southern Africa.

In precolonial times Southern Africa was populated by several nationality groups which enjoyed varying degrees of autonomy from one another while on the other hand they were, in one

way or another, tied to central administrative bodies with which they held occasional grand conferences to decide on matters of common interest. Owing to the distortions and destruction, Africa as a whole has experienced in the hands of her colonial masters, her history has suffered like-wise. It is therefore not possible for me to say what the actual nature of these social, political and economic institutions of precolonial times were.

Social scientists of the colonial era serve as sources of information on African history but they themselves were guided by their own interests. They understood little of what they saw. They often made their observations after the colonial armies, administrators, etc., had done a good job at disrupting social order, marginated as proof of belated tribalism and rationale for intervention. They saw tribes where cities had been buried in cannon rubble and ignored available information, that the so-called tribes had achieved higher levels of development than can be credited to tribal society.

For greater details on this question see Chancellor William's book, "The Destruction of Black Civilisation" pp



37 – 40. For the destruction of African civilisations and the distortion of the history thereof William Chancellor's book is the best work available. He clearly calls for re-investigation and redocumentation of the history of Africa. He takes African history back to 4500 B.C. prior to Arab influence.

The colonial socio-economic systems replaced prosperous systems and civilisations in most parts of Africa.

This applies to both Arab (Moslem) and European (Christian) colonial systems. They exploited the natural and social resources but at the same time they forced people to migrate from place to place often *banishing* them to remote and barren parts of the land. The outcome of these disruptions was the destruction of the pre-colonial social formations. The colonized reverted to the subsistence forms of economy while in actual fact they had enjoyed a greater prosperity before.

It is well to know that the presently identifiable nationality groups in Southern Africa have one stem. This is seen in language similarities and other social factors. It is this stem which gave rise to the so-called "Bantu" speaking peoples. The labelling of the Southern African people as "Bantu" or "Bantu speakers" in particular has also led to a great confusion and actual distortion of history because there is no such a group of people as "Bantu". *Ntu* means person and *bantu* means persons or people, all people regardless of race or nationality. (See Lester Brook's book; *Great Civilisation of Ancient Africa* for a documentation of such civilisations.)

I must point out that in the so-called Africa North of the Sahara and Eastern Africa some historians credit development to Asian influence. Their claim overlooks time limits. William Chancellor clarifies this, i.e., he dates Asian influence in Africa and details pre-Arab influence civilisations as well.

It makes sense to speak of margined people rather than tribes in all of Africa unless, of course, people can give material reasons as to why and how certain races stagnated at the tribe stage while others leaped over epochs.

Without reliable sources of information and sound analysis we must start off with whatever rudiments of information we can find in our efforts to study our history. It is safe to say that the classical modes of production

outlined by Karl Marx as a general trend in social development are not clearly seen in the history of Southern Africa. We cannot say that the slave mode nor the classic feudal mode took place until the recent European slave trade of the precapitalist period of the 17th to 18th centuries championed by the Portuguese.

Most history books attest to the public ownership of land administered by recognized monarchs.

We can also say that even if there were some privileged individuals of groups, i.e. Monarchs and aristocrats, disparity was nothing compared with Europe. This means then that the social relations, i.e., organised relations of production and distribution, were not as antagonistic as we know them to have been in Europe. We know from our understanding of dialectics that if this was the case the warlike situation often overemphasised by the colonial writers of our history could hardly have been that serious. Europeans often saw the world through their own experiences and since wars were rampant between various European nationality groups at the time of Europe's expansion (from about 1300 A.D. onwards) then they would be inclined to assume that Africans in Southern Africa were also warlike.

#### **Shaka's Attempts at Unity.**

The middle of the eighteenth century, however, saw a new trend. A small nationality group of the Nguni branch saw a need to unite with the other nationality groups in the area we refer to as Azania today. The group called itself the Zulu and their leader was Shaka. The Zulus were well aware of their history, their origins, migrations, etc., including the fact that all the nationality groups in Southern Africa share these including the Quyi-Quyi whose language similarities with coptic led some to trace their roots to Egypt. The Azanian people, of whom the Zulus were a part, are traced to the north-eastern horn of Africa, Somalia, originally Azania.

Brooks tells us that Azania and other African Empires were highly developed by the standards of the time (700 A.D.). They built roads, metal works, irrigation schemes, etc. The empire shared with the empires of Nubia, Axum, Sabia, Middle Egypt, etc. In the South the Azanians merged with civilisations of that region such as

Zimbabwe, Mapungubwe and Quyi-Quyi.

I might add that at various times, for various reasons, peoples in Africa have migrated from one place to another, within and outside the continent. (See Dr. G.K. Osei's book, *History of the African People Vol. I and II.*)

Dr. Osei tells us about when, how and why people of African origin migrated to various parts of Europe. He draws examples dated much earlier than the periods of both Asian and European domination in Africa.

Anyway, it seems reasonable to say that Shaka and those who supported him knew more than they received credit for, about nationalism and the need for unity in view of the obvious threat of Europe invasions. The experience of *imfecane* also led to further migrations as some groups escaped and fled Shaka's 'reign of terror'. Some settled under Moshoeshe on the mountains of Lesotho, Mzilikazi ended up in Zimbabwe with a sizeable number of people. Some joined the Xhosa-Qoyi nationality of the Cape while others fled to present-day Swaziland. This took place during the time European armies and traders were hovering at the African coastal belt. The Portuguese were already in Angola and Mozambique. A large part of the Cape was already under colonial control and over ten major wars (so-called frontier wars) had been fought by the African people against European invasions.

Shaka did not just dream of invading his neighbours and brothers, nor was he a psychopant as Leonard Thompson and his colleagues often claim.

There were concrete realities which led to his efforts. Organised unity was greatly needed by Africans in our part of Africa at the time. It simply does not help to ignore the actual reality at the time of Shaka's rule of 'terror' both at home and in the world generally. Shaka saw the need and set out to forge it by force. Nothing was new about that. Generals in other parts of the world behaved in the same manner.

One often reads in pro-colonial literature that the European settlers arrived at the Cape at the same time as the so-called "Bantu" speakers from the North. This is an attempt on the part of these so-called historians to erase from the pages of history records of some realities, e.g.



(a) that the so-called "Bantu" immigrants from the North and/or Eastern horn of Africa took place in seventh century A.D. and earlier;

(b) That the European colonial occupation followed at least eight centuries later (1652 A.D.);

(c) that Abatwa (people from the south), as the Qoyi-Qoyi people were called by the newcomers from the north, were the actual inhabitants of the area now known as the Cape;

(d) that European colonial settlers in Azania refer to the Africans as "Bantu" (people), "Bushmen" and/or "Hottentots" while they in turn refer to themselves as Africans (Afrikaners) is specifically in order to claim the land as their own and to say that the actual Africans, i.e. the natives of the country came as immigrants from anywhere where the colonials have little or no vested interests;

(e) that derogatory vocabulary used by the colonial social scientists reveals an arrogance and need on their part to discredit and do the African down. For instance, language which would be used on animals is used on Africans: African homes are referred to as "kraals". Old and obsolete vocabulary of the gone tribal stage of development was brought forward and used against the Africans.

It is true that Europe led by England made the leap forward to the capitalist mode of production and industrialisation but this does not mean that Europeans have always been at the lead as this is often implied by many who view Caucasians as the civilized and Africans as "primitive". In the last five hundred years of colonial rule in Southern Africa this has been thoroughly capitalized on.

The damage which has been caused by this dichotomy lies in the numerous deductions which follow, e. g.

1. primitive society was composed of tribal groups which were constantly at loggerheads with one another waging unending wars;

2. tribes consisted of small numbers of people, and so on. These are automatically applied on Africans without question as to whether the cap fits or not.

The little that is known on Southern Africa does not enable us to determine what mode or modes of production prevailed nor to say what level of development the precolonial Southern Africa peoples had achieved. This calls

for intensification of research in the field and an effort to analyse and redocument available data methodically so that these questions can be answered.

### The Rise of Colonialism in Azania

It is imperative that one traces European intervention in our country to the very roots of European expansion. We must understand the material conditions which prevailed in Europe at the time in order to apprehend their behaviour as colonial masters in our country. This paper is too short for me to include the details but I can provide some reference.

Carlo M. Cipolla, in his book: *Guns, Sails and Empires* details the history of technological development in western Europe and thus serve to enlighten us about developments there which led to European expansion. These are established in the prologue of the book as follows, though not in the same order:

(a) The chronic weakness of western Europe.

(1) Europe was thinly populated with about 100 million people.

(2) Most important was that Europeans were divided into small nationality groups, at a constant state of war with one another, thus general confusion prevailed.

(3) They were superstitious. Often placing their hope of survival in God.

(4) Generalship (in war) was poor, sacrificing tactics and strategy for the impossible dream of striking heavily at the enemy while remaining invulnerable, relying on heavily armoured cavalry which was colourful but unwieldy (according to Lot in his book *Art Militaire* p. 429. Reference taken from Cipolla's book.)

(b) Europe was dominated by the eastern Arab and Turkish Moslems who were stronger and had held Spain and the Balearic Islands. On May 28 1353 A.D. the Turks invaded Constantinople. The Christians were conquered in Nicopolis in 1396. Western Europe lived in fear of the Turks who were much stronger on land, thus she began directing her efforts to the seas as they could not use the Suez Canal to reach the East where silk, spices, gold, slave, labour, fabrics, etc., were to be found.

(c) Cipolla dates the primitive pro-

duction of cannons by western Europe, to early 14th century. Fifteenth and sixteenth century Europe, which was feudal, devoted a great deal of time manufacturing cannons, guns and ships which were greatly demanded by the wars at home and by the early voyages across the seas.

(d) Later they remodelled the former heavy guns and boats into lighter and mobile ones. This was to mark the tide in favour of western Europe in which Spain and Portugal became prominent.

The scramble was for wealth and territorial acquisition.

In their trials and failures searching for the sea routes to the East they reached the Americas and Africa. They were, however, repelled by the Qoyi-Qoyi in their efforts to establish a base at the Cape.

They saw, as a challenge, the Moors (Afro-Asian culture of North Africa) who had dominated Portugal and Spain as early as 700 A.D. King John I attacked what Europeans looked upon as the key to the Mediterranean, the fortress of Ceuta in 1415. This marked the beginning of the rise of Europe from the medieval feudal epoch to a modern Europe. It also marked the new strategy for the encirclement of Islam worldwide and the spread of Christianity.

Repeated invasions of the West African coast from the North to the South and occupation of the seaports as refreshment stations by the European East India traders was the starting point in the colonisation process of Africa by various European nations initiated by Portugal who were later followed by the Dutch, British, French and German.

Equipped with these fundamentals and yet generalities about western Europe before and during their expansion it becomes a little clearer why exploitation in Azania came to be based on/white racism and/white cultural chauvinism in the name of Western Civilisation.

It was the Portuguese who led the others in following the sea route via the apex of the African cone (so-called Cape route). The British, the French and the Dutch (through their East India Companies) followed.

The Dutch were the first to send a garrison of men to the Cape in 1652. They established a refreshment station in the Cape under the control of the



Dutch East India Company. As the station grew in size conflict between them and the native people, i.e., Africans, intensified. The Europeans launched many wars of aggression in order to gain land, livestock, grain and slave labour from the Africans.

The Christian crusades were not limited in working among the masses of Europe arousing sentiments of hate against the Moors (anti-Moslem and anti-Black, pro-Christianity and pro-Caucasian) but did their best in convincing Africans that West European Culture was the ideal while projecting African Culture as the "quintessence of evil" as Frantz Fanon put it in his book *"The Wretched of the Earth"*. They labelled Africans "bushmen", "hottentots", "kafirs", "heathens", "pagans", etc.

African resistance against colonialism in AZANIA was protracted, stretching over two and a half centuries. Many of the wars fought were won by Africans although the technologically advanced Europeans conquered in the long run. Africans employed their numerical strength and wit in defence of their motherland and succeeded in preventing extermination by their foes.

Control of the so-called Cape of Good Hope changed hands several times as power changed hands in Europe, an outcome of the wars fought between the various European nations over territorial claims.

Balam Nyeko and Donald Dennon attempt to explain this determinant and relative effect of European events on Southern Africa in their book, *"Southern Africa since 1800"*, as follows:

"In 1795, once again the European situation impinged upon Southern Africa. During the course of the Napoleonic Wars, the Netherlands were conquered by France, and Britain occupied the Dutch possessions, including the Cape. The occupation continued until 1803, when there was a three year period of Netherlands authority under the Batavian Republic, which had succeeded the monarchy in the Netherlands. In 1806 the Cape was re-occupied by the British on the outbreak of further war in Europe, and in 1815 the Cape became a permanent British possession".

The permanence referred to above was frequently tested by the Dutch settlers in South Africa who continuously

rebelled against British authority at the Cape thereby migrating further inland to settle in the provinces now known as the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. These rebellions climaxed with the Anglo-Boer Wars, the last of which was in 1902. This period also marks the end of the Africans Wars of resistance, the last of which came to be known as the Bambata Rebellion in 1906.

Africans had lost all control to the Europeans who, though allied against Africans, had continued to wage wars against each other at the same time. The Europeans must be credited with their clarity on their order of priorities. As far as their policy continues to show, they have always been united in their endeavour to oppress and exploit Africans. They put their internal contradictions aside in order to maintain an upper hand on this question. The Africans on the other hand frequently allied with the Europeans against their own people thus jeopardizing their own national interest. Since the Europeans gained control over the Africans (a situation determined at the war front) they have consistently maintained themselves as a ruling class and a labour aristocracy by military force.

Their early presence in Azania was marked by the slave trade during which Africans, Indians, Malays and Chinese people were forced into bondage and traded like cattle to serve Europeans.

As if to illustrate once more the determinant effect in Europe on Azania, the abolitionist movement and the 18th century bourgeois revolutions in England and France came to bear on the South African economy. Wage labour was gradually replacing slave labour. Like the slave owners of the South in the United States of North America, the Hollanders (in South Africa) resisted these developments, clinging to slave labour.

However, British capitalism and industrialisation was fast entrenching itself in Azania and it was evident that it was incompatible with the backward feudalism of the Dutch.

It was over these issues that the Anglo-Boer Wars were fought. The British colonials wanted to end slavery to replace it with the more benefiting wage labour and force the Dutch settlers to accept British authority as their own. They generally and temporarily succeeded in bringing about these changes. This is not to say that remnants of feudal relations are not found

in Azania today. Prison labour, for example, resembles the mixed lord of serf and master to slave relations of pre-industrial United States of America.

Feudal relations remain a stark naked reality in the agricultural sector of the otherwise backward capitalist mode of production.

*The British sector of the settlers continues to play an anti-fascist but determined pro-imperialist role. This is no surprise if one knows that they own a big piece of the Azanian pie. The Dutch continues to enforce a fascist and backward politico-economic system.*

### From Feudalism to Capitalism

Primitive accumulation of capital and therefore control of the masses in Azania was carefully planned by the colonial masters employing well known methods already tested in Europe. For example:

- (a) Military invasion of the peasants, seizure of their land forcing them into the least productive and small areas – so-called native reserve, bantustans, homelands, etc.
- (b) Imposition of taxes to be paid in cash (ten shilling per head) to start with, Europeans alone had access to cash so that Africans had to work for the Europeans to get the cash.
- (c) Further provision was made to swell the landless class (native), the labour force that must, through the institution of fixed tenure whereby native peasants were restricted to small plots (a stand) and told to limit their production of cattle, goats, sheep and other animal products to numbers stipulated by the government. The vacated land was to be held in trust for them by the private trust companies. This was a trick, of course.
- (d) Many statutes were passed for the purpose of disarming the African people in particular including the Coloureds and Asians. It is illegal for an African to possess a gun of any description, an instrument which has a sharp blade of more than four inches in length, etc.
- (e) Hundreds of statutes notoriously known as dom (stupid) pass laws were passed and enforced, designed for effective curfew restricting the people's geographic and social mobility.
- (f) The exclusion of Africans from the franchise puts a rubber stamp to the robbery and exclusion the colonial masters, that is Britain, Holland, and



the settler colonials, have maintained since the dawn of colonialism in Azania.

It must be understood that only the colonials, that is the European settlers were recognised as the so-called South Africans. Privilege was their right while the Africans and the Asians were to toil for their colonial masters.

The granting of independence to the feuding Dutch settler and the British colonial authorities based at the Cape must not be confused with or taken to mean a change in this social order. Britain was relieving herself of the administrative duties of the colony, allowing the settlers to be their own administrators. It meant that Britain would no longer send administrators to South Africa, already an industrialised country, but that she would send capital for investment. She was only moving forward with the order of the time, namely, imperialism.

It is interesting to note that this act was to pass for many British colonies soon after, but in a different form, that is, carefully picked administrations were granted "independence" but were to remain as neo-colonies. In their case there was to be a change of face, that is, Natives became the administrators as opposed to the settler colonies so-called South Africa, Rhodesia and South-West Africa.

After 1910 Europeans maintained their privilege as the colonial masters "maintaining European Culture" as their leadership often reminds us.

This extension of the so-called European culture into Africa runs along colour lines. It separates the black from the white but at the same time separates the haves from the have nots. The polarisation lies on the economic factor but it would be a gross error to focus only on this factor (i.e. *to wage only a class struggle*) and overlook the right of the African people to national sovereignty and self-determination. Presently the European immigrants enjoy South Africa as a class in a sovereign state exclusive of the Africans. In more straight forward language one can say that we are oppressed as a nation first and foremost and then as a class as well. This makes our struggle more like the two sides of a coin. That is, a national struggle on one side and a class struggle on the other. The two are inseparable.

As the whole world is aware of the separatist endeavours on the part of the successive colonial administrations

and their exploitative nature, it must also be aware that hardly any merging of cultures took place there. Instead an assault on African culture took place, weakening the masses of African people. The outcome of this has been an emergence of two cultural groups bitterly opposed to one another and yet united by their dependency on one another.

The African population has been transformed into a proletarian force while the European population has deteriorated in their positions of privileged worker and comfort.

The African proletariat knows that its enemy is not only the internal one, as we know the presence of international entrepreneurship is a naked one. *They work for American, British, German, Japanese, French, etc., companies. The product of their labour is shipped out of the country to international markets while they themselves do not receive enough to nourish, let alone educate themselves and their families.*

Unrest and martial law are a tradition in Azania in as much as it is often kept silent by the imperialist news media.

The beginning of exploitation of minerals in Azania by the Europeans saw an influx of skilled workers from the already industrialised European countries. Minerals provided some of the necessary capital and the African peasants who had been forcibly separated from their land were flocking to the mines. As competition grew between the new arrivals and the African semi-skilled workers in the mines and other industrial centres the colonial and racist policies were also becoming more and more favourable to European settlers thus elevating them to the level of a labour aristocracy.

There were still sectors in the industrial parts of the country's economy where both European and African workers organised together. Early this century they jointly waged strikes for better wages and better working conditions. The result of these was a significant fall in the price of gold. The mining magnates responded to this situation by pitting workers against workers, that is, by placing European workers in supervisory and managerial positions and increasing their wages while African workers were not only forced to work under Euro-

pean colonial settlers in their own country but also had to accept reduced wages. These incidents marked the point of departure between the African workers and the European colonial settler workers. The former realised that they were doomed to toil for the benefit of others while the latter were to share in the spoil and therefore become a determined ally of the bourgeoisie. The Industrial Conciliation Act of 1913 legalised this division. This meant that the African workers had to line up in labour recruitment centres without any right to bargain in the buying and selling of their labour. Agents from the centres of production came periodically to the African residential areas, so-called "bantustans" to pick the fittest and the healthiest using the methods which were employed in the buying and selling of slaves. The African workers were forced by poverty in the "bantustans" to sell their very selves to these European settler entrepreneurs.

*These are the realities of our history and it is upon them that the struggle for national sovereignty and self-determination plus the class struggle must be seen.* The seemingly two struggles are one struggle in reality, the primary contradiction at this stage being colonialism. The settler colonial state machinery has to be destroyed and in its place a workers' state machinery in the service of all the people must be created and headed by workers whose interest is synonymous with that of the masses.

### **British Masks Colonialism in Azania**

Following the end of the Anglo-Boer Wars won by the Cape and Natal (British) administration against the Orange Free State and Transvaal administration, Britain declared the four provinces "independent" as a Union in accordance with the treaty of Vereeniging. The Dutch settlers were not happy with this settlement. They waged an intense struggle on the political, social and economic fronts only to come back into power over the whole Union in 1948 under the leadership of the Nationalist Party. They renamed the "Union of South Africa" the "Republic of South Africa" in May 1961 and also made it known and clear in the Republic's constitution that Africans were not a part of the Republic.

It is under this leadership that the



colonial settler state so-called "South Africa" clearly came out as a fascist and racist state.

It is this "independence", clearly granted by British to her civil servants in one of her colonies whom she endeavoured to unite with the long deposed Dutch administrators of the Cape in order to resolve the contradiction between herself and them on one hand, on the other between the British and the Dutch settlers. The masses of the African people gained nothing from this settlement. Instead they lost whatever rudiments of democratic human rights they had. *Failure to grasp these facts of history has led some to suggest that we must wage a struggle against racism. This is an oversimplified line. Others claim that the struggle must be entirely waged along class lines and not on racial lines. This line is not only simple but also ignores the fact that there is little or no difference between class lines and racial lines in Azania where racism is the tool of exploitation.*

*The correct line, however, has to take into consideration the fact that*

*(a) We are colonised as a people, as Africans, a nation which I have decided to refer to as Azania. The fact that Britain decided to hand over state power to her previous administrators in our country did not change the colonial nature of the relationship between the Africans and the Europeans, not even in form, let alone in substance. We are subjects of the South Africa state without any say in its running. We do not participate but do as we are told.*

*(b) We are also exploited and oppress-*

*ed as a race, (Note: I do not say because of race) and as a nation, so that class stratification takes on racial form. This is not a denial of the fact that Africans are also capable of exploiting and oppressing other Africans. In fact, the correct line will also have to take into consideration the budding African petty bourgeoisie in our country who are presently displaying their willingness to act as managers for the racists at home and the international capitalists who are willing to pay them high incomes in exchange for the right to continue exploiting the bulk of the nation through capital exportation (imperialism).*

#### **Britain gives Birth to Neo-Colonies in Southern Africa**

In the later half of the 19th century three nationality groups, namely, the Swazi, Tswana and Sotho, in part and individually approached the British crown for protection against the encroachments on their territories by the Boers (Dutch settlers).

Britain took advantage of this confessed weakness by her rivals and completed her colonisation programme. She dispatched her own colonial administrators to the territories and declared them British Protectorates. This is why these territories were not included in the Union of South Africa's direct sphere of control.

As Britain was recalling her colonial administrators from her colonies in the face of the following factors:

- (a) the rising forces of nationalism in her colonies;
- (b) her inability to cope with the expense of running the colonies;
- (c) the rise of imperialism in the world

replacing the *laissez faire* stage of capitalism, enabling the international bourgeoisie to exploit the masses in the colonies through (native) national bourgeois regimes by means of capital exportation, etc., she recalled those in the three territories as well granting the national bourgeoisie there the so-called independence, thus turning them into neo-colonies.

Now that we know how the Africans lost control over their resources and over themselves as a people to a foreign and colonial people it must be clear also that our primary task is to overpower that foreign and colonial clientele, destroy its power base while at the same time forging a free nation which will determine its own destiny.

All along the line of struggle against colonialism the toiling masses must be vigilant and educated so that they will certainly gain not only national liberty but also freedom from poverty, disease, economic exploitation and oppression. As I said before the international bourgeoisie (imperialists) are fast breeding a national petty bourgeois class of Africans whose aspirations and interests are the same as those of the present settler colonial administrators, the would-be African allies of the bourgeoisie. They cry out loud for "independence" of the "bantustans". Others are for majority rule in Southern Africa. We must not be fooled by others who are for Black majority. This means that the struggle for national liberation must not be seen in terms of blacks replacing whites but in terms of the exploited replacing the exploiters. *An end not only to racism but an end also to exploitation of man by man.*

## **The Role of the Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa. Part I**

In these days of various kinds of Church assistance showered upon the Azanian liberation movements it is advisable that we take a look at the role of the Church in our colonial conquest. We publish the first part of a pamphlet that appeared in the 40s on the "Role of the Missionaries in the Conquest of South Africa."

### **The Missionary Movement**

#### **Where it came from**

The coming of the missionaries to Southern Africa at the end of the 18th century coincided with the first occupation of the Cape by the British. The missionaries were a British product and this was not accidental. Earlier in the century the Moravians had been

their forerunners and had established a mission station amongst a group of the already weakened Khoikhoi (known as Hottentots) at Baviaans-Kloof, later known as Genadendal or Vale of Grace. But the main missionary movement, led by the London Missionary Society, was a British one and was in full force during the period of military conquest in the first half of the 19th

century.

It is important to know the womb from which sprang the missionary movement in Southern Africa and indeed all the colonies of the British Empire, for Southern Africa was but one of a vast network of missionary activity. To understand its function we must view it as part of a great historical movement, the expansion of capitalism.

Now it is one of the many falsifications of history to obscure the true nature of events behind sentimental phrases or catchwords. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries we hear much of the activities of the Evangelicals, the Humanitarians, the Philanthropists,



the Emancipationists, those people who concerned themselves with the morals of the poor at home and the sufferings of the slaves abroad, who devoted their energies to the emancipation of the slaves, the "liberation of the Hottentots", the conversion of the heathen to Christianity and such like. There is no doubt that there were well-meaning people who supported these humanitarian movements. But we would have a false perspective of events if we accepted these grandiloquent aims at their face value and assumed that there was some mysterious milk of human kindness animating the hearts of the English. From the days of Queen Elizabeth in the late 16th century, when Englishmen joined the crusade for the plunder of the New World, when Sir Walter Raleigh and other adventurers were authorised to "advance the conversion of savages and increase traffic", the glory of God and the profit of England had always been, one might say, synonymous terms. It is our business to look into the economic aims underlying all these activities at the beginning of the 19th century.

The London Missionary Society, which sent its first missionaries to Southern Africa in 1799, was established by a group known as the Evangelicals. As early as 1776 they had founded the Society for Missions in Africa and the East and through their influence missionaries of various denominations were scattered throughout the British colonies, in the East Indies, Jamaica, Trinidad, Nova Scotia, the West Coast of Africa and in Southern Africa. In the British House of Commons they had secured the adoption of a series of resolutions affirming the obligation of Parliament to work for what was called the religious welfare of Britain's richest colonial possession, India. The missionary and the military were never far separated. It is true there was some rivalry between different religious sects, which hindered the good work — until the Evangelicals had the bright idea of founding the London Missionary Society (1795) based on the principle of united action by all denominations of orthodox Christians.

Who were these Evangelicals who were so anxious to convert the colonial peoples to Christianity? They were a religious party, originating among some Cambridge divines, which received strong support from an influential group of politicians representing the

industrial and mercantile class. This group of politicians was known as the Clapham sect and their leader was William Wilberforce, the son of a rich merchant of Hull, who lived in Clapham, a district of London. The group included also Lord Teignmouth, a former governor-general of India and a representative of the aristocracy that associated itself with the rising middle-class. Another member was Thomas Fowell Buxton, partner in a brewery concern, who, with Wilberforce, subsequently founded the Aborigines Protection Society during a particularly ugly period of British colonial conquest and assisted Dr. Phillip, Superintendent of the London Missionary Society in Southern Africa, in building up his reputation as the "defender" first of the Khoikhoi and then of the Bantu. It was Buxton who formulated that happy discovery so pregnant with profit to the British industrialist, that "the Negro race are blessed with a peculiar aptitude for the reception of moral and religious instruction."

Now we have to ask ourselves why this influential group of British industrialists at this time became so anxious to "liberate" and save the soul of the slaves in far-distant countries. They acquired the name of humanitarians and philanthropists, but the truth is that neither humanitarianism nor philanthropy had much to do with the case.

### **Wilberforce — Oppressor and Liberator**

Let us take a look at Wilberforce with a view to learning something more about this group, whom he represents. The curious thing is that the would-be liberator of the colonial slave and the sponsor of missionary activity throughout the British Empire, was a thorough reactionary and supported the Government in its repressive legislation against the English workers. He was an enemy of the workers. He supported the Corn Laws, by which the landowners taxed the bread of the poor, and the Combination Laws of 1799 and 1800, which made trade unions illegal. At this time the English rulers were greatly afraid that the liberatory ideas of the Great French Revolution would stir the English workers to revolt. "Scratch a trade unionist and you will find a Jacobin," they said, and those workers who combined to resist exploitation were con-

demned as agitators. Wilberforce denounced these trade unions as "a general disease in our society." When the people demanded the franchise and the repeal of those oppressive laws, he supported the notorious Six Acts which denied them political rights, freedom of speech or criticism of any kind; under the Seditious Meetings Bill, all assemblies "aiming at changes in Church or State," were declared illegal, and the penalty under any of these Acts was imprisonment without trial, or transportation or death. It is noteworthy that in the same year the British Parliament voted a million pounds for the building of churches. How, then, could a man be both liberator and oppressor?

In one of his humanitarian speeches about the West Indian slave, Wilberforce referred by contrast to the "free British labourer." It was an unfortunate phrase, for the condition of the working-class in England during this period has been well-documented. England was becoming a great industrial power and was building up her empire and her trade. The classes who possessed power in the state were the rising industrialists and the landowners, who understood by government the protection of their power and their property. They abhorred any demands on the part of the workers that stood in the way of the unlimited development of their industries and the accumulation of their wealth. In other words, their attitude to the workers at home was similar to the attitude of the slaveowner to the slaves abroad. Could they then be both liberators and oppressors? Under the juggernaut of expanding capitalism men, women and children worked under appalling conditions in the factories, in the mines and in the crowded, insanitary city-slums, so that they seemed to be a race of degraded, brutalized human beings.

Now those industrialists who supported the missionary movement and the emancipation of the slaves at the same time expressed great concern about the morals of the "lower orders," as they called the workers. The Evangelical movement became fashionable. When some ungodly employers objected to their encouragement of Sunday observance among the poor because it meant loss of labour one day out of every week, the Evangelicals pointed out that it was to their own advantage to have a religious and obedient body of workers. In the



moral and religious control over the masses they saw the best guarantee for law and order. Wilberforce, in his pamphlet, "A Practical View of the System of Christianity," made this point quite clear. Christianity, he indicated, teaches the poor to be diligent, humble, patient and obedient, and to accept their lowly position in life. It makes the inequalities between themselves and the rich less galling because, under the influence of religious instruction, they endure the injustices of this world with the hope of a rich reward in the next. It is significant that Wilberforce remarked to the Prime Minister, Pitt, whose government had passed the Six Acts and other oppressive legislation, that this particular section of his pamphlet was "the basis of all politics."

This, then, was the outlook of the sponsor of missionary activity throughout the British empire. He was the spokesman of the English middle class. The picture serves to illuminate the social system, the civilization, which these industrialists upheld with all their might and from which their so-called humanitarian movements sprang. When we see them described as an expression of the new spirit of *liberalism*, we must be clear as to what this liberalism was. Briefly stated, liberalism, with its ideas of liberty and equality, supplied the ideological weapons with which the English middle-class in the 17th century and the French middle-class in the late 18th century, threw off the shackles of feudalism and established capitalism. This freedom and equality, while they had been useful slogans for rallying the workers to assist the middle-class to achieve victory, turned out to be valid only for the man of property, the industrialists and merchants, not for the workers. Likewise the "emancipation" of the colonial slave, together with christianising him, had nothing to do with his liberation, but on the contrary, his enslavement. It was part of a world wide historical movement, the expansion of capitalism. New methods of production demanded a new relationship between those who laboured and those who profited by that labour. The worker was now "free" to sell his labour to one master or another, in order to exist. In other words he became a wage-slave. This served the interests of the industrialists better than the serf or slave who was tied to the land. Witness the situation in England when Wilberforce and his

fellow "saints" (as they were ironically called) were making speeches for the emancipation of the slaves. Steam and machinery had revolutionized industrial production; workers were streaming into the towns; the wheels of the industrial machine were turning faster and faster. Britain, well on the way to defeating her French and Dutch rivals in the colonies, was rapidly expanding her trade. She was searching for new markets, new raw materials and a mass of new workers. The time for the old slave system was passed. It had yielded great riches, but the new system and the new slave would yield even greater riches. It was a search that *made Britain — and her rivals — send their agents all over the world.*

This is the womb of the so-called humanitarian movements of early 19th century. It is against this background of vast economic forces that the influx of missionaries to the colonies acquires meaning. The missionaries came from a capitalist christian civilization that unblushingly found religious sanctions for inequality, as it does to this day, and whose ministers solemnly blessed its wars of aggression. Men like Wilberforce had visions of extending this civilization to the ends of the earth. They saw themselves as the chosen race.

Britain had many agents of conquest, great and small, official and unofficial, conscious and unconscious: the military, the explorer and the farmer-colonist; the missionary and the petty trader, as well as the adventurer, the impoverished artisan or the vagabond — there was room for all of them. Some acted blindly in self-interest, while others like Dr. Philip, Superintendent of the London Missionary Society, were fully conscious of what they stood for.

Yet the humblest and most well-meaning saver of souls, though he might never have seen the inside of an English factory where children died to enrich the English industrialist, nevertheless obeyed, like all the others, the laws of expanding capitalism. The middle-classes knew when and how to make use of all their agents in their time and place.

### Functions of the Missionary

We shall better understand the function of the missionaries in Southern Africa if we see them as one of several agents, each of whom played their part

in the subjugation of its inhabitants. Whatever the differences and conflicts between the various elements among the Europeans, they all had a common aim: the confiscation of the land and the establishment of White supremacy. The preliminary stages of the invasion had been carried out by the Dutch over a long period during which they had decimated the baThwa and, after a protracted resistance, driven the Khoikhoi northwards, while the rest remained as serfs in the Colony. The Dutch had then settled down to an isolated feudal existence at the Cape.

The taking over of the Cape Colony by the British at the beginning of the 19th century introduced an important change in the situation. For they represented a more advanced stage of civilization than the feudal Dutch at the Cape, namely, capitalism, with its superior organisation and more varied resources. From the time of their second occupation (1806) the main strategy throughout was in the hands of the British, backed by the vast resources of the mother country. It was British policy that dictated the course of events relative both to the Africans and the Dutch; at all times the initiative rested with them. In all the complexities of the political scene in Southern Africa throughout the 19th century, in the apparent anarchy produced by the conflicts between the various agents of conquest, a single end can be perceived, the establishment of British supremacy. And this meant one thing, the establishment of the new economic system, capitalism, into which both the Dutch and all Non-Europeans (African, Coloured, Indian) had to be fitted, the one as partners, the other as the exploited. To sustain this system the toil of the Black man was imperative. In its insatiable need for profits, the tentacles of this system extended to the farthest corners of the colonial world, in Asia, India, Africa, sucking the blood of the Black man, relentlessly, without ceasing.

It is as part of British strategy, with its varied resources, that the missionary finds his place. Looking at the picture as a whole, we see how the different agents of conquest contributed their share to the main task and how each one carried on where the other left off. This history, therefore, must aim at unfolding a continuous process of a developing British strategy which made use of the missionary as an important agent to achieve its aims. While it is necessary to emphasise his



part, it cannot be presented in isolation; he works always in conjunction with the other agencies, sometimes retiring into the background, sometimes even appearing to be in conflict with the Government, especially when he protests on behalf of the very people who are in the process of being subjugated, yet by so doing, actually furthering the aims of the Government.

At the outset, the missionary approaches the chief humbly, Bible in hand, and asks for a small piece of land to set up his mission station. At his heels hastens the trader, the purveyor of cheap goods. Thus the Bible and the bale of Lancashire cotton became the twin agents of a revolutionary change. The peaceful penetration by the missionary and the trader — sometimes the missionary turned trader — is followed in due course by an "agreement" between the chief and the Governor, whereby the British became the "friend and protector" of the chief. But this "agreement" is actually the precursor of British interference, of war and looting of cattle, and it ends with a so-called "treaty" in which the chief "agrees" to the seizure of a large piece of land belonging to the tribe. In return, he receives a magistrate as well as a missionary, who is much less humble than he was when he first arrived to beg land of the chief. Now other mission stations are set up in the still uncharted territory and in their train come still more traders, their tin shacks sitting like squat spiders throughout the land. The invaded tribes are split asunder; "divide and rule" under the capable hands of the missionaries carries on its deadly work of disruption. In the already confiscated territory large tracts of land are handed out to Dutch farmers or British settlers; there is unrest on the so-called frontiers; the hungry people try to retrieve their plundered cattle and the thieves accuse them of cattle-theft and send out destroying commandos to raid the sleeping villages. They are joined by the military, who scour the country to keep order among the "treacherous" tribes — as the official phrase has it. Before long, gunpowder, fire and famine mark the next stage of conquest. Still larger tracts of land are seized; the farmers cry out for labour and it is there for the taking; the destitute Africans, robbed of their land, are being turned into a cheap labour force. It is a remorseless process. If for a time the policy of the British Government seems to dictate a

halt in the rather costly business of war — for though it is assagai against gun, the Africans are hard to subdue — there are always the Dutch (Trek Boers) to carry on with their land-grabbing, until, as a matter of principle, the British find themselves "reluctantly compelled" to annex the new territory in order to "protect the Natives." Hypocrisy has always been one of Britain's most useful weapons.

Throughout all this period, more than half a century, the missionaries are at hand, preparing the way, disarming the chiefs with their message of God's peace — at the same time the God of an all-powerful nation prepared to be their "friend." Thus they make easy the negotiations between the Governor and the chief; they act as the Governor's advisers and assist in drawing up the terms of the "treaties." They become interpreters and "peace-makers" while at the same time they are military advisers to the invaders. For they know the geography of the land better than the commanders themselves; on receiving permission from the chief to set up a mission station they make it one of their first tasks to explore the surrounding territory. Thereafter, when it is time to consolidate the conquest, they become magistrates and self-styled chiefs till in the fulness of time the sons of missionaries become governors, magistrates and Ministers of "Native" Affairs, the inheritors of conquest unto the third and fourth generation.

The key to the function of the missionary in the conquest of colonial peoples is supplied by Dr. Philip himself, the Superintendent of the London Missionary Society who was sent out to the Cape in 1819 and who can be described as the most far-seeing representative of British Imperialism in the country at that time. The Preface to his "Researches in South Africa" contains the following statement:

While our missionaries are everywhere scattering the seeds of civilization . . . they are extending British interests, British influences and the British Empire . . . Wherever the missionary places his standard among a savage tribe, their prejudices against the colonial government give way, their dependence upon the colony is increased by the creation of artificial wants . . . Industry, trade and agriculture spring up."

Here spoke the true servant of the British middle-class. Wilberforce

might have called it the "basis of all politics" with respect to colonial conquest, and the arch-imperialist, Rhodes, would certainly have endorsed it. Philip, half a century before Rhodes, aimed to extend British domination to the equator. But the complete fulfilment of his imperialist vision, with the establishment of a capitalist system in South Africa, had to wait till the discovery of gold and diamonds — and the final military defeat of the African.

To follow Philip's career during about thirty years of missionary control in Southern Africa is to have a picture of the political function of the missionaries while the military conquest was in progress. As a result of his activities in connection with the Khoikhoi and later the Griqua, the maNgqika and the baSotho of Moshoeshe, there grew up a persistent liberal myth which it will be our business to examine. The British acquired a special repute as "the Friends of the Natives." Nothing is further from the truth. But it was largely due to the missionaries that this myth of British "Protection" arose. Actually the rapacity of the Dutch for land and labour never equalled in efficiency the systematic subjugation carried out by the British, precisely because the British represented an expanding capitalism while the Dutch were the representatives of a decaying feudalism operating under colonial conditions. It was the British who carried to a fine art the policy of "divide and rule." They not only had superior forces compared with both the Dutch (the Trek Boers) and the Bantu; they also had the weapon of liberalism. The achievement of the missionaries was the first achievement of liberalism.

#### The London Missionary Society

Before looking further into the aims and methods of Dr. Philip as largely summing up this achievement, let us get some idea of the early stages of missionary activity before his arrival. In 1799 the London Missionary Society sent to the Cape Colony its first party of missionaries, consisting of two Hollanders, Van der Kemp and Kicherer, and two Englishmen, Edwards and Edmond. Dr. Van der Kemp, who seems to have been the leader of the party, had had sixteen years experience as an officer in the Dragoon Guards before taking up missionary work, and this possibly served him in good stead as mission manager. However that may be, the missionaries on their ar-



rival at the Cape of Good Hope were well received by the Governor and Van der Kemp lost no time in travelling as far as the Tyumie River in an attempt to win over the Xhosa chief, Ngqika, the young nephew of the great fighting chief, Ndlambe, who had held his own against the Dutch for about quarter of a century. At this stage Ngqika resisted the overtures of the missionary, whose chances were spoiled by some Dutchmen who hinted to the chief that this man of peace had really come to betray him.

The striking thing about the London Mission is that it flung its net so wide *at the very first throw*. The Rev. Kicherer and the Rev. Edwards made their way north and established a mission station among the baThwa at the Zak River, though this was short-lived. The baThwa were already a decimated people and avoided the White man, and to attempt to gather them into a community was unprofitable. In the words of J. du Plessis, author of "A History of Christian Missions in South Africa", this mission was but a "stepping-stone" to the distant north. Before long the London missionaries were over the Orange River where the Griqua lived as a free and independent people. They were of Khoikhoi origin, with an admixture of Dutch blood, and were continually being joined by runaway slaves and those Khoikhoi who were escaping from serfdom under the Dutch. By 1801 the Rev. Anderson, who had come out with a second batch of missionaries soon after the first, had established a footing among the Griqua, and, as we shall see later, began that process of "divide and rule" that was to end in the downfall of the Griqua nation.

We see the foreshadowing of further events to come in the mission establishment by the Rev. Edwards in the far north among the baThaping, a Tswana (known as Bechuana) tribe on the Kuruman River. Here Edwards, like several other missionaries, combined Christianity with trading. According to the Rev. Robert Moffat, who subsequently established the famous mission station at Kuruman, Edwards "went to barter as far as the Bauangketsi, a powerful nation north of the Molapo River, and, having amassed a handsome sum . . . retired to the Colony and purchased a farm and slaves." Thus Edwards was the forerunner of that better-known apostle of Christianity and Commerce, David Liv-

ingstone. A glance at the map will show us how these first journeyings of the missionaries anticipated the ultimate extent of British possessions in Southern Africa.

To return to Dr. Van der Kemp. From the outset he was regarded as a most useful agent of the Government. Assisted by the Rev. Read (another member of the second batch of missionaries) he began work among the Khoikhoi at Graaff Reinet, which at that time was an outlying district to the north-east of the Colony. Now the Khoikhoi, weakened and impoverished after a protracted period of wars, were rapidly becoming a landless people forced into serfdom to the Dutch. But in the outlying districts there were several independent groups under their redoubtable leaders, the best known among them being Klaas Stuurman. It is of particular interest to us today to know that these stubborn fighters allied themselves with another uncompromising resister to the invaders, namely, Chief Ndlambe. On one occasion their combined forces routed the marauding Dutch and chased them right back as far as George, where the English soldiers came to their rescue. Inspired by this example of unity, the Khoikhoi on the farms in the Graaf Reinet district joined their brothers, to the great alarm of the Governor, Dundas. It is recorded that "His Excellency, remembering the unfortunate events of San Domingo" (i.e. when Toussaint L'Ouverture, himself a slave, liberated his people from the French yoke) "remembering the terrible insurrection of slaves which broke out on that island in 1791, feared with great reason the serious consequences for this country if the progress of this evil were not speedily suppressed." The Governor, then, feared that the spirit of revolt would spread to the Khoikhoi in the western districts and among the slaves. It was considered the more necessary to increase control over the Khoikhoi because they were a valuable source of labour, especially useful in the outlying districts where slaves were scarce.

This is where the missionaries could play their part. It was precisely at Graaff Reinet, the seat of the recent disturbance, that Van der Kemp set to work. And his first function was that of "divide and rule." In face of the dangerous example of Bantu-Khoikhoi unity Van der Kemp co-operated with Maynier, Resident Commissioner

at Graaff Reinet, in breaking this unity. Having drawn a number of Khoikhoi into the Christian fold, he was able to persuade them to accompany him to Algoa Bay where he placed them in a temporary location at Zwartkopfs River. The missionary's first attempt at "divide and rule" received a temporary set-back when a number of Khoikhoi joined Stuurman, who, together with his ally, the Chief Ndlambe, attacked the mission station. Soon afterwards, however, the mission settlement was permanently established at Bethelsdorp.

The experiment was a significant one from several points of view. Note that the missionaries followed the principle of segregation from the outset. (The earlier Moravians had done likewise.) The confiscated land of the Khoikhoi was restored to them (if one can use the word) only in one form, the segregated missionary settlement. Another point is this, that the site of the mission settlement was chosen for military reasons. It was in this district nearby what is now Uitenhage, that Khoikhoi resistance was concentrated, and to the north of it the Xhosa tribe of Ndlambe was situated. Bethelsdorp, therefore, operated doubly for the purpose of "divide and rule", the missionary-controlled Khoikhoi could be used against the still independent Khoikhoi, and if their resistance could be smashed, it would be easier to pursue the attack against the maXhosa. And so it came to pass. The Khoikhoi resistance had been long and hard, but one by one their last leaders were captured or slain and Xhosa-Khoikhoi unity was broken. The missionary Khoikhoi, as we shall see, were recruited in the wars against Ndlambe.

Bethelsdorp missionary settlement illustrates in other ways the usefulness of the missionaries to the Government. It is interesting to observe how early the pattern of the subsequent labour policy emerged. The traveller, Lichtenstein, has left a picture of Bethelsdorp as a place of shameful poverty; it was on a barren strip of land, insufficient to enable the Khoikhoi to live without going out to labour for the White man. As Dr. Philip was later to point out, such mission settlements were reservoirs of labour from which the neighbouring farmers could draw their supplies. Be it mission station, location or reserve, the principle has always been the same — that the land thus oc-



cupied does not belong to the people, nor is it sufficient for their needs. It may be added that, in addition to their other duties, the missionaries assisted the Government in procuring forced labour for the roads, and it was also their business to collect taxes from the destitute Khoikhoi.

From this brief outline of the early stages of the activities of the London Mission, some of the main functions of the missionaries clearly emerge. They carried out the policy of "divide and rule" and they established the mission station for the greater control of the Khoikhoi as a labour force. On the resumption of British rule at the Cape in 1806 a government official expressed his appreciation of Dr. Van der Kemp in the following terms: "He will be of the greatest assistance in retaining the Hottentots (Khoikhoi) in their present favourable opinion of the English, as well as in communicating with Gaika (Ngqika)."

It was a few years later that the London Missionary Society decided to intensify missionary activity in Southern Africa and for this purpose sent one of its directors to survey the field. This was the Rev. John Campbell, a man with the Imperialist vision which embraced Khoikhoi, abaThwa, Griqua, amaXhosa, and extended as far north as the Tswana tribes, where he sent the Rev. Robert Moffat to strengthen the missions there. The little known regions of the west also drew his attention. "It would be highly gratifying to the Society and to public at large to cause these countries to be explored," he said. On his second visit he was accompanied on his tour of the mission stations by the Rev. Dr. Philip, who remained behind him as Superintendent of the London Missions.

The main task of the missionaries throughout the rest of the century was to assist the Government in the subjugation of the Bantu. But to get a complete picture of how the missionaries worked in the interests of British Imperialism, it will be necessary to follow Dr. Philip's career from the beginning, when he acquired renown as the "Defender of the Hottentots".

#### **Dr. Philip – "Defender of the Hottentots"**

Herrenvolk history books present two pictures of Dr. John Philip, Superintendent of the London Missionary Society (L.M.S.), who was sent to the

Cape in 1819 to put the affairs of the Society in order. Cory and others present him as a political mischief-maker who created trouble between the two natural allies, the Dutch and the British, chiefly because of this liberal attitude towards the Non-Whites. They aver that he stood for "equality between White and Black" and abominate him accordingly. On the other hand there are those liberal apologists, like Macmillan, author of "Bantu, Boer and Briton", who hail him as the "Defender of the Hottentots," humanitarian and emancipationist, who, with Wilberforce and Buxton, strove to abolish slavery. "The Wilberforce of Africa," he has been called, and the phrase is less laudatory than its inventor supposed. Between those who damn him and those who praise, what is the truth?

There is no doubt that this Superintendent of the London Missionary Society played an important *political role*. He came to the Cape Colony armed with those ideas of "liberty and equality," liberty of speech, "free" labour, etc., with which the middle-classes in England had liberated themselves from feudal autocracy. He had the support of Wilberforce, Buxton and other representatives in the British Parliament of the industrial and merchant class, and with them he kept directly in contact, as well as with the Mission headquarters in London. At a later stage in his career he was able to write confidently (and confidentially) to Buxton: "At present the Colonial Government does nothing as to relations with the independent native tribes without consulting me." The Missionary Movement was fortunate in sending out such a man at such a time. He had his agents all over the country so that he continually kept his finger on the pulse of things; he received official and semi-official reports from mission stations as far afield as Bechuanaland; he corresponded not only with missionaries but with merchants and military men as well as with chiefs (through their attendant missionaries). While the trek oxen were pulling the Boer waggon further and further North, the indefatigable Dr. Philip was making his frequent tours of the mission stations, assuring the chiefs of his "friendship" and promising them the "protection" of the British Crown.

Philip did not always see eye to eye with governors, who at this stage were

always military men; but, while there were certain contradictions between the various elements of the population at the Cape, there was a fundamental unanimity between them – as there is to this day – to conquer and subdue the inhabitants. Lord Somerset, Governor at the time of Philip's arrival, was a conservative and, in fact, a representative of the most backward element of British rule, the feudal aristocracy, who constituted his supporters in the British Parliament. Somerset was a petty despot; those freedoms claimed by the middle-class, representative government, freedom of the press, etc., made him reach for his gun. It was part of his creed that Church and State work hand in hand, but it must be the orthodox Church; he had no time for the upstart non-conformist, who smacks of middle-class independence. Dr. Philip, on the other hand, was a liberal and a non-conformist and, above all, he had the support of the industrialists in the British parliament, i.e., the most progressive section. It was inevitable that they should clash.

It began simply over a question of the independence of the L.M.S. mission stations; Lord Somerset wasn't satisfied with the behaviour of the L.M.S. missionaries because they weren't carrying out to his satisfaction the job of being recruiting agents. On one occasion the Rev. Anderson, who had been sent to establish control over the too independent Griqua on the Orange River, failed to procure a quota of men to fight against the Xhosa. At first Philip adopted an amicable tone and assured his lordship that "the Colonial Government may rest assured that every portion of our influence, and additional means to those already employed, will be used to remove prejudice and make the Griquas serviceable to the colony." Likewise he declared his intention of making Bethelsdorp missionary reserve more efficient by clearing out all the "vagrants" who wouldn't go out to work for the neighbouring farmers. There didn't seem to be much cause for difference between them. Lord Somerset, however, in whom was vested autocratic rule at the Cape, was always ready to play the despot; it displeased Philip when he appointed the Rev. Brownlee as his own government missionary and representative with Chief Ngqika. He was still more resentful of the fact that the Governor had refused permission to the L.M.S. missionaries



to proceed into Namaqualand. The reason seems to have been that his Lordship, himself a feudalist, adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the Dutch in these regions — he was certainly always generous in doling out farms to them from the confiscated lands of the maXhosa — and on this occasion it pleased him to respect their hearty dislike of missionary interference with their serfs or slaves. *Philip was incensed. There was more involved than the question of allowing freedom of action to the missionary superintendent.*

Looking at the situation as a whole, we see a conflict developing on three planes. First and foremost the conflict between Black and White, in which both the British, who represent capitalism, and the Dutch, who represent a feudal economy, combine to overthrow tribalism. At the same time there is a conflict between the British and the Dutch (Boers), i.e., between a backward feudal economy and a progressive capitalism, a conflict that in time resolved itself by the more progressive force incorporating the more backward and retaining only those elements that were useful to it in the ultimate exploitation of the conquered peoples. Then there is a subsidiary conflict between two British sections within the colony. In this outpost of empire, the British colonists were struggling to procure those elementary rights of the British middle-class that had sent them there — freedom of the press and assembly, representative government and the control of their domestic affairs in the colony. As is to be expected, this conflict against an autocratic governor was carried on under the well-known liberal slogans of liberty and equality, the slogans of democracy. All this makes up a complicated political pattern within which it is our business to follow the main thread of our argument — the role of the missionaries in the primary conflict, i.e., between Black and White.

Now the fight between Philip and Lord Somerset over interference with the L.M.S. missionaries took on larger proportions and became part of the struggle of the liberals against local absolutism (in the person of his Lordship) and towards procuring Representative Government. It is not part of this survey to follow the intricacies of the conflict, culminating much later (1854) in the granting of Representative Government to the Cape Col-

ony. It is sufficient to say that Dr. Philip, together with his son-in-law, John Fairbairn, and the pro-emancipationist, Thomas Pringle, who had come out with the 1820 Settlers, became the spearhead during Somerset's time.

Philip brought up the big guns of liberalism to expose the maladministration of this military Governor, Lord Somerset. The Governor, on the other hand, tried to discredit the L.M.S. missionaries before the Home government, and this in spite of the fact that he was aware of the usefulness of missionaries — provided they were under his strict control. The missionary Superintendent was to prove a formidable opponent, for he was shrewd enough to enlist a very formidable ally — British Public Opinion. He suddenly discovered the necessity to defend the rights of the oppressed Khoikhoi and used this as the big stick to beat Lord Somerset. Having unearthed a mass of evidence proving the charges of the Rev. Read on the ill-treatment of Khoikhoi by Dutch farmers and giving instances of unpaid forced labour, he prepared a voluminous memorandum to be laid on the table of the British Parliament through his supporter, Buxton. His main attack was on the slave economy of the Boers, and the undesirability of a military government entrusted with civil administration.

Subsequently he elaborated his case in his "Researches in South Africa" (1828), which the British Philanthropists, headed by Wilberforce and Buxton, regarded as their trump card. Writing to Philip, Buxton said approvingly: "Your 'Researches' have done the work". It gave a clear exposition of the value and function of missionary institutions in the interests of British imperialism, and at the same time the very basis of its argument was the superiority of the capitalist economy, with its "free" labourer, over the backward feudal economy of the Dutch.

It must be said that at the beginning of the dispute between himself and Lord Somerset, Dr. Philip had not been concerned with the Khoikhoi. Describing what took place at this stage, Professor Macmillan remarks that Philip was "apparently unconscious of any special problem of Hottentot rights." What he did want was to gather enough evidence of maladministration to hang his aristocratic opponent. In this he almost suc-

ceeded, for he engineered (through Wilberforce and Buxton) a Commission of Enquiry and Lord Somerset found it convenient to resign. It need not surprise us that by some peculiar oversight the Commissioners' Report devoted a very brief space indeed to the Khoikhoi and its only contribution towards solving their problems was a proposal for increased grants of land for missionary settlements — a mere sop to humanitarian sentiments. As the conflict between Philip and the Governor had proceeded, however, it had compelled the missionary to clarify and formulate his ideas. Hence the excellent exposition of the function of missionaries in his "Researches." Hence his discovery of the need to "defend the Hottentots." "My struggle has merged into a general question respecting the aborigines. It did not begin there," he wrote. While Lord Somerset in his despatches to Lord Bathurst, Secretary of State for the Colonies, and his supporter in Parliament, clamoured for the dismissal of the upstart "journeyman weaver of Kirkaldy who calls himself 'reverend'," Dr. Philip was unearthing documents exposing the activities of a Dutch official at Bethelsdorp. "The result was triumphant," he wrote: "I saw that I had in my hands not only the means of vindicating the calumniated missionaries, but also the means of liberating the Hottentots from their cruel bondage." And again: "I have no doubt that the papers I have sent home (to the British government) will lead to the recall of the first authorities of the Colony and to a total change in its administration . . . I know that the *Governor and Colonel Bird* (his secretary) are dreadfully alarmed . . . If they had listened in time they might have kept their places and the old system in a modified form. Now it is before the British Parliament."

The gist of all this means that the so-called "Defence of the Hottentots" became a pawn in the fight of the liberals against the feudal aristocrat, Lord Somerset. Their "defence" turned into an attack both against local absolutism (the governor had dared to interfere with the freedom of the press) and the whole Dutch economy i.e., feudalism. Of course the liberals had to win, for history was on their side and the days of feudalism were already numbered. The world-wide expansion of capitalism dictated the Abolition of Slavery (1833). A few years earlier



(1828) Ordinance 50 was promulgated "for improving the condition of the Hottentots and other free persons of colour at the Cape of Good Hope, and for consolidating and amending the laws affecting these persons." With this Ordinance the Khoikhoi, while treated as a separate section of the population, were granted legal equality and, formally, the right to buy land. This meant lifting those feudal restrictions which prevented the free movement of labour. That was the one face of the Ordinance. But it had another face. It was a segregatory law, with special application only to "Hottentots and other free persons of colour"; it consolidated those sections of the existing labour laws, based on old Dutch slave laws, which were essential to a Masters and Servants relationship; that is, any breach of contract on the part of the servant was to be punished as a criminal offence. Thus Ordinance 50 at one and the same time looked forward to capitalism and backwards to serfdom.

Acting on representations made to the British Parliament through the supporters of Dr. Philip, the new Governor, Major-General Bourke, employed Andries Stockenstrom, landdrost of Graaff Reinet, to draw up a memorandum as a basis for the Ordinance. It was fitting that the English Governor should enlist a Dutchman to do the job. Dr. Philip once reported that "the landdrost (Stockenstrom) and I agree remarkably well on the subject of the aborigines." Later we shall look further into the nature of this understanding between the missionary superintendent and the Dutchman, when they had a larger field for their joint activity, namely, the subjugation of the maXhosa. This early prototype of General Smuts, this ruthless leader of commandos against the Khoikhoi and the maXhosa, embraced the English as his "adopted countrymen" (to use his own phrase) and out-liberalled the liberals. "I confess," he once said, "I should be glad to see the whole of Africa one immense British colony with our laws in full vigour through every nook of it."

The British-Boer, Stockenstrom, was well suited to handle the two-faced Ordinance with the two-fold purpose of "liberating" and controlling a landless people. Thus early we have a foretaste of the subsequent amalgamation of the methods of British imperialism and Dutch feudalism for the more complete exploitation of the

Non-European.

For his part in agitating for the "liberation" for the Khoikhoi — to which the 50th Ordinance gave formal expression — Dr. Philip contrived to be hailed as their "Defender and Liberator". Now he himself makes perfectly clear the purpose behind this so-called liberation. This he did in his "Research in South Africa," a book which well deserved the approval of Wilberforce and his fellow industrialists in the British parliament. The virtue of the Superintendent of the London Missionary Society was the clarity with which he saw the issues involved in conquest, the particular tasks or the missionary and the methods to be employed. In the comprehensiveness of the general statements in his Preface it is obvious that he is not confining himself to the question of the Khoikhoi only, but of a wider conquest in Africa. It was during the conquest of the Bantu that the missionaries were to find full scope for their activities. It is of particular interest to us, therefore, to follow his analysis of the tasks.

#### Christianity and Labour

The Preface to Dr. Philip's "Researches in South Africa," contains what may be called his credo, from which the rest logically follows. We quote the passage again:

"While our missionaries ... are everywhere scattering the seeds of civilization ... they are extending British interest, British influence and the British Empire ... Wherever the missionary places his standard among a savage tribe, their prejudices against the colonial government give way, their dependence upon the colony is increased by the creation of artificial wants ... Industry, trade and agriculture spring up ..."

Here he states both an aim and a method. The method is christianization, which involves something much more than the simple question of religion. The aim is the destruction of one culture, tribalism, and replacing it by capitalism. By "civilization" he means the Christian capitalist civilization. As we have said, it is an industrial civilization that is insatiable in its need for raw materials — grown in new lands that must be confiscated; raw materials that must be procured by the labour of the conquered and christianized people of new lands.

Philip recognises that the transition

from tribalism to capitalism does not take place automatically. The habits, customs and ideas of the old system have to be broken down and replaced by those of the new system. That is one of the functions of the missionary. Having accepted him as a man of peace, the Christian convert has a desire to dress like his teacher and eat like his teacher. The tastes of the new civilization — those "artificial wants" — are thus insinuated into his habits. At the same time, as Philip explains, "Missionaries teach industrious habits ... The first step towards civilizing the savage is to overcome his natural indolence." Now the link between the mission station, Christianity and labour begins to be clear. Philip writes:

"Many who are acquiring a taste for civilized life by their connection with our mission stations, will prefer labour, with a state of freedom, in the colony."

From this, his advocacy of "liberation" for the Khoikhoi from Dutch serfdom, falls into its proper perspective. He continues:

"Make the Hottentots free. Give them a fair price for their labour, and their masters will have double the work and the value to the state will be trebled."

He is careful to add that there would be no danger involved for the White colonist by granting this "freedom" to the Khoikhoi, since there is "a hereditary reverence for authority in them." This would be kept well-nourished by the missionary, who would encourage the proper habits of industry and obedience.

From first to last the interests of the new economic system were to demand labour and more labour. And the continuity of the policy of the Government towards the Non-White peoples comes out when we compare what Dr. Philip has to say in the early part of the century with a statement made by Rhodes when introducing the Glen Grey Bill in 1894, a Bill designed to tie the Africans securely to the wheel of the now rapidly expanding industrial system:

"It is the duty of the Government to remove these poor children from this life of sloth and laziness and to give them some gentle stimulus to come forth and find out the dignity of labour. ... We will teach them the dignity of labour and make them contribute to the prosperity of the State."

We may add here that Dr. Philip



found no difficulty in coupling "freedom" with segregation. The segregated mission reserve was the particular contribution of the missionary to the pattern of South African society. It was part of the liberal myth of "protection." It is trusteeship in its earliest form. In other words it is the beginning of the herrenvolk lie of the inferiority of the Non-European. "Protection" and "inferiority," the idea that the Black man is "different" from the White — these have become part of the machinery of oppression.

In summing up the benefits of the policy he was advocating, Dr. Philip made the following conclusive argument:

"By adopting a more liberal system of policy towards this interesting class of subjects, they will be more productive, there will be an increased consumption of British manufactures, taxes will be paid and farmers will have no cause to complain of a lack of labour."

It can be said that with the "liberation" of the Khoikhoi a victory for British capitalism had been achieved, under the guise of liberalism. But let us repeat, the abolition of slavery in the British colonies, together with the "liberation" of the Khoikhoi was part of a historical movement in which the "philanthropists," liberals and missionaries were the agents of an expanding capitalism.

Thereafter the Khoikhoi and the liberated slaves formed the nucleus of the Coloured population, the mass of farm labourers and the impoverished workers who lived in the towns. The missionaries found them a landless people and a landless people they remained, in spite of the 50th Ordinance. The outcry raised by the farmers against "vagrancy" immediately after the passing of the middle thirties, as Prof. Macmillan writes: "There was a visible decline in the interest bestowed on the Hottentots, even as a potential labour supply . . . The labour supply was now more adequate to colonial demands." At the same time we are told that the Missionary Superintendent "lost touch with Hottentot affairs." The truth is, the Khoikhoi could now be left to the mercy of their liberty because a new stage had been reached in colonial conquest. The Government, together with the missionaries, became absorbed with events in the east and north-east of the colony. If the labour supply became more "adequate" it was by reason of the

ferocity of the wars against the maXhosa, who lay next in the path of conquest.

#### Chapter IV:

#### Divide and Rule

#### The MaXhosa

Of all the functions of the missionaries, that of "divide and rule" is the most characteristic and as the history of the 19th century unfolds we shall see it operating again and again in various ways.

In their war of aggression against the maXhosa, the British found themselves up against Ndlambe, who had ignored the attempts of several governors to make the Fish River their temporary boundaryline. He occupied a stretch of territory south of the Fish River, known as the Zuurveld, and here the Dutch had come looking for pasturelands — for their trekking in search of land and cattle began long before the so-called "Great Trek" across the Orange River. Ndlambe did not dislodge them, though the situation had to end sooner or later in an open clash, and the Xhosa chief had proved the stronger.

British tactics, however, were totally different from those of the Dutch. They weren't just looking for grazing lands. Unable to make headway against Ndlambe, they realised the necessity to split the maXhosa asunder, and then attack. For this they needed the help of the missionaries, whose business it was to persuade one of the Xhosa chiefs to accept the "friendship" and "protection" of the British Governor. It took the missionaries several attempts before they succeeded in penetrating the Xhosa wall at its weakest point, namely, Ngqika, and that only because they took advantage of one of those tribal feuds, in which the young chief was determined to get the better of his uncle, Ndlambe, who, together with the paramount chief, Hintsa, had whipped him in more than one encounter between their warriors.

Dr. Van der Kemp was the first missionary to undermine Ngqika's resistance, having finally received permission to establish a mission station near him at the Tyhume River. This paved the way for a meeting between Ngqika and the Governor's military representatives, who came to a verbal agreement with him as paramount chief, a title which both he and they knew to be invalid — but it served the purpose of the invaders. By 1812 the

British were ready to launch their first determined attack against Ndlambe and succeeded in driving him across the Fish River. In this they were assisted by the Khoikhoi of the missionary reserve at Bethelsdorp, so that the Government had double reason to be grateful to the missionaries. Dr. Philip put it on record that:

"The Hottentots belonging to the institution of Bethelsdorp . . . contributed much to the success of the enterprise . . . Military posts were afterwards established (in Ndlambe's territory) to prevent the return of the Kaffirs, and the Boers and Hottentots were put under requisition with a view to this effect."

It will be remembered that the site of Bethelsdorp had been chosen with an eye to military operations against Ndlambe, and now in 1813, a mission station at Theopolis, seventy miles nearer to Ndlambe's territory, was set up for the same purpose. It is apparently with pride that Dr. Philip recorded that: "The institution of Theopolis has from its establishment . . . proved equivalent to a military station." It is understandable, therefore, that he was able to point out to the Government that:

"Mission stations are the most efficient agents to promote the internal strength of the colony and the cheapest and best military posts that a wise Government can employ against the predatory incursions of savage tribes."

The British bided their time for the next attack against Ndlambe, meanwhile strengthening their hold over Nquika by sending several missionaries in succession to reside near him. Then the Rev. Williams brought the chief another message of "friendship" from the Governor, Lord Somerset, and when he showed great reluctance to meet him, Major Fraser, his military representative, begged the missionary to "pledge his honour that no evil should befall the chief through meeting the Governor." The verbal treaty that followed (1817) was to result in Ngqika's "ally," the British, swallowing up both his land and that of all the Xhosa tribes. Ngqika himself once said, referring to the British:

"OOahina-ka-qhonono!  
Ma yizal'imaz'enkomo  
Sizo kuty'isigqokro."

Now the maXhosa at this time had a great leader in the warrior-prophet, Makhanda (Makana), who, at the head of the armies of Ndlambe and the



paramount chief, Hintsá, routed Ngquika. This gave the British their opportunity. Under the pretext of coming to the assistance of their "ally," Ngquika, two large commandos entered Xhosa territory, committing slaughter and devastation on a colossal scale (1818). For this we have the word of Andries Stockenstrom, who himself led one of the commandos. Describing how his Government deliberately interfered "in a quarrel that did not concern us," he goes on to say that they "took from a vast population the flocks upon which they, men, women and children, were exclusively dependent for their very existence."

Though the British, as in all their wars of aggression, aimed to defeat the people by the plunder of cattle and the destruction of their crops, they were met with a stubborn resistance from all the maXhosa, united into a strong force by Makhanda, who planned a campaign of attack that well-nigh succeeded. The warrior-prophet seems to have known and distrusted the missionaries, for he had refused to allow the Rev. Read of the London Missionary Society to establish a mission station near Ndlambe. His first step was to lay siege to the military-mission station of Theopolis, and so little did the Khoikhoi know their real enemies that they gave their lives defending it.

The intrepid Makhanda, however, resolved to oust the English garrison from the fort at Grahamstown. Wave after wave of Xhosa warriors descended from a nearby height upon the English soldiery, who were on the point of surrender, when a contingent of Khoikhoi under their captain, Boesak, and reinforced by those from Theopolis, turned the tide in their favour. Thinking to save his people, Makhanda came to meet the Governor's representative, but was seized by Stockenstrom and sent as a prisoner to Robben Island. Not long afterwards he died as bravely as he had lived, when he and a fellow prisoner were attempting to escape from the island, and for the next half century he remained the symbol of Xhosa resistance.

Makhanda's defeat opened the floodgates of British invasion into Xhosa territory. The Governor, who had treated Ngquika as paramount chief only until he had defeated Ndlambe, and the chiefs, Phatho, Kama and Chungwa, who had joined him, was now in a position to confiscate not only the lands of all these chiefs, but also

part of Ngquika's lands between the Fish River and the Keiskama. Such were the first bitter fruits of "divide and rule."

From their new vantage ground the British could prepare for their next land seizures, while meantime carrying on a daily war of attrition, cattle-plunder and crop-burning, to describe which we once more fall back upon the words of Andries Stockenstrom, Commissioner-General at Grahamstown, and supervisor of these regions:

To have denied the extermination of the Hottentots and Bushmen, the possession of their country by ourselves, the cruelties with which their expulsion and just resistance had been accompanied, the hardships with which the laws were still pressing upon their remnants, the continuance of the same system against the Kaffirs, or the iniquity of the aggressions and murders lately perpetrated upon the latter race . . . would have been ridiculous . . ." (From his Autobiography.)

In the peculiar language of the *herrenvolk* the land that had been confiscated from the maXhosa went by the name of the "Ceded Territory" or the "Neutral Belt." Africans were excluded, but on the day on which Ngquika was supposed to agree to the new treaty, the Governor was writing to the Imperial Government about the colonization of the "Neutral Belt" since it was "as fine a portion of ground as is to be found." Here military posts were set up, British settlers were granted farms and, according to Stockenstrom, "some Boers had already been encouraged to squat up to the sources of the Koonap." And these were not all. In the Kat River valley, the fairest land in that region and the home of Maqoma, who had succeeded his father, Ngquika, a military-missionary settlement of Khoikhoi was placed.

#### Kat River Settlement

The story of the Kat River settlement demonstrates on a larger scale than even Bethelsorp or Theopolis, the disruptive influences put into operation when one dismembered people is used for the purpose of destroying another, who are actually their natural allies. According to a contemporary Wesleyan missionary, the Rev. William Boyce, the idea of settling a body of "deserving" Khoikhoi, including the best of Bethelsorp and Theopolis, in a Reserve on Maqoma's land, resulted from talks between Stockenstrom and

the Rev. Read of the London Missionary Society. Its specific aim was to "strengthen the colony's defences against the Xhosa." While Stockenstrom was military head of the settlement, a great deal of the control rested with the missionaries. This is how he described its success to Pringle, an 1820 settler and friend of Dr. Philip:

"They pay ever tax. They have cost the Government nothing except a little ammunition for their defence, some seed corn and the annual stipend for their minister. They travel great distances for divine service and their spiritual guides speak with delight of the fruits of their labours . . . The same plan on a more extensive scale would enable the Government to withdraw troops altogether against the natives."

To this encomium, the Rev. Read, co-begetter of the scheme, added:

"The success of the settlement is unquestionably owing in pre-eminent degree to the zeal, judgment and indefatigable labours of the missionaries."

The way in which the land for this military Reserve was seized is an object lesson in British tactics. At the time of the dissensions between the Rev. Tead and Stockenstrom, it was still occupied by Maqoma, who had re-claimed it when he found that the Whites were swarming into the so-called "Neutral Belt." Now Stockenstrom had "allowed" him to remain, provided he kept down cattle-theft. It was part of the peculiar terminology of the invaders to ascribe cattle-theft to those from whom they had plundered thousands of cattle. Under the conditions of anarchy then prevailing in those parts, it was not difficult for Stockenstrom to find a pretext for Maqoma's expulsion, and the device adopted was precisely that which was to be used some sixty years later when the Ndelbele chief, Lobengula, was attacked under the pretext of "protecting" the maChona. In this instance Maqoma was found guilty of pursuing some baTembu into the "Neutral Belt," and this, according to Stockenstrom, was an "insult to the protectors of the sufferers." When he was later questioned on this point before the Commission of the Aborigines (Protection) Committee, he had to admit that he had made no treaty with the baThembu, who were completely unaware that they were being "protected" by the Colonial Government. Thousands of Maqoma's cattle were confiscated, and when the people resisted, Stockenstrom proce-



ded to drive them out of the Kat River valley at the point of the bayonet. He then advised the Governor to let the "Tambookies" (baThembu) know of the Government's "interest in their cause." Why? "Because," he continued frankly, "this will secure a counterpoise to the Gaikas' (maNgqika) power and therefore make a salutary diversion in our favour."

The missionary-controlled Khoikhoi, then, were placed in the Kat River Settlement in 1829, this being the only way in which they received grants of land after their "liberation" in 1828. In keeping with the consistent labour policy of the Government, it was split up into 47 locations, with plots no bigger than two to fifteen morgen, so that in addition to being a buffer state between the Whites and the maXhosa, they were a reservoir of labour for the surrounding farmers. It took the Khoikhoi some twenty years to discover how misplaced had been their gratitude to the missionaries for procuring land for them. Here we can do no more than mention that in 1850 the Khoikhoi of the Kat River Settlement and the mission station at Theopolis joined forces with the maXhosa in an attempt to defeat the British soldiery. But it was too late, Dutch and British farmers clamoured for the settlement to be broken up because it had become a "hotbed of sedition." But the truth is. The tide of invasion was ready to engulf it, together with the land of the maXhosa.

### Chapter V

#### Political Role of the Missionaries

##### The Missionaries and the Chiefs

The full extent of the political role of the missionaries in the Subjugation of the Bantu tribes becomes apparent during the Twenties, thirties and forties of the 19th century. It is not enough to say that they acted as peaceful forerunners paving the way for the governor and the military. They participated in a very positive sense in conquest.

For the invaders the problem at this period was to destroy the power of the chief as the military leader of his people. The breakdown of tribalism meant first the removal of the tribal head, the chief or chieftainship. Every effort had to be directed to this end. During the period of military conquest, therefore, the missionary had a very particular part to play, distinct from that which he was to play later. Every step that brought a section of the people nearer

to the missionary, every idea out of the new system that was insinuated into their minds, served to undermine the authority of the chief, and therefore weakened his position as the military head of his people. The mission station itself was the spearhead of that attack on the authority of the chief, for there the Christian converts put up their dwelling and were separated off from the rest of the tribe. Allegiance to the missionary undermined allegiance to the chief. Of course, this process took place gradually, insidiously. The missionary came as a man of peace; he came as a "friend". It was much later that the chiefs themselves became aware of what was happening and put their finger on the fact that the missionary constituted a danger to their position.

"They mean to steal our people," said the chiefs, "and become magistrates and chiefs themselves."

At first, then, the chief merely tolerated the presence of the missionary, to whom, as to anyone else, he granted leave to occupy a portion of his land. He was thus disarmed at the outset. Judging from a document like the Diary of the Rev. Owen, who preached the foreign doctrines under the sceptical eye of Dingane, the Zulu chief, the Christian dogma was dismissed as unacceptable to reason. It was rare for a chief himself to become converted. But as the contracts between the tribe and the foreigners increased, he found it more and more necessary to rely on the missionary as go-between and interpreter. He had to rely on the very agent of imperialism whose task it was to undermine his authority. From this it was easy to pass to the next stage. As the ferocity of the military invasion increased, the chief in desperation was more willing to believe that the missionary could help him to recover his lost territory. Here we see the beginning of the role of the liberal as the conciliator between oppressor and oppressed. The missionary in actual fact identified himself with the government, but he was careful not to do so to the chief himself. He came as his "friend" who was willing to *intercede* with the Government on the chief's behalf. He protested a great deal on behalf of his protégé. But the more the chief relied on the missionary, the more surely was he betrayed into the hands of the Government.

The missionaries for their part seem to have had no difficulty in being at one and the same time God's ambassa-

dors and Government go-betweens. Quite as a matter of course they played a political role in the more obvious sense. There was constant communication between them and the Governor and the local military commanders. From their position of vantage in tribal territory they proceeded to map out the surrounding district, gather information about surrounding tribes, find out the customs of the people, and pass on this information where it was most useful. Thus they not only charted unknown territory for the use of the military, but they communicated their *knowledge* of the Africans to influential parliamentarians in London, the *Secretary for the Colonies and the rest*. Therefore it was natural that the Government made use of them when it came to drawing up "treaties" and evolving "Native" policy. The missionaries prided themselves on knowing the Africans better than anyone else. Once more we see here the beginnings of that tradition which for a hundred years and more the liberals have kept alive and which is only now breaking down as the eyes of the people are opened to their true function. The liberals have always specialized in "*knowing*" the Africans and in this sense have been the Government's most useful agents.

Of course we know that this claim on the part of the missionaries to an "intimate knowledge" of the Africans was a false one, often compounded of arrogance, ignorance and bigotry. It was true only in so far as they were in a position to gather information useful to the Government and at the same time, having been accepted by the chiefs as intermediaries, could appear as their spokesman. On the other hand it was they who helped to build up a picture of the Africans as a people who were morally inferior; "irreclaimable thieves," "treacherous, ungrateful savages," etc., were missionary epithets handed on to headquarters in Government reports. In their position first as assistants in evolving "Native" policy and then as the chief instruments in educating the Africans into the new system, they reinforced the subsequent policy of trusteeship, of imposing special and separate treatment on all Non-Europeans.

At the period of which we speak (the thirties of last century) it is understandable that a man like the Rev. William Boyce, Wesleyan missionary and the Governor's confidential Adviser in place of Dr. Philip, should make the following boast:



"Nothing can be effected without the hearty co-operation of the missionaries, but, with this, no obstacles are too difficult to overcome."

By this time the tentacles of missionary activity were spread throughout Southern Africa. A glance at a map will indicate how far they had penetrated. The Moravians and the London Missions had been followed by many others, Wesleyan, Scots, the Rhenish and Berlin missions, the French and, finally, the American mission. Both the Rev. Williams and the Rev. Brownlee of the Glasgow Missionary Society had added their efforts to those of the L.M.S. missionaries in breaking down the resistance of the Xhosa chief, Ngqika. The Rhenish mission concentrated on the Namaqua and the vaHerero ("Hereros") in the far north-west beyond the Orange River. The Berlin mission added its quota of missionaries operating among the maXhosa and founded a mission station at Bethel; they also attached themselves to the Koranas beyond the Orange River, having obtained land from the Griqua Chief, Adam kok II, who was himself under the influence of the Wesleyan missionaries.

East of them the French missionaries, on Dr. Philip's advice, ingratiated themselves with Moshoeshoe, the great chief of the baSotho, and the Americans, also at the instigation of the superintendent of the London Missions, attempted to get a footing both among the maZulu situated between the Drakensberg Mountains and the East coast, and among the maNdebele (Matabele), a branch of the maZulu who had broken away from Tshaka and settled further inland on the High Veld. Dingane, the Zulu chief, however, had as little time for the Rev. Owen of the American mission as he had for a handful of arrogant Trek Boers under Retief. The maNdebele, also, were averse to foreign doctrines.

Of all these missionaries the Wesleyans were the most remarkable for their thoroughness and came to be regarded by the Government as its most efficient agents. Their first mission was to the Namaqua in the extreme west of the Colony, whence they crossed the Orange River into Great Namaqualand. But their most intensive operations were among the Bantu tribes, both in the east and in the north. Under the leadership of the Rev. William Shaw, a most zealous organiser, they proceeded to entrench themselves sy-

stematically beside every chief. The Rev. Shaw mapped out a chain of mission stations in the south-east from the Zuurveld (now Albany) to Port Natal, a distance of 400 miles, and we shall see later how persistently they carried out the tactics of "divide and rule" in this region. Beyond the Orange River they became the political rivals — we use the word advisedly — of the London Missionary Society among the Griquas and played their part in hastening the dismemberment of that nation. Still further north they gained a footing among the baTswana (Bechuana) tribes and soon followed the French missionaries into the land of Moshoeshoe.

With this general survey of how the missionaries were strategically placed throughout Southern Africa, we must now give a more detailed picture of how the position of the chief as military leader of his people was undermined. It was not enough to place a missionary beside him; the influence of the Missionary had to be reinforced by other means. The plan for doing this was largely evolved by the Superintendent of the London Missionary Society, Dr. Philip, who, at this time, was a political adviser to the Governor.

#### "We must be the Masters"

The British were aware that they had no easy task in subduing the Bantu tribes. The maXhosa, who were in the front line of attack, were preparing to put up a renewed resistance. In the east and in the north the chiefs Dingane and Mzilikazi had no fear of the White man; Dingane knew the value of the White man's weapons and unceremoniously dismissed the missionary when he couldn't get a sufficient number of guns out of him. Moshoeshoe, the most resolute and sagacious of them all, constituted a formidable barrier to the invaders, both Boer and British.

Through his numerous correspondents, Dr. Philip, superintendent of the London Mission, was aware of these things. He did not make the mistake of belittling those who had to be conquered. And with his imperialistic outlook, he saw further than military governors and commanders. This determined his line of approach to the problem. One of his correspondents, a merchant of Uitenhage, had summarised the position in a very apt phrase. This Dr. Philip quoted and fully endorsed in his communications with Buxton, his supporter in the British Parliament:

"We must be the masters." The missionary superintendent elaborated this point when he said on another occasion: "Annex up to the tropics." He had no doubt as to the rightness of British conquest. What he feared was the spirit of resistance in the chiefs goaded by the sheer ferocity of the military machine. He had more subtle methods of subjugation. Failing outright annexation — and a Government which had plenty of unofficial agents to carry on the job was not yet prepared for the expense involved in annexation — Philip proposed making treaties with the chiefs with the specific purpose of undermining their position in preparation for outright annexation of their territory.

The first step was to persuade the chiefs, through the missionaries, to accept the "friendship" of the British Government, to accept its "protection". The next step was to subsidise the chief, i.e., pay him a fixed salary. This was a revolutionary step, for it meant making him a paid servant of the Government, accepting payment in the coin of the new economic system. This was what Dr. Philip meant when he emphasised the necessity of "ruling as we do to India", namely, through paid chiefs. It was the very cornerstone of the policy which he, as the self-appointed political adviser of the Government, proposed. And there was no doubt as to the purpose behind that policy.

"Had a few of the chiefs been subsidized," he said on one occasion, "by having small salaries paid to them, we might by this time have had the affairs of Kaffirland in our own hands." The plan involved the undermining of the authority of the chief by placing beside him a resident agent (as the British representative was called). This agent, ostensibly his guide and adviser, was later to fill the position of magistrate and gradually usurp his functions as head of his tribe. As the magistrate's authority grew, so that of the chief diminished. Again, Dr. Philip left no doubt as to the purpose behind this step. Recommending to the Governor the appointment of these resident agents beside each of the Xhosa chiefs's, he wrote:

"A total expenditure (on agents) of even Pound Sterling 3000 would cost much less than armies"

The joint effect of a missionary on the right hand of the chief and resident agent on his left, was to reinforce those



elements of disruption in the tribal system that already existed through the teachings of the missionary. And when subsequently the imposition of a magistrate over the chief was a settled point of "Native" policy, it was perfectly natural that he should be a missionary or the son of a missionary. For did they not claim to "know" the African?

There is no doubt that Dr. Philip contributed much to evolving this scheme of subjugation which proposed to emasculate the power of the chief. Others took up the idea and elaborated upon it, but he may well claim to be its begetter. The Governor, D'Urban, put the plan into practice about the middle thirties, but a certain discussion that took place between a military man, a missionary and a liberal, reveals them working out the problem nearly ten years before that time. On one of his frequent tours to the country, Dr. Philip, accompanied by Thomas Pringle (subsequently secretary of the anti-Slavery Society) discussed with the Dutchmen, Andries Stockentstrom, the problem of subduing the African tribes and civilizing them, i.e., bringing them into the new economic system. Stockentstrom (as he records in his Autobiography) emphasized the necessity of co-operation between the Church and the Government.

"These two forces combined," he said, "will not civilize unless they make the Native chiefs the principal levers in the operations on their people. . . . If we gain the confidence of the chiefs, they, with the power of the Government and the efforts of the missionaries, will influence the masses. . . ."

"A powerful Government like that of England, with equitable treaties . . . will soon have the chiefs so completely under its influence that its word will be law without appearing to be so."

It is not at all incongruous that he who talked of "gaining the confidence of the chiefs," was to drive Ngqika's son, Maqoma, out of the Kat River valley and cover up this act of aggression with the hypocrisy typical of his adopted countrymen, the English. The apparent contradiction disappears when we understand the common purpose behind these two methods, namely, the subjugation of the African tribes.

The focal point of attack on the part of the military was the chief. This was no less true of the missionary. But Dr. Philip had no doubt as to the superio-

ity of his method. The purely military phase of conquest looked to be long, costly and wasteful, for it delayed the initiation of the new order of society. This larger perspective led the missionary superintendent to condemn the plunder and pillage methods of the military forces, the "Reprisal" system of cattle-raids, which had the effect of stiffening the resistance of the chiefs. He condemned it in no uncertain terms. Once more he prepared reports and memoranda for the London Missionary Society in London, with instructions to communicate certain passages to his supporters in the British Parliament, particularly Buxton. As usual the liberal is performing the useful function of collecting information useful to the Government. No sooner had the new Governor, Major-General Sir Benjamin D'Urban, assumed office, than he received a despatch from the Colonial Secretary, Lord Glenelg, a son of one of those "Philanthropists", whose colonial policy was directed to the best interests of the British industrialists. In this despatch the Governor was instructed to "cultivate an intercourse with the chiefs on the Kaffir Tribes," by stationing "prudent and intelligent men among them as Government agents, and to consider the practicability of annual presents or salaries for the chiefs." Subsequently D'Urban explained that:

"I was well aware that the substance of that Despatch had originated in the London Mission within the Colony. . . . And Dr. Philip was my agent for introducing the system which I contemplated in accordance with the Despatch."

On the strength of Dr. Philip's role at this time, herrenvolk historians have depicted him as the Friend of the Africans, carrying out the same humanitarian principles that actuated his efforts in "liberating" the Khoikhoi. But again we must reject the falsification of history that obscures political expediency with the cloak of humanitarianism. The Rev. Boyce, who succeeded Philip as the Governor's political Adviser, was nearer the mark when he commented that "The Kaffirs entertained very extravagant expectations as to the good to be anticipated from Dr. Philip's advocacy," and added acrimoniously: "The Wesleyans have done at least as much as those whose names have been trumpeted forth as the friends and saviours of the aborigines" — meaning the "Philip Party", inclu-

ding Philip and the liberal, Fairbairn, his son-in-law. Of course we are not concerned with petty quarrels between missionaries, all of whom were serving a common end. But there is point in the Rev. Boyce's comment on his rival.

The subjugation of the chiefs was a matter of historical necessity, just as the "liberation" of the Khoikhoi had been. As the great Conciliator of the chiefs, the missionary superintendent was acting consistently as the agent of a Christian capitalist civilization.

It was in the role of benefactor, then, that Dr. Philip was able to approach the Xhosa chiefs Maqoma, Tyhali and Botomane, as a preliminary to a new treaty which would do something to mitigate the barbarities of the Reprisal system. "I have resolved to carry the whole of the system you have recommended into effect," wrote the Governor, D'Urban, to Philip. It was agreed that the missionary superintendent would act as the Governor's forerunner and gather information as to the temper of the chiefs. Philip wanted his visit to appear unofficial and gave it out that he came simply as their "friend." The chiefs, however, saw him as one who had a great deal of influence with the Governor and not un-naturally assumed that he would help them to recover their land, which was to them the vital question. It is hardly necessary to say that this was very far from the missionary's intention.

The chiefs expressed themselves freely to their "friend." With eloquent anger Chief Maqoma pointed out the injustice of seizing land as a reprisal for so-called cattle-theft.

"The Governor," he said, "cannot be so unreasonable as to make our existence as a nation depend on a circumstance which is beyond the reach of human power . . . You sanction robbery by the patrol system. After having taken our country from us you shut us up to starvation, you threaten us with destruction for the thefts of those to whom you have left no choice but to steal or die by famine."

The missionary's reply to his is a classical example of how the liberal advised the oppressed when they seek his advice.

"I said everything to soothe them," wrote Philip in his report of the interview. He assured them that the Governor "was a just man and would redress any *real* grievances. *But they must not expect any more than was reasonable.*"



He (the Governor) was obliged to protect the Colony from depredations and the chiefs would have to prevent all stealing and restore cattle."

The chiefs were obviously dissatisfied with the nature of this reply. Pointing to the lands that bore the marks of recent devastations, Chief Maqoma replied:

"We have had these promises for fifteen years."

Whereupon the missionary spoke as follows:

"If they (the soldiery) drive away your people at the point of the bayonet, advise them to go over the Keiskamma peaceably. If they come and take away your cattle, suffer them to do it without resistance. If they burn your huts, allow them to do so. If they shoot your men, bear it till the Governor comes and then present your grievances, and I am convinced you will have no occasion to repent of having followed my advice."

Dr. Philip was very confident of the results of his pacification of the chiefs. While he waited at the Kat River Settlement for D'Urban's arrival, he betook himself to a great deal of writing, setting down his ideas on "Native" policy to Buxton and others. In a letter to his wife he made the interesting comment: "I am now ready for him (the Governor) with a grip of the whole situation." To Miss Buxton, to whom he often communicated things he wished to be passed on to her father and thence to the British Parliament, he wrote: "I consider my work in this place done. Nothing is left to accident. I can leave the frontier, should the Governor not come at this time, without caring whether I am at a public meeting of the chiefs or not. The principle of my scheme (and that is all I care for) is no longer an experiment that may fail, but a law that must be enforced. God commands it. The Thing is practicable . . . I stand as on a rock."

British imperialism owes much to men of such character.

To the Governor he pressed home the necessity of making a treaty with the Griqua chief, Waterboer, on the northern frontier, where the Trek Boers were seizing land, but were unlikely — he feared — to be able to protect either themselves or the Colony from an attack by the Ndebele chief, Mzilikazi. As Waterboer was a particular protégé of the missionaries, Philip considered him a good subject for the

first application of the new system of treaties on the Indian model, i.e., ruling through paid chiefs. Thus, in 1833 Waterboer was brought to Cape Town and went through the formalities of signing a treaty with the British Government. Its primary purpose was a military one, making the Griqua nation a buffer state between the Europeans and the Bantu beyond the Orange River.

While Dr. Philip was formulating "Native" policy in what he considered the best interests of the British Government, other agents of Imperialism were pursuing their more violent methods. Colonel Somerset, who was in charge of military operations, was particularly active with his commandos during the two or three months following Philip's conciliatory (but secret) visit to the Xhosa chiefs. Instead of the new order that had been promised them by the missionary there was still more ruthlessness. Even a military officer expressed his "utter amazement" when, on entering their territory near the Tyhume River, he found the whole landscape ablaze. On asking Colonel Somerset the reason for it, that worthy replied that he was expected to keep the country clear and this was the most energetic method he could think of — by smoking them out. The situation was working up for a climax; crops were burned and the people were faced with famine; if an African lodged a complaint about stolen cattle, he was seized as a prisoner; a chief's envoy bringing in stolen cattle (which it was the chief's duty by law to recover) would be shot. In despair, Chief Maqoma sent a letter to Dr. Philip through the local missionary.

"When shall I and my people be able to get rest?" said the chief. "Both I and my brother, Tyhali, have almost no more country for our cattle to live in . . . I beg the favour of your enquiring at the Governor for me the reason of all these things."

In all likelihood the Xhosa were being deliberately goaded into attack as a pretext for the further seizure of land. The frontier farmers, who, as well as Dr. Philip, were waiting for the Governor to arrive, made no secret of their expectation of further grants of land from him. It needed but the wounding of a chief to give the immediate signal for war — though indeed a war of destruction had been waging against the inhabitants of Southern Africa for more than a hundred and

fifty years. The Xhosa chiefs, Maqoma, Tyhali and Botomane, led an attack into the Colony; farms and traders' stores were burned. But it is noteworthy that not a single mission station was touched. The Africans drew a marked distinction between the missionaries and the rest of the Whites.

The assegai had to yield to the gun. Colonel Harry Smith, who commanded the British soldiery, drove back the Xhosa and laid their land waste. But the chiefs found an impregnable stronghold in the Mathole fastnesses and from there carried on a guerilla warfare which baffled the invaders.

A significant epilogue to the missionary superintendent's "peace" negotiations with the Xhosa chiefs a few months previous was his action on the outbreak of war. He immediately informed the Governor that he would send messages to all the missionary institutions, calling the Khoikhoi to defend the Colony against the Xhosa. This was done and the Khoikhoi were armed.

## Kampuchea Atrocities Refuted at United Nations

(from Beijing Review)

Besides making unfounded claims, the Soviet political news analyst repeats the old lie about "the extermination of three million Kampuchean" as a reason for opposing Democratic Kampuchea retaining its lawful seat in the United Nations. "Three million" is a shocking figure. It was invented by Viet Nam and the Soviet Union to shock. But the figure has no basis. When the Lon Nol regime was overthrown in 1975, the population of Kampuchea was about 7 million, and it increased somewhat in 1978. An AFP report from Phnom Penh last January said that according to officials and international organizations in Phnom Penh and data collected from various provinces, the population at the end of 1979 was approximately 6 million. In addition, there were about 700,000 refugees in the Kampuchean-Thai border areas. It was only after Viet Nam launched its war against Kampuchea that the Kampuchean population began to shrink. It is the direct outcome of the genocidal policy Viet Nam pursues against the Kampuchean. Democratic Kampuchea did indeed commit some grave mistakes in the past, including



the erroneous killing of some people. Leaders of Democratic Kampuchea have on many occasions publicly admitted their mistakes and made self-criticisms and have taken steps to rectify them. Last year, Democratic Kampuchea put forth a Draft Political Programme of the Patriotic and Democratic Front of the Great National Union of Kampuchea to replace the 1976 Constitution, reshuffled the government and adopted a series of democratic policies to unite with people of all strata. It is regaining the understand-

ing, sympathy and support of the Kampuchean people at home and abroad.

## KAMPUCHEA CONNECTION

The Kampuchea Connection by C.M. Gomes (paperback Pound Sterling 2.75 p) has just been published by Grassroots Publisher, 101 Kilburn

Square, London, NW6, England. The book takes the form of nine replies to a young English girl quering the history of the struggle of the Kampuchean people. It comes out as a well documented history of the struggle of the Kampuchean people. It takes a critical look at mass media coverage of world events and analyses *Peace with Horror* by Barron & Paul and other distorters of Kampuchean's history, like John Pilger. Highly recommended for a good account of the struggle of the Kampuchean people.

## A Good Marxist-Leninist Analysis

The APRP (Azanian Peoples Revolutionary Party) which came out of the turmoil of the Arusha Conference, largely the result of the machinations of P.K. Leballo has now produced a commendable Marxist-Leninist document defining the nature of the Azanian struggle, though we are not in agreement with every aspect of the document and have serious disagreements with the APRP's style of Party building. Certainly in our view there is no contradiction between building the PAC as a mass national movement and in building an independent Marxist-Leninist Party, tasks to which IKWEZI is resolutely dedicated. We have produced the section defining

### A Brief History of the National Liberation Movement in Azania:

Before the First World War, the liberation movement in South Africa, like in most colonial and semi-colonial countries was led by the petty-bourgeois, viz., the intellectuals, clergymen, chiefs and businessmen. Such were Imbumba yama-Afrika 1822; Natal Indian Congress 1894, African People's Organisation (predecessor of the Coloured People's Organisation) in 1902, and the South African Native National Congress (ANC) in 1912. The first three movements emerged and developed with the decline of the wars of resistance. The last war of resistance was the so-called Bambata Rebellion in 1906. After conquest, and particularly after the declaration of the Union of South Africa in 1910, the African people tactically renounced warfare and used political strategies and tactics to regain their lost territory. There was a greater urge for unity of all the indigenous nationalities, which resulted in the formation of the ANC in 1912.

the tasks, motive forces and goals of the National Democratic Revolution as it relates to a correct resolution of the National Question. The first section which we have left out defines the democratic tasks of the revolution in a much more through going and honest manner than the notorious Freedom Charter does. It is necessary for Azanian revolutionaries to overcome petty squabbles, subjectivist views, factionalism, clichism, etc. and to learn from one another and unite on the basis of correct and principled policies relating to our struggle and revolution. It is in this spirit that this document is presented.

One of the factors that contributed to the petty-bourgeois nature of the national liberation movement was the lack of class consciousness and organisation of the indigenous proletariat, which by then had its social roots in the countryside, and owed its allegiance to its traditional chiefs. Class consciousness first developed among the white workers. This can be illustrated by the first labour unrests, viz., the miners' strike of May 1907, the white miners' general strike of 1913 and 1914. The first unrest by black workers was the night soil workers' strike in 1918, followed by the African miners' strikes in 1920, and numerous others right up-to-date. The first African labour movement, the Industrial Workers of Africa was formed in 1917, followed by the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union (ICU) in 1919, the South African Trade Union Congress in 1926, the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU) in 1955, etc.

After World War I, and with the victory of the Russian October Revolu-

tion in 1917, a new era was ushered, the era of World-proletarian revolutions. It was at this stage that a false start was made in Azania. Once again, the white workers took the initiative. Of course this was not surprising since they were better exposed to world events, and they were freed from labour repression. In 1921, they formed the Communist Party of South Africa, which was exclusively white and colonialist in orientation; so that while in other colonial and semi-colonial countries such as China (The Communist Party of China was formed in the same year), Korea, Vietnam, Albania, etc., genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties were formed — ours was a racist party from the outset, no wonder that it has consistently (even when the majority of its members are black) followed and maintained an erroneous policy on the National Question.

This was evident during the 1922 Rand Miners' strike, where racist slogans were displayed. Chief amongst these was the slogan: "Works of the world unite to fight for a white South Africa!"

In 1928, after the defeat of that uprising, and when the Party membership had swollen to 550 whites and 1 600 blacks, the Executive Committee of the Communist International made this analysis of the South African situation, and the tasks of the CPSA:

"South Africa is a British dominion of a colonial type. The country was seized by violence by foreign exploiters, the land expropriated from the natives, who were met by a policy of extermination in the first stages of colonisation, and conditions of semi-slavery established for the overwhelming majority of the native masses. It is necessary to tell the native masses that in the face of the existing political and economic discrimination against the



*natives and ruthless oppression of them by the white oppressors, the Comintern slogan of a native republic means restitution of the land to the landless and land-poor population.*" (Our emphasis).

The next paragraph reads:

"This slogan does not mean that we ignore or forget about the non-exploiting elements of the white population. On the contrary, the slogan calls for 'full and equal rights for all races.' The white toiling masses must realise that in South Africa they constitute national minorities, and it is their task to support and fight jointly with the native masses against the white bourgeoisie and the British imperialists. *The argument against the slogan for a native republic on the ground that it does not protect whites is objectively nothing else than cover for unwillingness to accept the correct principle that South Africa belongs to the native population.*

Under these conditions it is the task of the Communist Party to influence the embryonic and crystallising national movements among the natives in order to develop "these movements into national agrarian revolutionary movements against the white bourgeoisie and the British imperialists." (Our emphasis).

The next paragraph warned in part: "The failure to fulfill this task means separation of the Communist Party of South Africa from the native population."

The Freedom Charter is in fact, a direct refutation and betrayal of the above thesis of the Comintern. Because it stubbornly opposed the above directive and warning, the CPSA alienated the African people from it, for they, the Africans, rightly felt not represented by it and that it was not serving the interests of national liberation. They also noticed that the ANC by its close relationship with that organisation had deviated from its founding objectives. Hence the emergence of the ANC Youth League in 1943, with its radical nationalistic policies, which culminated in the formation of the Africanist Movement within the ANC, and finally emerged as the Pan Africanist Congress in 1959. The Black Consciousness Movement which emerged in the late 60's is also inclined towards the PAC's position.

**Why a Party of a New Type**

The history of our struggle in South Africa has taught us that:

(1) The petty-bourgeois class is too weak to lead that struggle to victory because of the following reasons:

(a) It does not commit itself to any revolutionary theory.

(b) Its organisation is weak.

(c) It is inconsistent in its social practice. It is easily manipulated by imperialism.

(d) It is always suspicious of the class consciousness of the proletariat.

(2) Historically, most of the struggles that were led by the petty-bourgeoisie in Africa, Asia and Latin America have not accomplished their tasks. After liberation they have failed to solve the problems of the majority of the people, the workers and peasants.

From colonialism they have sunk even deeper into misery (neo-colonialism). They have not broken away from the imperialist orbit.

South Africa is a highly industrialised capitalist society. The struggle against white domination should be combined with the struggle against imperialism. Only a working class Party can accomplish such tasks. The leadership of a genuine proletarian party is a sure guarantee that the revolution will not be betrayed or carried forward only halfway through. Our national democratic revolution should therefore be New-Democratic, in that it should be led by a new class, the proletariat.

Many labour unrests took place in the 40's and 50's; also the stay-at-home and pass campaigns in the sixties were some form of labour unrests. In the early 70's there were numerous strikes which led to the formation of the Black Allied Workers Union (BAWU). All this is proof that the black proletariat, the core of the working class in Azania is long awake, but it is misused and misguided by the opportunist leadership of the national liberation movements and CPSA – just as they had misused the peasant uprisings in the 1950's and 1960's, and the recent student uprising in 1976.

It is common knowledge that South Africa is a highly industrialised capitalist state. The racists have boasted that it is a powerhouse of Africa and the bulwark against communism. It commands the largest working force (8½ million) than any other country in Africa, and perhaps in the third world. We have already il-

lustrated above how this force has asserted itself in struggle since the beginning of the century.

Among other reasons why it has not made any headway in its struggles against exploitation and national oppression is that it has always struggled as an appendage of the bourgeoisie which has misused it, divided it, and misdirected it. It has no organisation of its own.

We are convinced that the Azanian revolution needs a new engine in order that it should not be betrayed; and that the new engine must be equipped with a new compass, a new barometer, a new and powerful telescope, and above all, it must be of stainless steel.

The Azanian proletariat is confronted with a problem and tasks that had confronted the Russian proletariat as early as 1902, when Lenin observed:

"History has now confronted us with an immediate task which is the *most revolutionary* of all the *immediate tasks* that confront the proletariat of any country. The fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also of (it may now be said) Asiatic reaction, would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat."

(V.I. Lenin – *What is to be Done? – Vol. V. Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 373.*)

**The Theoretical Basis of our Programme:**

In our epoch a revolutionary party is mainly concerned with the solution of three problems:

**A. The National Question:**

This involves the solution of national contradictions, the resolution of the problems of oppression of one nation by another, and the form that the future nation should take.

**B. The Social Question:**

This is the resolution of social contradictions which have as their base the prevailing mode of production and production relationships which mould and condition social conditions. The prevailing mode of production in Azania is capitalism, which is characterised by private appropriation of the products of social labour and



has engendered master-servant relations.

### State Power

This involves the formulation and creation of appropriate public institutions by the dominating class for the purpose of solving the national and social questions in the image of the dominating class at a national as well as at the international level. In all modern states whether national or multi-national, state power is either wielded by one class or a coalition of classes. Forms may differ but the content is the same.

This part of the manifesto is meant to deal with these three questions, and any other additional questions.

### A. The National Question

#### The Status of the different National Groups in Azania:

The complex nature of the Azanian national democratic revolution demands both a definition of the status of each population group in the country, and an identification of their various interests in the country's unfolding political process. For it is beyond all question that each group of people, each nationality or class, cherishes a definite, identifiable material interest, exclusive or accommodative, which is either served or damaged by the revolution. Who, then are the people who inhabit Azania today, and what is their relationship to the liberation process?

#### I. The Africans:

(a) The Africans of Azania are the indigenous inhabitants, the natives of Azania; and they constitute the overwhelming majority of the entire population. They are the native original and rightful owners of the country, who were robbed of it and its natural wealth, along with their livestock and other independent economic means of livelihood by European colonialism. The colonial conquest which triumphed over 300 years' heroic resistance, and broke it at the end of the 19th century by sheer weight of Europe's advanced technology (military) which was then unknown to Africa, subsequently subjected the Africans to the three huge mountains that weigh heavily on them: ruthless *political subjugation*, whose chief characteristic is the African's lack of

any constitutional means of political redress, resistance of self-defence, since white domination does not regard them as citizens and disallows their representation in any state organ: unparalleled *economic exploitation* by both settler capital (apartheid's business) and western imperialism (big business) – the major feature of this being "coercive labour repression", to wit: the terror of influx control laws exclusively enacted for the Africans, their forced regimentation under labour migration system, their starvation wages, well below the Poverty Datum Line (PDL) – in all economic sectors, the worst conditions of work everywhere, their lack of any trade union rights, etc., ad infinitum; which results in a staggering degree of social degradation that callously breaks up their families while it ceaselessly harasses them from street to house and back, everywhere and always. This conquest, which was always and everywhere preceded or accompanied by relentless *cultural aggression*, also paved the way for the greater all-round *cultural subjugation* that every African suffers today in Azania.

Thus today the indigenous Azanians reel under the combined impact of Christian-western civilisation (as manifested by Calvinistic-herrenvolkism in Azania), and backward African traditions that co-exist and collaborate with it to produce monstrosities like "Bantustans" and "Bantu Education".

(b) Thus taken as a whole, being the most oppressed population group in their fatherland; the Africans want to fully and manifestly assume the effective control of their country. In a word, to recapture it from foreign rule and then to govern it in the best and truest interests of all who shall continue to inhabit it as fullblooded members of the new Azanian nation. Therefore, the Africans constitute the core of the nation.

(c) Yet the indigenous Africans themselves are no more socially homogenous than the ruling white minority. They are today stratified into social classes which, having been called into their blighted and precarious existence first by European colonialism (Dutch and British), and then by South Africa's settler capitalism – live according to the enslaving dictates of the country's race cloaked economic system. So it is that quite apart from the super-exploited African industrial,

rural and semi-proletariat, there are also the brutally repressed petty-bourgeoisie of various levels and walks of life, as well as the landless and land-hungry peasantry. It is today, more than ever before, perfectly undeniable that while all these African classes, together with the peripheral strata within each one of them, may have divergent class interests, they however all cherish one major political desire: their *National Liberation*. For this reason alone, they reject wholly and contemptuously the whole concept, the entire programme and policy of "Bantustans" or "Bantu homelands independence" which Pretoria is forcing down their throats. Still, the differentiation of the indigenous Azanians into various classes must necessarily generate class views and aspirations with regard to the nature, meaning and promise of this national liberation to each of them.

In today's race-dominated South Africa, it is not only the native Azanians who are the victims of foreign domination; added to them are all the other black peoples – the Asians of various oriental origins, and the so called "Coloured" people.

#### II The Asians:

These are the various foreign ethnic minorities who were brought in by European imperialism right from the beginning of our social milieu – as slaves from Malaysia and Indonesia, and as indentured labourers from India and China. Collectively, they are statistically the smallest minority on South Africa's racial scales.

Chief amongst them are those of Indo-Pakistani origin. While some of them have made it into "high business" in South Africa's commercial world, the great majority remains exploited and wretched on the sugar farms of Natal, a province of their main concentration. And while they have been accorded some kind of second-class status, they nevertheless remain an oppressed group.

For, while other Oriental ethnic groups, namely the Japanese – who came only recently as free immigrants – and the Chinese, were moved into the "white" or "honorary white" status, the "Indians" remained "non-white" and therefore outside the maelstrom of South Africa's official society. However, since they had nothing more than their bare labour power to be seized from them when



they landed in Azania, the Asians have retained their cultures and cultural institutions to this day, keeping them exclusive.

Historically the Asians have no definite territory of their own in Azania, and they have never made any forceful claims on any piece of land in that country.

Herein, lies the difference between them and the European invaders. Even those well-to-do gentlemen who have been successful in one way or another to purchase some plots of land are now being ruthlessly uprooted and forced into segregated locations for Asians only. Their plight is the same as that of the dispossessed Africans, they are land-less. And as is manifest in their non-representation in any state organ, they are also politically oppressed. Quite clearly, the oppressed Asians have a definite and easily identifiable interest in the political transformation of the country. In the solution of the land problem they will benefit equally like any other citizen without any discrimination. There is no question of territorial autonomy for Asians or any other minority in Azania.

The Asians have a tradition of struggle alongside the Africans in Azania, and for this reason alone it would be unjust to deny them the fruits of the revolution. As for the traitors among them, who are either busy crawling for a stake in the "Bantustan" system or in the white camp, we shall deal with them in the same manner as we shall with their other black counterparts.

### III The "Coloureds":

The so-called "Coloureds" of Azania are the historical product of miscegenation and intermarriage between various groups in the country — the Africans, Asians and Europeans — and are therefore not a foreign group. On South Africa's racial scale they are the next second large minority in the country. They are to all intents and purposes part of the African nation. Precisely because of this historical fact, and quite apart from the fact of their small concentration in a few parts of the country — mainly in the Western Cape — these "Coloured" Azanians, very much like the Asians, have no separate territory of their own. For apart from John Dunn's descendants, whose own territorial location in Zululand was determined by some specific historical conditions in the

final days of the Zulu kingdom, the "Coloureds" live either as squatters or labour tenants on white farms, or as townspeople of various walks of life. It is precisely these conditions that gave rise to their indeterminate status in the race-defined relations of the country, making them psychologically "afloat" and split between their white and black parentage.

Whereas they are mostly influenced by western culture and traditions, especially the Boer stream — witness their speaking "Afrikaans", they have no identifiable independent culture of their own. In this respect, as in everything else, they are under the tutelage of the Boer faction of white domination.

Thus, contrary to the false nationhood conferred upon them purely according to the race ideology and prejudice of the white rulers, they are in truth not a nation on their own. Rather they are manifestly part of the wider African nation of Azania. This is so not only because the very idea of a "Coloured" nation is historically and theoretically untenable. Nowhere in the world has the offspring of two different races constituted a nation apart from their parents simply because of their mixed pigmentation. Trapped by the oppressive circumstances of their birth, where one of the parentage is master and the other is underdog, they have invariably identified with the latter, especially upon being socially rejected by the former.

The uniqueness of the Azanian case lies in the fact that while the ruling whites will not accept their "Coloured" children into their own extraordinarily privileged ranks, they at the same time, will not allow them to fully identify themselves with their black parents. With an occasional classification or reclassification as whites, they keep them in the colour-determined racial limbo of "Coloured".

Thus, from this viewpoint, as well as from the harsh realities of their everyday life, the "Coloured" Azanians, enjoy no political rights or representation of any kind, and are subjected to economic exploitation in every sector — they are, like the Africans and Asians, also politically oppressed and socially degraded. Consequently, whatever white domination is doing, or planning to do, about their political future and social status within the

framework of apartheid, (e.g. the "Theron Commission's" liberal recommendations, and Stellenbosch University verkrampte intellectuals' reactions and counter-recommendations: 1975); the "Coloured" belong squarely in the ranks of the general African national liberation movement. That much they have made quite clear by voluntarily throwing their lot with the indigenous Azanians (dissolution of their own liberation movement and joining the older African liberation movement in the mid-nineteen sixties). Herein lies the only true hope for their socio-political emancipation and the real, meaningful democracy for which they so much yearn.

It is therefore perfectly clear that, like the Asians, the "Coloured" people, have a definite and identifiable interest in the liberation of Azania. The national liberation of the much more heavily oppressed indigenous Azanians spells emancipation for them too.

### IV The Whites:

This is the dominant group. Today a conglomeration of the European nationalities, groups and even individuals of diverse origins, with the English and the "Boer" sections combining to constitute its core, this group is a foreign minority in Azania. It is the extraordinarily privileged ruling group that first aggressed the indigenous Azanians in the 17th and 18th centuries, then later conquered and subjugated them at the end of the 19th Century.

It has arrogated to itself the exclusive power to shape, write and distort the history of Azania, and has today concentrated all the reins of power exclusively in its own hands. Consequently, in every sphere of the country's life it enjoys a supreme monopoly, far out of all proportion to its size.

With the victory of the ruling National Party in the all-white elections of 1948, a division of power was clearly effected between the Boer and the English factions: The Boer took up the reins of state power, and are today politically predominant, of which they already had a firm grip.

Yet unlike the Asians, the whites came to Azania as colonists in pursuance of their mercantile ends during the advent of the Industrial Revolution. Having landed on the shores of Azania in 1652, they established the bridgehead whence they "explored" further afield, committing aggression against the native inhabitants on their



way, and annexing the territories of the vanquished, and subjecting them to their expansionist will. Ultimately, having violently robbed the Africans of their land, their sovereignty, and all means of an independent existence, they then alienated them from the land of their forefathers by allotting them a paltry 13% or less of Azania's land area.

This is what has variously been called "Native Reserves", "Bantu homelands" or "Bantustans", which are now being utilised in the biggest political swindle over – the so-called "homelands" independence. Under such circumstances it is meant to remind them and their supporters that the land which they seized by violent robbery, the land on which they today so oppressively rule, is not theirs, it is the land of the oppressed Africans of Azania. The minority whites in Azania have no territory of their own in the country, nor any rightful claim to any part of it. Their political supremacy, a necessary outcome of their colonial conquest, as well as their absolute monopoly of all the effective instruments of power, has not, and never can, change the axiomatic truth.

Having arrogated to themselves all the 87% of Azania – the best part of the country – the minority whites hold an economic monopoly whereby they own, in league with imperialism, all the major means of production in the country.

In partnership with imperialism, and in its interest, they exploit the indigenous Azanians in an unparalleled manner.

Witness all the racially couched laws of the country, as well as the many operative institutions that apply upon them, which are all designed for the sole and overriding purpose of exploiting the now famous *cheap black labour* that only apartheid could make possible for imperialism and settler capital. As if that were not enough, they not only exploit the other section of black Azania, i.e. the Asians and the "Coloureds", but also strive to split the latter from the indigenous majority and to set them against each other. The legislative provision for the "Coloureds" and Asians to become members of white trade unions while their inferior wages/salaries, working conditions and social circumstances are predetermined by race laws, is a case in point. Divide and rule is the basic pervasive principle. Thus, the

callous separation of the entire black proletariat from what passes for the white "working class", which was effectively brought about early in the century, and which was further emphasised in the period of South Africa's industrial leap, and was fully realised during the 30 years of National Party rule, is now for ever being assiduously fostered within the whole black *working class*. Gaping wage and salary differentials, demoralising discrimination in working and social conditions as between the African workers on the one hand and the "Coloured" and Asian workers on the other – indeed a whole scheme of socio-economic petty bribery designed to frustrate, at the cheapest price, any efforts at black proletarian solidarity. As a result of this two-way division of the working class, imperialism and settler capitalism gleefully reap the super profits that today make South Africa the greatest attraction in the world.

Beyond Azania's frontiers, this white minority has oppressed and exploited the Namibian people for the past thirty-one years, defying all international pressures and UN decisions which seek that country's orderly transition to national independence.

White domination is able to do all this not only because it holds a monopoly of military power inside Azania and in Southern Africa, but also because imperialism is backing it to the hilt. So it is, that today South Africa finally has acquired nuclear armament capability. Such western powers like West Germany, the US and Israel, made it all possible. And, lavishly spending an ever-increasing military budget on further strengthening and streamlining her machinery of internal suppression and external aggression – the racially segregated South African Defence Force (SADF) South Africa is today the strongest military power on the continent.

It is hardly necessary to point out that from these heights of political, economic and military power and privilege, the whites in Azania enjoy also a status of being socially the most privileged group, with exclusive social amenities that are the envy of people even in advanced western Europe. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in their exclusive monopoly control of the country's cultural institutions. With these powers they have presumed to dictate the cultural life and future of every population group in the country,

and to impose their own cultural values upon everyone else.

All this is based on South Africa's anachronistic church-state relationship (Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk-National Party) that is reminiscent of medieval Europe.

This religious-cum-political dominance of the Boer faction has professed the philosophical basis for their racist doctrine and domination.

Like the Jews in occupied Palestine, the whites in Azania are not a nation, in spite of their regarding themselves as such since 1961. Certainly, there is a sizeable white community whose core is made up of the British and the Boers, the latter now playing an even more predominant role since political power is in their hands. All the other Europeans in the country are appended to this core, whatever it is or calls itself. The 'Nationhood' that white domination claims for itself came along with the Republican status of South Africa in 1961, after a landslide victory in a referendum on the issue.

It is hardly necessary to belabour the issue. Suffice it to adduce only one or two arguments against the "Nationhood". First, they have no rightful or legal claim to the territory they rule today, since it came into their hands by usurpation and robbery. They therefore lack the first material objective requirement for any people to be a nation. Secondly, they all speak very different languages, and uphold very different cultures – English, Afrikaans (a hybrid culture, predominantly Dutch), Jewish, (Yiddish), Portugese, Greeks, etc. That is to say, while English and Afrikaans are the country's two official languages, requiring everyone to be bilingual; while great strides have been made in integrating the South African economy; and all strenuous efforts are made to keep the white politically together, the whites' claim to nationhood in Africa soil lacks all historical justification, and has not a single theoretical basis.

We endorse the stand of the Comintern that, "the white toiling masses must realise that in South Africa they constitute national minorities." (Native Republic Theses, 1928).

Only this class, as well as genuine democrats will be accepted as organic parts of the emergent Azanian nation. As for the compradors, bureaucrats and other filthy monsters, they will be accepted only after they have laid



down their arms and renounced their territorial claims, and their foreign connections.

We shall discuss the question of the white workers separately under, the motive forces of the revolution.

### On the Question of Guarantee of Rights of National Minorities:

In Azania we are specifically referring to the Asians and the whites. We have already defined the present political status of each one of these national minorities in Azania in great detail, and we have made a clear distinction between the two. Now, we would like to state their position in a new Azania, so as to assist them to solve their own problems.

In Azania we are specifically referring to the Asians and the whites. We have already defined the present political status of each one of these national minorities in Azania in great detail, and we have made a clear distinction between the two. Now, we would like to state their position in a new Azania, so as to assist them to solve their own problems.

In almost all, if not all revolutions, past and present, minorities have always had mixed feelings about the prospects of the revolution, more especially the privileged and well-to-do classes.

In Southern Africa, and more especially in Azania, where minority regimes are in power, it is even more apparent. We saw how the Portuguese ran helter-skelter at the dawn of independence in Mozambique and Angola; we are witnessing a bigger exodus of whites in Zimbabwe today; it was the same in Azania in 1960, and recently in 1976.

Their cry has always been "guarantees", "minority rights", etc. What "guarantees" do they want?

They want to be assured beforehand that after independence:

1. They will not lose their privileges;
2. They will not be oppressed by the majorities;
3. They will not be assimilated;
4. Today they are told by the bourgeoisie that they should fear communism as their biggest enemy.

These are real problems that we as revolutionaries must help them to overcome, for, if we do not do so, they may develop a fear of the revolution. The only alternative in their fear induc-

ed scepticism, is either to fight half-heartedly, to run away, or worse still, to oppose the revolution. In this way we lose possible allies whose *basic interests* are served by the revolution, which situation strengthens the enemy.

Some ignorant chauvinists say that, since the Africans are the overwhelming majority, they don't need the help of the minorities — they can go it alone. But at what cost? Experience has taught us that the enemy is already training Asians and "Coloureds" for border security duties and in the navy.

### The Guarantees:

(a) The Azania Peoples Revolutionary Party (APRP) is a Party of the working class, a Party that comes from the most oppressed class in society:

(b) It is not a nationalist party which would otherwise, probably protect the interests of its own nationality; therefore, the best guarantee that the APRP can give to anybody who has doubts about their future in the revolution is *freedom, democracy, justice and social progress* for all, regardless of nationality, race, sex or creed.

(1) Concerning the "guarantee" of privileges:

The APRP will uphold maximum *justice* — no nationality, whether in the majority, or in the minority will be more privileged than the other in a new Azania.

National privilege and class privilege is just what we are fighting against in Azania. It is incompatible with democracy.

(2) What about oppression by the national majority?

In a truly *democratic society*, there is no room for national oppression; again, national oppression is what we are fighting against.

Here we have trust and conviction in the wisdom of Comrade Stalin, who led the most complex multi-national society in our era, when he said:

"It may be feared, therefore, that the minorities will be oppressed by the national majorities. But there will be grounds for fear only if the old order continues to prevail in the country. Give the country complete democracy and all grounds for fear will vanish. (*Stalin Works, Vol. II P. 376* —

Our political programme guarantees

all these rights to all citizens, regardless of nationality.

(3) What about assimilation?

In Azania it is the whites who fear this most, and the reason is already well known the world over:

(i) Their racist ideology and of course, protection of their 'superior' culture, even their 'superior' hair, etc. etc.

(ii) They cannot imagine or picture themselves living with other human beings other than those with similar racial origins as theirs, i.e. European.

### Race Question

To the extent that apartheid and racism have pervaded every aspect of Azanian life, it needs to be fought to the finish.

But it is by no means the major contradiction in Azania. Being a great myth, a cover-up for the actual social contradiction, it must be fought as a secondary contradiction whose continued existence is a serious hurdle in the way of the great social transformation that must follow hot on the heels of the Azanian new democratic revolution.

### Who constitutes the Nation in Azania?

1. The indigenous Azanians constitute not only the main force of the present revolution, i.e. the new-democratic struggles for national liberation, but also, and more important, they constitute *the core* of the emergent Azanian nation.

2. All the other minorities are but part of that new nation; (and they have said as much in the course of the Black Consciousness Movement — 1969/76). They are organic units, appendaged to this core. So long as apartheid, or racial discrimination exists and operates, they can never be part of the ruling white society. Nor can they perpetually remain in the vacuous "no man's land". Therefore, the "Coloureds" and the Asians are neither nations in themselves nor capable of becoming nations. They have never been part of the white community either.

Everyone else's liberation is obviously contingent upon emancipation of the indigenous African. It is indeed this particular contradiction and its *final resolution* that will necessarily determine the fate and shape, the destiny of every oppressed nationality in Azania.



Occupation by force (by white 'nation') and political domination over the indigenous African majority and Asian minorities – these are the characteristics of a colonial state. But because there is no metropolitan power, it is not an ordinary colony, but a *settler colonial* state (a state dominated not by the metropolitan country, but by the settlers themselves).

We reject the concept "internal colonialism" because it is based on the false assumption that the whites are natives of Azania, who are oppressing the other nationalities of Azania. The people of Azania know better, and nobody can deceive them on this historical issue.

### Inter-state Relationships:

*Domination of the economy, political influence and military assistance by the western imperialist powers; these are the characteristic features of a semi-colony. It is indirectly ruled by imperialism. This is self-evident in the meddling of the five western powers – the US, Britain, West Germany, France and Canada in the Namibian issue.*

### Conclusion:

South African has a dual character, internally, it is a *settler colony*, while externally, it is a *semi-colony*.

### B. The Social Question

"The mode production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life-process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary it is their social being that determines their consciousness."

(Karl Marx)

The Azania People's Revolutionary Party proceeds from the materialist conception of history that forms of society that succeeded primitive communal society, viz. slave, feudal, capitalist societies, were class societies. The emergence of modern nations in Western Europe was stimulated by the rise of capitalism. The rise of capitalism engendered a centralised economy and the collapse of feudalism and separate feudal states.

In Eastern Europe and parts of Asia, the emergence of centralised states took place before the rise of

capitalism. It was precipitated by the needs of defence against outside invasions. Thus multi-national states were formed. Multi-national states engendered national oppression and, with the rise of capitalism, national exploitation. This gave rise to national movements and the ultimate disintegration of the multi-national states into national states.

### ADVENT OF COLONIALISM

Capitalism in Western Europe developed into imperialism, which sought more territory, raw materials, fuels, markets, etc. Imperialism engendered colonialism in Asia, Africa and the Americas.

This process disturbed and dislocated the normal natural development and evolution of the nations of these continents.

In Azania for instance, tribes were just moving towards the formation of nationalities and had not completely emerged from primitive communalism.

Colonialism imported slavery. With the discovery of diamonds and gold in the mid-19th Century, there was a leap to capitalism, but this did not completely eliminate the development of feudal relations in the countryside. With the might of conquest, Africans were forced to sell their labour power in the mines, while white-owned farms and other enterprises were generated by the rise of capitalism.

In other parts of Africa and Asia whole populations were uprooted and shipped away as slaves.

Another phenomenon was that colonialism balkanised our territory into a Union of South Africa (presently the Republic of South Africa) and protectorates (Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland),

### Crimes of Imperialism:

Imperialism perpetrated the following crimes in Azania:

(1) Land robbery accompanied by foreign political subjugation (colonialism).

(2) The advent of colonialism brought with it new modes of production – slavery, capitalism, while unconsciously and sometimes purposely retaining traditional semi-feudal relations in the countryside (present Bantustans).

(3) The development of the new mode

of production brought about the emergence of classes and class struggle in Azania.

(4) Unlike in Europe capitalism in its new forms (colonialism) fostered balkanisation of territory and people in Azania.

(5) The advent of capitalism, unlike in Western Europe, did not foster national formations but, on the contrary, it promoted racial and tribal formations which have culminated in the formation of a super-white racist state and nine mini tribal states. This is the form of national oppression in Azania.

(6) Racism was used as a shield for national oppression and super-exploitation on a most unprecedented scale.

(7) Consequently, upon the new colonial racist and tribal formations – the slave, capitalist and semi-feudal production relations – a new culture and ideology, Herrenvolk ideology (apartheid), was evolved. In this sense, the advent of colonialism (capitalism) in Africa, Asia and Latin America, unlike in Western Europe, was negative, divisive and reactionary. Hence our national-building process will follow Western European patterns, more or less.

Modern nations, a product of capitalist society, are nothing other than class societies, (Azania is no exception to this rule), and every nation is composed of oppressor and oppressed classes.

In capitalist society the dominating class is the bourgeois (capitalist) class, and the oppressed class is the working class (and the peasantry). In the colonies the dominating class is the bourgeois class of the metropolitan power, with the settlers as its social base. The working class, the peasantry and the bourgeoisie of the colonies comprise the dominated classes. In this way class struggles have taken the form of national struggles.

### Class Alignments in Azania:

In Azania, though the white bourgeoisie has broken all formal political ties with international capitalism, it still serves as a bridge for continued imperialist domination and exploitation of the African people, more especially the black workers. The colonist white bourgeoisie therefore conspires and collaborates with international capitalism in the national oppression and economic exploitation



and cultural domination not only of the black workers, but of other classes as well, including the black bourgeoisie.

In this process it has mobilised the white workers into its mass base by according them a "civilised" status. This is how the struggle which is social in content takes the form of national struggle.

In Azania therefore, there is *national* as well as *class* oppression.

### The Place of Antagonism in Azania:

There are three main contradictions in Azania today:

(i) The contradiction between imperialism and the minority racist settler regime on the one hand, and the African indigenous majority and other non-indigenous minorities on the other – National or Colonial Question.

(ii) The contradiction between the Boers (land Barons) and Bantustan puppet regimes on the one hand, and the peasantry and rural labourers on the other in the countryside – Land Question.

(iii) The contradiction between western imperialism and the white bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the workers on the other – Labour Question. Of course, there are contradictions of a national character that are non-essential.

At present the hotbed of antagonism lies within the first two contradictions, because they complement and support each other.

The land question should not be separated from the national and colonial question. The two contradictions differ only in scope but not in magnitude, – they are highly explosive. The land question therefore, lies at the base of the national question.

Although there have been numerous strikes by workers in Azania, from the early 20's to the early 70's, the general tendency is that they are either inspired by the national question or, even when they are purely economic, they finally turn into national uprisings. This latter contradiction is therefore secondary.

### The Character of the Azanian Revolution:

The Azanian revolution is characterised by the two major contradictions

mentioned above:

(i) Minority settler rule, which is most undemocratic and racist.

(ii) The Land question.

#### 1. Minority Settler Rule:

It has two aspects. *Minority* rule presupposes the absence of democracy for the majority of the population, while *settler* rule defines the national status of the regime in power which is colonist:

It is this latter aspect which engenders national oppression, and it is based on the land question. The native republic thesis of 1928 described this concisely in this manner:

"South Africa is a British Dominion of a colonial type.

*The country was settled by foreign exploiters, the land expropriated from the natives, who were met by a policy of extermination in the first stages of colonisation, and conditions of semi-slavery established for the overwhelming majority of the native masses.*" (Our emphasis).

Of course we have already described the present status of the country, but it is important to note that the dominion status has been removed (1961), while the *colonial status remains*. This colonial status can never change as long as the land question has not been solved. Even political democracy, majority rule, etc., is contingent upon the realisation and admission that Azania belongs to the indigenous people. Even the minority nationalities cannot achieve any meaningful rights if the majority is denied its *birthright*. That is why we have said that the land question lies at the base of the national question.

#### 2. The Land Question in Azania:

The native republic manifesto of 1928 puts it this way:

"South Africa is a black country, the majority of its population is black and so is the majority of the workers and peasants. The bulk of the South African population is the black peasantry, whose land has been expropriated by the white minority. Seven-eighths of the land is owned by the whites. Hence the national question in South Africa which is based on the agrarian question lies at the foundation of the revolution in South

Africa. The black peasantry constitutes the basic motive force of the revolution in alliance with and under the leadership of the working class."

This fundamental proposition of the Comintern is still valid today. Even though the situation has slightly changed in the countryside today. The countryside is divided into two zones according to land tenure mode of production – the so-called '*white areas*' and the '*bantu homelands*'. These geographical demarcations were made by the settlers (Dutch and British) during their wars of conquest and dispossession.

##### (a) The 'White Areas'.

This covers eighty-seven per cent (87%) – 106,867,520 hectares – of the total land surface area of Azania (122,100,000 hectares), together with all the natural resources that go with it. After conquest the settlers founded the Union of South Africa under the British Crown. The 1910 act of Union was the first constitutional blessing and consolidation of the land that the settlers had occupied during the wars of dispossession. The indigenous Africans were stripped of the right to own (even to purchase) land in the 'white areas'. They were further denied all political rights in the all-white parliament, the government and the armed forces.

The mode of production on the white farms is *capitalist (commercial farming)*, and it is well mechanised.

The white farmers enjoy a rare luxury of *black cheap labour*, indeed, the cheapest on the South African black labour market. The black labourers (1,2 million) are completely landless and live as rural proletarians, paid partly in meagre wages and partly in kind. They work the longest hours and the longest week and month (holidays are not counted on their calendar).

Some are employed as 'squatters' (short contract labourers), or as labour-tenants (those who live with their families on the farms). The labour-tenants are sometimes allocated small plots for the green season, so that they should not 'steal' from the boss's field. This plot is also payment in kind. The family (women and children) in most cases work gratis on the farmers' fields. These are the conditions of semi-slavery which were referred to in the native republic manifesto. Treatment is harsh, and floggings which sometimes result in deaths are a common occurrence.



3. The whites, enjoying all the advantages of power and privilege, have with great arrogance not only presumed to shape the destiny of all the oppressed people in racist South Africa, but have also conspired and essayed to confer upon themselves all sorts of possession, mantles, titles and self-definitions. The greatest falsehood they have perpetrated in modern times is the misconception that they are a nation.

This happened in 1961 when racist South Africa declared itself a republic, meaning that, having pulled out of the British Commonwealth of Nations, it was no longer a dominion of Great Britain either. The declaration was by referendum, the nationhood was by interpretation thereof.

Among the whites, there are real democrats who deplore racism and apartheid, those whites have realised that they have no other home than Azania (in recent years there has arisen a discussion amongst them about the acceptance of the name Azania for South Africa). Some of them have even formed organisations that oppose apartheid, while some (though very few) have joined the black liberation movement.

The white workers were the first to bring proletarian politics into the Azanian political arena. It is the most potentially revolutionary class among the whites, though it has been much corrupted by privilege. Owning no means of production, this class is also oppressed and exploited by the white bourgeoisie and imperialism. It is clear therefore, that objectively, the white worker and the white democrat would like to stay in peace with the oppressed and exploited masses of Azania, notwithstanding the subjective factor which is determined by the herrenvolk ideology and social privilege this gives rise to.

Are we against all settlers? The only category of settlers that we detest are the colonists – those land-barons who have usurped and arrogated to themselves 87% of Azania's territory and are occupying it by armed force. We would call them landlords, but for their capitalist mode of production. Their political representative is the present ruling National Party. As for the *big industrialists and merchants in the cities*, they belong to the comprador bourgeois class, they are the union partners of imperialism, who plunder the wealth of Azania and other nations

abroad. They lack every trace of patriotism. Their political representatives are the various English-speaking opposition parties in the white parliament. They can never be part of the Azanian nation.

From the above analysis it is clear that the white workers and the white democrats fall within the definition of oppressed and exploited people in Azania, who will finally link-up with other oppressed groups in the course of the revolutionary process to form ONE AZANIAN NATION.

#### **The Particular Interest of the Working Class:**

(a) **Socially.** There is no longer any need to belabour the fact that the South African economy is dominated by monopoly finance capital of the imperialists, with the white bourgeoisie as their junior partners.

This finance oligarchy is linked up with subsidiaries, associates and affiliates in different parts of the globe, i.e., from Europe, North America, Australia, and even some parts of independent Africa. In this context South Africa is a component part and junior partner of international imperialism, in plundering the natural and labour resources of other countries on a global scale.

The workers of Azania and other affected countries suffer double exploitation in the interests of imperialism. This is neither in the national interest nor in the working class interest. This also illustrates the identity of interests of the bourgeoisie of different countries.

The interests of the working class of Azania are self-evident:

(i) The radical removal of this exploitation which can only be effected by:

(a) A radical transformation (nationalisation) of the major means of production, both in the heavy and light (manufacturing) industry and finance capital, into social property – state property. This is only the first stage (New-democratic revolution).

Private capital should not be allowed to dominate the livelihood of the people.

(b) Removal of the colour-bar in labour policy, i.e. repeal of all racial labour legislation. This will facilitate the unity of the working class in Azania, and prepare the working class for the final assault on capital in the next stage (socialist revolution).

(c) The socialist stage will deliver the final assault on private capital in general, and finally eliminate the system of exploitation of man by man.

(b) **On the Land Question:** But the Azanian proletariat has an interest in the bedevilled land question of Azania. For, long before it can bring about social emancipation, it must have settled, or helped to settle, the Azanian peasant's land problem. However, the proletariat takes an ever broader view of the land problem, a direct interest and an indirect interest in it.

#### **Direct Interest.**

First and foremost, the land is a common heritage and common property that needs liberation (seizure) from the colonial expropriators. This is called for by the class conscious patriotism of the proletariat. Secondly, the land is an object of labour, a means of production, whence comes life itself. Everybody depends on the land for food, as well as for many raw materials, of which the land is the source, which combine to ensure society's continued existence. But, since the land is monopolised and exploited by the ruling white bourgeoisie and therefore cannot adequately fulfill its social function, it is the duty of the proletariat, in collaboration with other oppressed classes, to liberate it and put it at everybody's disposal . . .

*In a nutshell, this is the direct interest of the proletariat in the land question.*

#### **Indirect Interest**

Because of the interdependence of industry with agriculture in the main, the peasant is the most reliable ally of the proletariat. Because of the above factor, and alienation from all the means of production, the rural worker (the farm labourer) is the class brother of the industrial proletariat. The common bond that binds all these classes together is the realisation that they have a common enemy – imperialism (monopoly capital) which, since its advent, has crushed the peasant economy and changed the relations of production in the countryside.

We have illustrated above the interests of the working class in the land question, and how they interrelate with those of the peasantry. This serves to further illustrate that:

(i) the land question, i.e. the agrarian



revolution, is basically a peasant revolution.

(ii) The industrial proletariat, though not involved in agriculture has direct and indirect interests in the land question.

(iii) For the successful prosecution of the agrarian revolution, there must be a worker-peasant alliance.

(iv) That because of its particular interest – direct and indirect – the working class has an obligation to take the leading part in the national democratic revolution (his patriotic obligation).

(v) The working class alone has the interest and capacity to unite, direct transform and develop all the productive forces of the nation.

### **The Particular Interest of the Bourgeoisie**

The interests that have been dealt with in this section, in exception of the interests of the working class – national liberation, political and social emancipation that guarantee maximum justice, a truly democratic society that has no room for national oppression and assimilation, freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, 'free trade', private property rights and 'free competition' – all these interests are in essence bourgeois interests. The bourgeoisie of the black nationalities are interested in changing the status quo, i.e. in the overthrow of the white bourgeoisie and imperialism.

From the period of the early fifties (i.e. from the Defiance Campaign, to be exact) until the mid-sixties, the liberation movement led by the petty-bourgeoisie, i.e. the bourgeoisie of the various nationalities, have organised at national levels and this resulted in the proliferation of national movements apart from the African National Congress (ANC), there were formed Indian National Congress (INC), Coloured People's Organization (CPO), Congress of Democrats (COD), African People's Democratic Union of South Africa (APDUSA), and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC). This process was motivated by the false notion that each national group was in fact a national in its own rights, disregarding all historical development and more especially, the highly centralised capitalist economy of the country.

The disintegration and final collapse of the INC, CPO and COD has illustrated that these minority groups

cannot survive on their own as nations, let alone as independent nations in that society, because they have neither definite territories of their own nor an independent economic foundation on which to build their nations. In fact, their conception of regarding themselves as nations in Azania means their differentiating themselves from the other peoples in terms of race. That is why they adopted the racist concept of multi-racialism. Realising the futility and baselessness of this concept, the "Coloureds" disbanded (CPO) and joined the PAC as Africans in 1966, while the Indians and whites (INC and COD resp.) simply joined the ANC as individuals in 1969.

At present the right wing elements of the "Coloureds" and the Indians have opted for the Bantustan system, but they have not been granted any land by the white bourgeoisie. Instead, they have been promised that they will graze with the white bourgeoisie in the "white pastures". Politically they will have their own separate parliaments and governments under the central leadership of the white executive president (under white domination). This is just a new form of multiracialism. The particular interests of the various categories of the black bourgeoisie were:

**African:** *land and trade.*

**Asian:** *Commerce and trade.*

**"Coloured":** *land and trade.*

The Congress of Democrats (COD), an all white organisation, had the ability and right to acquire all these and to even engage in industry by virtue of their national status as free citizens. Theirs, therefore, was an intellectual or theoretical interest, viz., democracy for the whole of society. They deplored racism and fascism. This explains why the Asians and the revolutionary whites are pre-occupied with civil rights; that is why they see the struggle of Azania as a struggle against apartheid, against racism and against fascism, pure and simple. That is why slogans such as "Izwe Lethu", "Mayibuye", etc. have very little meaning if any at all with these people. Hence they influenced the programme of the ANC (the Freedom Charter has laid much emphasis on civil rights). The Asian bourgeoisie would be able to acquire all they needed if only, like the liberal whites they had all the democratic rights, including full citizenship, then they would have the

right to acquire licences to trade as they wished, and even purchase land.

And finally, the Black Consciousness Movement has demonstrated to them that these black groups can only survive by forming a non-racial nation under the slogans 'Black Power' and 'One Azania', 'One Nation' in which Black means, African, Asian and "Coloured". Let us add that the Azanian nation will include the white worker and the white democrat in its final synthesis. Therefore, there is no basis for a multi-national state in Azania.

### **5. On the Character of the Bogus Republic of South Africa:**

It is often said that the South African situation is complex, exceptional, unique, etc. Indeed it is difficult to analyse and understand the real nature of the South African state, because of the following:

(i) The factor that makes it exceptional or unique is that it is not ruled by the indigenous people, but by a settler nationality, and yet it is not attached to any metropolitan power.

(ii) The other attendant factor is that the settler nationality in power is a small minority compared with the rest of the population, and denies them all political rights (it is fascist).

(iii) The other attendant factor is that the ruling settler nationality is racist.

(iv) The economy is dominated by foreign monopolies, with the settler monopolies as junior partners;

(v) As a result, the South African state is influenced politically and assisted militarily by the western imperialist powers. All these factors, taken together, really make the situation complex. The first three, viz., rule by the settler nationality, fascism and racism, are clearly and undoubtedly colonial factors. The second aspect of the first factor, viz. there is no metropolitan power to which it is attached, bears the assumption that the state is independent.

*The last two factors are a partial negation of independence. There are two relationships which are clearly discernible here, viz., intra-state relationships and interstate relationships. Only by analysing these two relationships, can we understand the true character of the South African state.*

### **Intra-state Relationships:**



The farmers (about 90000) are highly privileged and protected by law. They are subsidised by the state (R 300 millions a year) in the form of credits, artisans (3000 extension officers), seeds, implements, guaranteed prices for their produce, etc. Almost all, if not all the cabinet ministers and members of parliament belong to this class (the Land barons). The farmers are organised into farmers' associations and cooperatives, while the labourers are not allowed any organisation except the church.

### Convict Labour

In the 1950's and the early 1960's, despite the *pass laws* (which were extended to women in 1958) and the policy of labour registration, the farmers continued to experience labour shortages. This led to an intensified use of unconventional methods to secure labour. One of these was the use of "convict labour", which eventually led to the establishment of special labour conscription camps called "farm prisons".

To overcome the anomaly of treating ordinary farms as prisons, the Government later formalised the system by encouraging interested and approved farmers to build farm prisons according to specifications of the Department of Prisons. Over 20 such prisons now exist in Azania, and are concentrated in the western Cape and in the Bethal and Middleburg districts of the Transvaal.

After the harvest, the produce of the farms is stored in large wellbuilt silos and go-downs and then railed to the harbours where it is shipped away for export.

### (b) The 'Homelands':

The Bantustan system in Azania is not an original creation of the present white ruling classes, but a form of colonial policy that was well calculated and formulated towards the close of the 19th century and during the early decades of the 20th century, by British imperialists. The Hertzog government (1934-1936), and finally, the Malan government in 1948 put the final seal and systematised it as official government policy, which governs the lives of millions of our people to date.

The so-called 'homelands' cover only thirteen per cent (13%) 15,232,480 hectares (Bantu, January 1972) - of

the land surface area of Azania, as compared with the eighty-seven per cent (87%) - 106,867,580 hectares of the so-called 'white areas'. *Of the 15.2 million hectares, only fifteen per cent (15%), i.e. between 3000 and 5000 hectares is considered arable or usable land, as compared with 5 million hectares cultivated white farms.* These 'homelands' are composed of 300 pieces of land scattered all around the four provinces of the country. The total population of the 'homelands' is more than 10 million.

### Land Tenure in the 'Homelands':

The predominant norm of land tenure is communal. This accommodates ninety-four per cent (94%) of the 'homelands' population, while the remaining six per cent (6%) live under individual land tenure. These individual plots were purchased before the 1913 Land Act, in what are called 'scheduled areas' in some parts of the Ciskei, Transkei (both in the Cape Province) and Zululand (Natal Province). The administration of these communal lands is vested in the hands of the state president (since 1961) who acts through a spiral of bailiffs:

*State President  
White Magistrates  
African Paramount Chiefs  
African Headmen in the Villages*

Theoretically every family is entitled to not more than 4 acres, as compared with more than 200 hectares in the 'white areas'.

The land is divided into cultivated plots, common pasturage and woodland which is preserved for firewood and building material.

Apart from the acute shortage of land, and mainly because of it, more than forty-eight per cent (48%) of the 'homelands' able-bodied labour force is away in the mines, on the white farms and other heavy manual labour-based industries, at any given time.

### Production in the 'Homelands':

According to the FAO study mentioned above, the plot-holding African peasant in the 'homelands' can produce *no more than 4.2 bags of maize*, his staple food per hectare of his four acres or less. This is not enough for his family and in case of droughts, the situation becomes worse. As for their total production, Barbara Rodgers in "South Africa: The 'Bantu home-

lands' " has this to say:

*"The major dilemma is the fact that the reserves produce only 1.9 per cent of the country's total production."*

This is the situation in the so-called 'homelands', and all propaganda about 'independence' is just rubbish, because nothing has changed substantially, and *nothing can change until the land problem is solved.*

### Classes in the 'Homelands':

Colin Bundy reports that as far back as the 1870's and 1880's, there already was a certain "degree of differentiation and social stratification" taking place among the peasantry.

- (1) Peasant migrants;
- (2) Marginally self-sufficient small peasants;
- (3) Better-off middle peasants using family labour;
- (4) "All the way up to the group of farmers who consolidated early peasant successes and became small commercial farmers.

It is patently clear that, in spite of the uniform land system in the 'homelands', and the uniform privation of agricultural capital and other facilities, the African peasants do not all compose one homogeneous class, neither are they equal. On the contrary, it is quite obvious that they are divided into strata - peasant strata - by this self-same uniform situation. Thus, apart from the *apparently rich peasant class* described above, there certainly are other peasant strata in the 'homelands', this social stratification being determined by the economic conditions of these homelands'.

So it is that we have, therefore:

- (1) *Poor peasants* without land, or with very little and poor land, who farm implements or cattle, who often sell their labour for sheer survival;
- (2) *Middle Peasants* with some land (poor, or barren, or slightly better than that of the poor peasants), some farm implements, and sometimes more cattle; they also sell their labour sometimes in order to make ends meet. It is to be noted that these middle peasants themselves, are not equal in their circumstances, hence some are *lower middle peasants* others *medium middle peasants*, and yet others *upper middle peasants*.

Further it is to be noted that the



economic situation (improvement or discipline) of all these rural strata is conditioned by the migrant labourers' incomes, over and above the internal economic dynamics of the 'homelands'. Be that as it may, there is still some concrete, on the spot social investigation to be made, in order to ascertain and verify the current socio-economic situation in all the 'homelands'.

### The Social Tasks of the National Democratic Revolution:

Socially, the National Democratic Revolution is meant to liberate the productive forces of the nation from foreign control and exploitation. It is meant to achieve two things:

(1) To liberate the peasantry and the farm labourers (rural proletariat) by launching a through-going agrarian revolution, in order to sweep away the patriarchal semi-feudal relations in the countryside, together with the master-servant relations on the white farms.

(2) To liberate the workers from foreign exploitation (by foreign monopolies and their junior partners, the colonist racist bourgeoisie), by launching a radical transformation of the means of production and exchange in industry and commerce; from foreign to local, public ownership. This will go hand-in-hand with the removal of all colour-bar and colour privilege in all trades and skills.

The last measure will lay the material base for the unity of the working class and the working class movement, in preparation for the socialist revolution.

It should be noted that these two measures do not constitute social liberation in general, because there is still room for the exploitation of the workers and peasants by the local (national) bourgeoisie and the bureaucratic capitalists. However, it is a necessary step to be taken in order to ensure the end of the colonial and semi-colonial relationships in the country. It is the real material foundation for political independence, because without economic independence, political independence is only nominal.

This stage (new democratic) should not be unduly prolonged, otherwise the national bourgeoisie and more especially, the emerging bureaucratic bourgeoisie will be entrenched and it will deceive the masses that this is the

end of the road; that this is the ideal society, this is socialist society. The only guarantee that the revolution will not be betrayed at this stage is the leadership of the working class during this entire stage.

### THE TARGETS (ENEMIES) OF THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION:

In Azania they may be classified as follows, according to their relations to the means of production and their attitude towards the revolution:

(1) **Imperialism** – owners of multinational corporations, cartels, trusts and syndicates.

(2) **The Settler Big Bourgeoisie** – (who work in partnership with imperialism) in industry, commerce, transport, land, etc.

(3) **The Bureaucratic Bourgeoisie** – those who wield state power and manipulate it in order to accumulate or protect their capital.

(4) **The Land Barons** – they are engaged in agriculture, animal husbandry, orchards and plantations. In Azania there is no white peasant. All whites who are in the countryside are either big or small farmers. When we speak of the land barons, we mean the owners of the big farms and estates. This land was acquired by force of arms and the indigenous majority of the Africans were forced into small pockets called 'homelands' – 13% of the total territory of Azania. The land barons constitute the **big rural bourgeoisie**.

### THE MOTIVE FORCES – THE PEOPLE:

(1) **The Proletariat**: It is divided into three groups:

(a) All people who are employed in industry, transport, powerstations, water works, construction, telecommunication, municipality, garages, shops, hotels and private houses (domestic servants), etc. who own no means of production, and have no other means of livelihood but to sell their labour power. The **industrial proletariat** is the leading core of this class, because of:

(i) its high concentration and regimentation

(ii) its discipline.

(b) **Rural Proletariat**. All wage labourers in the countryside. It is most exploited and the most wretched strata

of the proletariat in Azania.

(c) **The Lumpen Proletariat**. All people who earn their living by illicit or illegal means. They usually form gangs to protect their interests or to harm other people's interest. Prostitutes and beggars fall within this group.

(2) **Semi-Proletariat**: Basically small handicraftsmen, poor peasants and lower middle peasants. To be found in large numbers in heavy industry transport, power stations, water works, etc. They are employed under contract and are usually migratory labourers. Their greatest numbers are found in the gold, diamond and coal mines – swelled by the proletariat of the neighbouring countries of Lesotho, Mozambique, Malawi and Botswana, on a similar labour contract employment system.

Most of the sewage carters, street sweepers, grave diggers, cleaners in parks, unskilled manual labour in building and construction, hotel workers and domestic servants – come from this category of workers. The semi-proletariat is a reliable ally of the proletariat and the rural proletariat are the main force in the agrarian revolution.

### (3) Petty Bourgeoisie:

Small shop-keepers, small merchants and traders, middle peasants, master handicraftsmen, hawkers, small artisans (tradesmen), professionals, high school and university students. All people who have no surplus or have a little surplus, who do not exploit or exploit very little, who are always on the brink of bankruptcy.

Students are judged according to their family origin or their life style.

### (4) The Middle Bourgeoisie:

The yardstick here should be the black "tycoon", the middle peasants, merchant and trader, small farmers, the rich peasants (rural bourgeoisie) and small industrialist. They are oppressed by imperialism and the big bourgeoisie.

### (5) The White Workers:

They represent the labour aristocrats, the technocrats, the overseer (divorced from manual labour), the elite stratum of the working class. They are workers in so far as they sell their skills and are exploited by imperialism and their own bourgeoisie. As citizens they serve in the armed forces, police and prisons, and as voters they form the social base of the white bourgeoisie. Their "civi-



lised" status is protected by law, e.g. job reservation, etc. Economically they enjoy a very high standard of living as compared with their class brothers.

According to South African law the term employee applies exclusively to white workers, hence they are the only ones who have the right to form legally recognised trade unions. Because of these exclusive rights and privileges they have developed a highly arrogant and contemptuous attitude towards the other workers (of the "lesser races"), and the black people in general.

The same attitude can be observed among the "Coloured" and the Asian Workers whenever they are found in large concentrations, e.g. in Capetown and Durban respectively, so much so that, African workers develop erroneous attitudes towards them.

We do not subscribe to the philistine and racist nationalist view that there are two or three working classes in Azania. We contend that all workers by virtue of their relations to the means of production form one indivisible class.

In Azania we hold that the divisions that have been created by the colonist bourgeoisie do not in themselves create classes within the working class. In

Azania the racists have created three racial strata within the working class, viz.,

- (a) The aristocratic strata composed of the whites.
- (b) The middle strata composed of Asians and "Coloured".
- (c) The lower strata composed of Africans.

To do similarly will be a serious and lamentable pandering to white racism and narrow bourgeois nationalism. Hence we have said that the black workers are the core of the working class in Azania.

We recognise the revolutionary potential of the white aristocratic strata of the working class', and in so far as it is ideologically backward, is not aware of its historical role, and is prepared to learn, we shall treat it as revolutionary and educate it; but in so far as it is racist, arrogant, contemptuous and stubbornly clings to the apron strings of its masters, we shall struggle against it.

Significantly, this is the strata that formed the nucleus of the Communist Party of South Africa and influenced its policies and programme. We are aware that they (CPSA) have made some amendments and even serious at-

tempts at self-criticism, but they still hold erroneous views on fundamental issues, more especially on the national question. They must still be subjected to severe criticism. The same fate awaits the middle strata if they continue to act in the same manner.

The victory or defeat of the Azania revolution depends to a certain extent on the proper or improper handling of these contradictions within the working class.

### Conclusion

The social question at this stage of the revolution is still limited and subordinate to the National Question. The main objective here is to liberate the nation from foreign oppression and exploitation. Within the nation there are still exploiting classes and exploited classes. The final solution of the social question is the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. This cannot come about by the issuing of decrees, making declarations and shouting slogans, but by destroying the germ of exploitation, the capitalist mode of production which is the material base for its existence and growth. The socialist revolution is the necessary sequel to the national democratic revolution.

## Independent Zimbabwe – A Great Victory in the Struggle against Imperialism and Colonialism

By Lutz Plümer – from *Communism and Class Struggle*, June 1980 – Theoretical Organ of the KBW in West Germany. The author was in Zimbabwe at the time of the independence celebrations.

All ZANU representatives with whom I talked emphasised that the solution to the tasks of realising the aims of the liberation struggle after the attainment of national independence would not be easier than the struggle to gain national independence. "We did not expect that we would take over the government of Zimbabwe as we did. We had planned to smash the colonial regime through armed struggle, and then assume political power. But we were also prepared to take over government after a negotiated settlement and a victory at the polls. Accordingly we elaborated corresponding plans for the latter solution. We probably needed more time for our preparations, but we will observe the Lancaster House Agreement which we have accepted."

The Agreement which was negotiated at Lancaster House concerning the constitution of an independent Zimbabwe, the truce and transitional rule until the holding of free and general elections is a compromise between the British colonial power and the people of Zimbabwe represented by the liberation movement. The British colonial power had to accept this compromise because through armed struggle the biggest part of the country had already been liberated. It was a compromise because the colonial power still could retain important parts of the country, particularly the towns and the main communications. The main advantage of the compromise was that the superpowers could be kept out of the struggle. The US Imperialists did not take part either in the negotiations nor in

the supervision of the elections. And the social imperialists did not get a chance to interfere under the pretext of the support of the liberation struggle. The fact that the government has been extremely aware of the social imperialists has been shown clearly in several instances. For example the delegation of the Soviet Union which wished to visit Zimbabwe before the independence celebrations in order to set up contacts was refused entry visas for a separate visit. The GDR (East Germany) leadership, during its visit to Mozambique had tried to blackmail ZANU to condemn the actions of the Peoples Republic of China against the border provocations of Vietnam. On this basis it was prepared to give assistance to it. It also was not invited to the independence celebrations. Similarly, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia were not invited.

The necessity to make such a compromise as occurred at Lancaster House is supported by several reasons. The establishment of a united front of the people of Zimbabwe as well as a united front with the African countries, above



all the front line states, was an important basis for the progress of the liberation struggle, while also being the basis as a defence against the imperialist efforts to intervene. The progress of this united front would have been endangered if ZANU would not have accepted the Lancaster compromise. The front line states have always supported the liberation struggle of Zimbabwe, but the continuous threats and aggressions of the Rhodesian Army, above all against Mozambique and Zambia, were a great burden to the economies of these countries, which are also dependent upon imperialism.

A quick end to the war and the realisation of the political independence of Zimbabwe to lay the foundations for a Southern African economic community in order to loosen the strangulation of the South African colonial state and to get rid of it was an acute necessity for these countries. We must also take into account the fact that the Soviet social-imperialists benefitted greatly from the difficulties experienced by Mozambique during this period in its efforts to bring the country into a state of dependence. Through the independence of Zimbabwe the policy of non-alignment pursued in this region has been strengthened.

The conditions laid down in the Lancaster Agreement during the transitional period and for the holding of elections were extremely unfavourable for ZANU. The difficulties which confronted ZANU was reported by comrade D. Mutumbuka, Minister of *Education and Culture*, thus: "When we returned from London to participate in the elections to carry on with the election campaign, we had to face numerous serious setbacks. One of the severest setbacks not only in connection with the election campaign but also for the entire revolution was the tragic death of Comrade Joshua Tongogara, our Secretary for Defence for 17 years who was head of ZANLA forces. It took us some time to recover from this. Then we tried to return to Zimbabwe. Lord Soames virtually hindered us. Finally the front line states had to intervene. All others including our colleagues from ZAPU were allowed to return. They were allowed to engage in the election campaign immediately, but they put every hindrance in our path. Eventually they allowed some of us to return, because the comrades in the assembly camps

stated that if their leaders did not return they would neither. As soon as we were allowed to return leading members of ZANU were given the assignments to lead certain electoral districts. I was for instance responsible for the Victoria District. When we arrived there it was virtually impossible to do anything. We were deceived in every respect. We were not given an office. All the other parties were given offices. We were not even allowed to get accommodation. We had bought 2000 vehicles for the election campaign with money which we had received from solidarity organisations, for instance, the KBW. We were refused permission to take the cars across the borders. From the 2000 we could only import 6. But when the masses realized that the British and the Rhodesians countermanded us in every respect they all rushed to us with assistance, they offered us cars, we only had to choose from them. Our people were absolutely great. A woman from Victoria gave us her office which we used as our office. We received food and everything we needed. When we had realized that there were all these hindrances we carried out rallies and told the masses: "this is the situation, what can we do?" We have fought for this country, we want to win the elections, that the sacrifices which we have made will be meaningful. The masses rallied and supported us in every respect. By the time the election campaign really got underway the Rhodesians got very worried and began to persecute ZANU with penalties. They started to detain sympathisers of ZANU in great numbers all over the country. The prisons suddenly were filled up with ZANU cadres and followers. As this did not help they even went further and detained the leaders one after another. I, for instance, was arrested and imprisoned thrice. Again and again we were thrown into prison. We had to call at the police station three times a week - until the day came when the election results were published. And then you should have seen how they reacted. Suddenly they withdrew their accusations and said we were the greatest. Now the Rhodesians used sugar-coated bullets to moderate us and to bring us to a certain situation favourable to them.

#### **All the Wealth of Zimbabwe is the Private Property of the Imperialists**

Zimbabwe is an extremely rich country

and the greatest parts of the soil are very fertile.

In Zimbabwe 1,5 million tons of maize, 78 tons of wheat, 270000 tons of sorghum, 5000 tons of rice, 23000 tons of potatoes, 2 million tons of sugar cane, all sorts of vegetables, 24000 tons of oranges, lemon and other citrus fruits, 2000 tons of tea, 73000 tons of tobacco, 44000 tons of raw cotton (without kernels) are produced according to official statistics. In addition there are herds of 5,6 million cattle, 179,000 pigs, sheep and 1,9 million goats. All raw materials except crude oil are produced in Zimbabwe. In 1973 3 million tons of coal, 500,000 tons of ferrous metals, 32 tons of copper, 600,000 tons of tin concentrates, 12,000 tons of nickel, 181 tons of chrome metal, 4000 tons of pure silver, 16 tons of gold, 151 tons of Wolfram, sulphur, asbestos, magnesium and so forth, was produced. Most raw materials are in great abundance. Therefore all natural conditions to develop a national economy based on self-reliance are extremely favourable. But all the wealth of the country the imperialists have transferred to their private property. 300,000 Europeans own more than 18,2 million hectares of arable land while 7 million Africans are distributed over just 16.3 million of Tribal Trust Land. The European settlers have the most fertile lands. The agriculture of the African peasants is mainly subsistence while the Europeans produce mainly cash crops for exports. The industries are completely controlled by the imperialist monopolies. Investigations about foreign direct investment in Zimbabwe which was published just shortly before independence in Salisbury show that the proportion of foreign investments in Zimbabwe is 70%. Since UDI the foreign net capital export including re-invested profits have amounted to 1.02 billion Rhodesian dollars. The share of Great Britain in the foreign direct investments amounted to 815 million Rhodesian dollars and the share of the South Africans amounted to 583 million Rhodesian dollars. South Africa itself is a colony of U.S. Imperialism and British capital and in which the West German imperialists also participate to a considerable extent. In addition Zimbabwe also depends upon South Africa for foreign trade. One reason for that is the economic embargo which was imposed upon Rhodesia after UDI by



the U.N. Further Zimbabwe has no direct link to the sea. It is planned in the future to carry the mainparts of Zimbabwe's exports and imports through Mozambique's ports, Beira and Maputo. But it will be some time before the railway of Mozambique and the capacity of the Mozambiquan harbours can be enlarged to absorb these additional quantities. The colonial regime accumulated 200 million (British Sterling) debts with the imperialists. From that 125 million Pound goes to South Africa and 70 million to British Banks. In order to develop the trade with the imperialist countries to get credits the Zimbabwean government was forced to take over these debts, as long as they did not accrue from purchases of arms. This includes repayments of credits from South Africa. "I do not agree with South Africa's policies but let's take the railways as an example. Presently, all our exports and imports go through South Africa. If we can cut this trade route at once we would cut our throats straightaway", declared Enos Nkala, Finance Minister of Zimbabwe.

The dependence of Zimbabwe upon imperialism cannot be overcome in a short period and the measures which can be taken to remove this dependence are restricted by the constitution which was agreed at Lancaster. By the constitution private property was guaranteed. The expropriation without compensation is forbidden and the pension rights of the colonial Civil Service are guaranteed as well. But it is not only the constitution which is against the un-compensatory nationalisation of industry, and the whole landed property of the settlers and its distribution to the peasants of Zimbabwe, the entire colonial state machinery is still in the hands of the colonial civil servants. The colonial police and the colonial army still exist while a great part of the liberation army still is stationed at the assembly points. The administration of industry is also fully in the hands of the colonialists who in addition systematically have hindered the African proletariat from acquiring the level of education necessary to handle the complicated industrial activities. The colonialists still concentrate considerable power in their hands.

The course which the government of Zimbabwe pursues is geared to break this power step by step and to avoid

larger battles at a point where the power of the people is not sufficiently consolidated. The amalgamation of the old colonial army and the liberation forces of the two into a unified army is supposed to be settled by the end of the year. The amalgamation of the two armies means that the commanders of the liberation forces assume the decisive command positions in the national army of Zimbabwe.

The colonial Civil Service in the ministries and in the provincial and district administrations were not dismissed, but through the development of democratic district administrations the colonial state machinery will be restricted step by step, in the course of this year. The nationalisation of the imperialist capital is not envisaged in the foreseeable future, Mugabe said. The Minister of Works and Social Affairs, Comrade Kangai, has announced the development of trade unions and the election of workers representatives and workers councils in the factories, which with regard to work conditions and on questions of production will have decisive rights as to participation and veto. On this basis the precondition will be established which will enable the African working class to take over the industrial production on all levels. On June 1st minimum wages were determined: 70 Dollars for industrial works, 58 dollars for miners, 30 dollars for agricultural workers, per month. If one compares this minimum wages to the wage distribution upto June 1977, more recent statistics are not available, 90% of the miners, 75% of the agricultural workers had lower wages. One has to assume since 1977 the wages in Zimbabwe has not considerably increased. The increase of minimum wages is enforced by the beginning of 1981 for industrial workers upto 85 dollars a month and for agricultural workers and domestic workers upto 45 dollars. Dismissal of workers after the introduction of minimum wages are to be prosecuted by the authorities.

#### **Measures of the Government to solve the Land Question.**

Simba Makoni, Assistant Vice Minister for Agriculture told me the following about the measures that the government will take to improve the conditions of the African peasants and to get rid of famine in the country: "We envisage that the land which is presently not utilised, the land which is

part of the category of European land but not settled and utilised, will be given to the people. When we use up this land which is a fairly great amount we will go further and look at the land which is in the hands of private property and see whether it is profitably utilised. If it is not the case we will take measures to utilise this land more efficiently, either by transferring it into private land of the Black farmers or what we consider as still more important, on the basis of cooperative production. We assume that we can satisfy the hunger of the people for land as a first step on the whole without appropriating such land which is privately owned. But in the long run it is our duty to reduce considerably the extension of the big and private agricultural farms."

"We want to reduce the concentration of people in the urban areas because we assume the urban areas will not be able to absorb a great number of people. Additionally agriculture is the basis of our economy. It provides sufficient food for our people and it is also the basis of our export which helps us to obtain foreign currencies. Therefore we want to employ a greater part of our peoples in the rural areas and to reduce over-population and pressure on the towns."

"We want to strengthen our agriculture. We want to diminish the flow from rural to urban areas and to encourage the masses to return to the rural areas because we are convinced that the land will provide accommodation and employment for their living for a great number of people."

"With regard to the development of co-operatives: it is correct we do not wish to force the people into participation of any programme about which they are not yet clear, and with which they might not be too happy. But our hope is that if we explain to the peasants the advantages and achievements of co-operatives then they will freely participate in them and come together for unifying cooperative work. There will be many who will agree in principle but would like to get to know more about how this programme will look like in detail. First we wish to carry out a programme of conscious building about what the programme for co-ops means and what benefits it will bring to the farmers. When they understand that there will not be the need to force anybody into anything we will have from the beginn-



ing a force of volunteers from our people who will participate in the co-op movements."

About the effects of the war on the situation in agriculture Comrade Makoni reported: "The situation is at the same time good and bad. It is good in the sense that the white commercial farms are not very damaged through the war, most of the the commercial farmers, most of the white farmers, settled in the central area and the amount of military activities was not as big as in the urban areas where our people are. The reason for this is that the participation of our people in the war. We had to move where our people were. Therefore most of the military activities took place in the rural areas. The military action of the old regime was mainly geared to protect those areas in which the white farmers lived. To keep the white farmers out of the military actions was a basic tactic of the old regime. But the great bulk of our people was badly hit. The resettlement of our people in the concentration camps, the so-called protected villages, the restrictions of free movement of the masses, the curfew, the situation of emergency, all this meant that they did not pursue agricultural activities and work as they would have liked. In the main part of our rural areas agriculture had come to a standstill. The peasants could only cultivate near their homes without breaking the emergency regulations. Animal husbandry was also considerably hit, particularly in the rural areas where the institutions of veterinary services and all other services were destroyed. Because of this half of the animal husbandry was killed. To sum up one can say that we have a fairly active commercial sector but the rural areas have been hard hit and we must provide a lot of help in order to rehabilitate and revitalise them. The people and the government of Zimbabwe have to face in all other areas similar great difficulties in the reconstruction of the services which have been destroyed by the colonial regime during the war.

#### **Question of further consolidation of national unity.**

There are two African peoples in Zimbabwe: the Shona and the Ndebele peoples. The Shona people constitute 80% of the population of Zimbabwe, the Ndebele people approx. 20%. To stigmatise contradictions between these two people and to parallel to that

the contradictions between ZANU und ZAPU was always an important constituent part of imperialist intrigues against the liberation struggle of the people of Zimbabwe. To strengthen the unity of the nation of Zimbabwe which has been founded in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism will be an important task. Comrade Mutumbuka said to me that to learn two languages in the schools (one of the two African languages and English) would be obligatory. This would be valid for the Europeans of which presently not more than 0.01% know one of the two African languages.

Comrade Zvobgo, Secretary of ZANU for Information and Publicity and Minister of Local Affairs, said: the imperialists have always declared that after the elections there will be war, there will be bloodshed between ZANLA and ZIPRA if one of the two parties would win. Where is there civil war. We have stated that there will be no civil war and there has been none. Now the imperialists say that the Ndebele would be angered because they feared their language and their culture would be negated. That is an old trick. There is clearly no basis for that. Nobody in this government will force a language on anybody. There is no reason for that. In this country there exists two African languages. With this we can cope. It is not like in other countries of the Third World where there are sometimes hundreds of languages which produce real problems of administration. One cannot assume to be the government of a country if one would try to force a language onto people even if it was a minority. What we want is that all Shona and Ndebele forget to be Shona and Ndebele and that they build one nation. This is what we pursued in ZANLA all through the war. We had Ndebele and Shona and we gave a new name to everybody because we wanted to root out tribalism. And one could not distinguish from the names whether one would come from Umtali or Salisbury. I was not permitted to ask somebody where he came from. He would simply say "I am Zimbabwean." This spirit we want to introduce amongst our entire people so that we can develop as one nation and not as tribes. The enemy did not question whether you were Shona or Ndebele when he shot at you. You were a liberation fighter. That was enough for him - to try to kill you."

On questions about the further strengthening of the Patriotic Front Comrade Zvobgo said: "Our aim is to consolidate the power of the people. This government is no coalition government. It is a ZANU government with which other parties are invited to participate. It is important to emphasise this difference. During the entire 16 years liberation war, we were always treated as equals. We knew that this did not correspond with the real condition. Now the people have pinpointed this situation, one cannot have a dual government, a leadership of two co-Prime Ministers, two co-Presidents. It was O.K. when we carried out the armed struggle. Now the people have spoken. The decision is quite clear. We do not wish to mislead anybody. This is the government of the majority Party."

"We have said to ZAPU: we were partners in the war, let us be partners in peace also. We invite you to participate in the government. They took the position that they will win the next election. That is their right. It is their right to carry out a campaign to win the next elections. But it is obvious that one cannot form a common government and at the same time oppose the common government. Either ZANU (PF) and the Patriotic Front are in one government which presently is the case and they assume common standpoint, or if that is not possible and the other partners wants to win the next elections he is completely free to form an opposition."

I do not believe that one Patriotic Front is necessary, in order to create within ZANU and ZAPU the same situation as when we were abroad. We will quarrel and quarrel and we will get nowhere. This is my personal conviction. We will continue the alliance but we must see how we can consolidate it. Because President Nkomo wants to become the Prime Minister, that is his right. It is possible to unify the 2 parties and to build one Party, then ZANU is prepared for that. When we were abroad we always stated: the question of leadership should be decided by the people. Now the people have decided. We see no necessity to sit together and discuss the question whether Mr. Nkomo or Mr. Mugabe should be President of the Patriotic Front. What remains to consolidate our unity is that ZAPU follows us and we follow them. ZANU is prepared for this."



## Brief History of the Mozambiquan Revolution — Part 1

This paper was delivered by *Peter Meyns*, author of two books on Mozambique and Tanzania at the Economic Symposium on Zimbabwe in Salisbury in September 1980. This first abridged part deals with a

The colonial legacy, liberation ideology and post-independence development strategy can be looked upon a thesis, antithesis and synthesis. This dialectical framework of analysis allows an understanding of the complicated and *contradictory process of development* which Mozambique has been undergoing since independence.

### 1. The colonial legacy

Independence left Mozambique with an economy geared to the interests of the former colonial power, Portugal, as well as other international capitalist interests, and largely integrated into the economic structure of southern Africa under the domination of South Africa. The main features of this colonial legacy were the plantation and settler dominated, and export-oriented agriculture; and the entrepot character of the economy dependent on the provision of services, such as railway and harbour facilities, and migrant labour to neighbouring countries, in particular South Africa.

### Colonial agriculture

For decades Portugal geared colonial agriculture in Mozambique completely to the task of propping its own backward economy. This policy involved isolating the colonial economy from other external relations. Production of agricultural cash crops for exportation and the promotion of Portuguese settlement of the colony were the main characteristics of a policy directed towards the integration of the "Overseas Provinces" into the "metropolis" Portugal. The system of exploitation of indigenous peasants is best described by forced cotton cultivation.

In 1960 12 commercial enterprises with cotton monopolies were operating in Mozambique. The largest of them covered whole provinces. In the early 30s the coercive measures were intensified. It was not until then that Portugal achieved the desired results. In 1925 Portugal had imported a mere 800 tons of cotton from its colonies. In 1937 its textile industry received 36% of its cotton supplies from the col-

onial background history of the Mozambiquan struggle. Part two deals with the problems of transforming liberation ideology into national development strategy and will appear in the next issue.

onies, and this figure increased to 65% in 1946 and over 80% in the 1950s. Mozambique's export of cotton increased from 4000 tons annually before 1936 to 40000 tons of cotton fibre in 1961. Cotton had by then become Mozambique's most important export product accounting for 27% of the country's total exports in 1961.

The advantage of the "cotton regime" for Portugal's textile industry, for a long time the country's main industrial sector, was twofold. For one it saved considerable amounts of foreign exchange. In addition, it benefitted from Portugal's protectionist policy whereby the price of cotton exported from Mozambique to Portugal was fixed at a level far below the world market price and the export of fixed quantities to the metropole was obligatory. In the years 1947/48 to 1954/55 Portugal bought cotton from Mozambique at an average price of 14,08 Escudos a kg, while the same produce fetched 27,12 Escudos a kg on the world market. With the help of these protectionist advantages the Portuguese textile industry was able to maintain its competitiveness. The colonies were also reserved as the main market for the export of the finished products of the Portuguese textile industry.

Those who suffered from this system of forced cotton production were the indigenous peasants. They had to reduce their acreage hitherto used for food crops drastically in order to plant cotton. But then, due to the low prices fixed for cotton, what they received from their cash crop was often barely enough to pay for the head tax which the colonial administration had also imposed on them. Widespread hunger and suffering were the inevitable result.

The production of sugar, another of the country's major export crops, was similarly tied to the Portuguese market by export regulations. Since the early 1960's plantations and settler farms came to the fore in the field of cotton

production, too. One reason for this was that the advance of the national liberation struggle together with growing international condemnation of the practice of forced labour forced the Portuguese colonial regime to change its policy, as far as the form of exploitation was concerned, and to give up forced cultivation of cotton step by step.

These changes did not lead to an improvement in the situation of the African rural population because a time of further expansion of the plantation and settler economy set in, further alienation of large areas of the most fertile lands from the African peasants by white settlers. The "cotton regime" had been terminated, but new regulations had been introduced whereby areas of up to 5000 hectares for farm land and 25000 hectares for pasture could be allocated to settlers. On the basis of this regulation 239312 hectares of land were alienated from the indigenous peasants in the provinces of Maputo, Gaza and Zambezia between 1960 and 1964. The plantations and settler farms produced the major part of nearly all agricultural export crops, namely sugar, cotton, tea, sisal, citrus fruits, wood and copra. Even those products traditionally regarded as the indigenous peasants' cash crops, namely cashew nuts and cotton, were increasingly cultivated on settler farms and plantations.

The African peasants received hardly any support from the colonial administration in order to prevent them from competing with the settlers, and, at the same time, to make and keep them available as cheap labour for the plantations and settler farms. Furthermore, the mining companies in the neighbouring countries of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia were also interested in cheap labour and Portugal had signed agreements with the white minority regimes there to supply them with labour. To provide cheap labour was, in fact, the main function of the African population in the colonial economy.

As a consequence African peasant agriculture remained to a large extent at the level of subsistence production. Plantation and settler agriculture remained predominant in Mozambique until the end of colonial rule. Plantation owners and Portuguese settlers were two major factions of the colonial bourgeoisie and as such determined the agricultural policy of the colonial ad-



ministration. The distribution of land at the end of colonial rule in Mozambique aptly sums up the situation. 0,2% of all units of production, namely the plantations and the settler farms, owned nearly 50% of the cultivated land, which, in addition, is the most fertile land in the country. At the other extreme the small peasants with less than 2 hectares of land each while totalling 76,2% of all units of production cultivate only 23,7% of the land.

#### **Industry and foreign trade**

Industrial development of any significance did not start in Mozambique until the 1960's after the beginning of the liberation struggle. In 1965 Portugal abolished the remaining restrictions on foreign capital investment in order to win its allies, in particular the USA and South Africa, for a stronger involvement in its colonies. As a belated attempt to prop Portuguese colonialism in Africa these measures failed.

What they did achieve was a rapid increase in foreign capital interests in Mozambique. Now additional investments in the field of industrial processing of agricultural raw materials, such as sugar, cashew nuts and cotton, as well as consumer goods production were made principally by South African and French companies but also by British and Italian.

The search for mineral deposits did not start on a larger scale until the late 60's. The belated investment boom in Mozambique did push industrial development ahead at growth rates usually above 10% annually between 1960 and 1973.

Industrial development in colonial Mozambique was not based on the country's own resources, and was not geared to the consumption needs of the mass of the people, but to those of the colonial power, the settlers, the colonial army, and the white South Africans and Rhodesians who used to flock to Mozambique on business and holiday.

Mozambique's external trade relations before independence also show the structural weakness of its economy, and its dependence on Portugal and western imperialist countries. The only mineral to be exploited in larger quantities was coal at the Moatize mines in Tete province, but the amount exported was small and relatively insignificant. All mineral exports together in 1970 and 1971 brought Mozambique an income of

less than 100 million Escudos, i.e. about 2% of the total export income in those years.

In face of such a large and increasing structural deficit of its trade balance Mozambique depended on other sources of foreign exchange income to pay for its imports and to avoid overall balance of payments deficits. These are payments resulting from the use of its port and railway facilities by neighbouring foreign countries, from the money spent by tourists in Mozambique and from the transfers of Mozambican migrant labourers employed outside the country. These features of Mozambique's external economic relations show the specific characteristics of the dependent economic structure which Portuguese colonialism bequeathed to this country.

#### **Dependence on South Africa**

Migrant labour from Mozambique had already been employed in South Africa before gold was discovered in the Transvaal, the South African province bordering on southern Mozambique, in 1885. After the industrial exploitation of the gold resources started demand for cheap labour increased rapidly. By the turn of the century already saw over 40000 Mozambican workers go to work in the Transvaal annually. Sending migrant labour to South Africa was a profitable affair for the colonial administration. According to the system of "deferred payment" the Mozambican workers only received 40% of their wages during their contract period of up to 1 1/2 years. The rest was transferred to the colonial administration which deducted outstanding tax payments and other costs, and paid the workers the remaining sum in Escudos when they returned to Mozambique. This gave the colonial regime a source of foreign exchange. A further advantage related to the system of "deferred payment" agreed upon in the Mozambique Convention did not become apparent until much later.

When the Convention was signed in 1928 it was agreed that South Africa would pay Portugal the amount due for the migrant laborers "deferred payment" in gold calculated at the internationally fixed price, which stood at 42 US-dollars per ounce after 1973. However, today gold is traded on the international gold market at a price determined on the free market. As a result the gold price has risen to levels far above the official rate. In April

1978 for instance it stood at about 180 US-dollars per ounce. This gave Portugal foreign exchange earnings up to four times as high as before, because it could sell the gold it received for 42 US-dollars an ounce on the free market for prices up to 180 US-dollars and at times even more. During the colonial period this additional foreign exchange income went straight to the metropole. It did not appear in the Mozambican balance of payments at all, even after the close financial integration of the Escudo zone was abolished in 1972.

For the independent government of Mozambique the issue of exporting migrant labour is a structural problem. Given the backwardness of the economy it inherited from Portuguese colonialism it will need time to create productive employment for the migrant labourers within Mozambique. The number of migrant workers going to South has, however, been going down since independence. The figures for official recruitment were 1975: 91,356; 1976: 67,436 and 1977: 34,817.

South Africa has avoided putting Mozambique under direct economic pressure after independence though by supporting the illegal Smith regime and the Smith-Muzorewa coalition until their end it was also indirectly working towards the isolation and weakening of Mozambique's stand. Principally, however, South Africa is trying to break through its own isolation by cooperating with its African neighbours. The issue of the gold payments was solved by South Africa in April 1978 without a direct confrontation with Mozambique. South Africa declared that it had decided to revalue its gold reserves as from April 10, 1978 in accordance with the abolishment of the official gold price by the International Monetary Fund in 1976 which left it to all IMF-member countries to fix their gold price in line with the market price. This meant that Mozambique immediately lost the advantages from which it had benefitted as long as payments were made according to the lower official gold price. Given its precarious balance of payments situation this was quite a loss. In 1975 Mozambique had received an additional foreign exchange income of about 150-175 millions US-dollars as a result of the old agreement. Because of the lower number of migrant workers this amount had been lower in 1976



and 1977. But it was expected that South Africa would send larger amounts of goods through Mozambique so as at least partially to offset the foreign exchange losses caused by the new gold price arrangement.

South Africa does have economic interests of its own to maintain relations with Mozambique. Not only do the mines continue to need migrant labourers, but South African wants to continue to use Maputo's harbour facilities as an outlet for the external trade from the Transvaal. Maputo harbour was geared to the needs of South Africa. Numerous facilities there specifically serve South Africa's *foreign trade*. The same is true of the railway lines serving Maputo. One leads to the Transvaal and is virtually monopolized by South Africa. One gives land-locked Swaziland its only outlet to the sea. The third one leads to Zimbabwe and was closed from March 1976 to December 1979 when Mozambique applied sanctions against the illegal Smith regime.

Because of its extensive use of Mozambique's transport facilities South Africa became Mozambique's most important source of foreign exchange. The "deferred payments" on the migrant labour account and tourist expenditure were additional sources of foreign exchange from South Africa. Colonial Mozambique depended and independent Mozambique continues to depend on economic relations with South Africa to pay for at least part of its chronic external trade deficit and bring its external payments into balance. The Cabora Bassa Dam is a further element of the dependence on South Africa Mozambique inherited from Portuguese colonialism. Its aim was to strengthen the integration of Mozambique into a southern African system led by racist South Africa and firmly controlled by US imperialism and its western allies.

Today, the character of Cabora Bassa has changed insofar as colonialism has been defeated and Mozambique has achieved political independence. Cabora Bassa has now become a potentially enormous source of energy for the economy of Mozambique, but given the quantity and direction of energy production installed it represents a development potential for Mozambique that can only materialize in a middle or even long-term perspective.

Apart from that, however, the hydro-electric scheme was geared from the start to supplying South Africa with large amounts of energy, one of the most important parts of the Cabora Bassa project being the 1400 km transmission line to the Transvaal.

In the short run, to finance the costs of the project, about 650 million US-dollars, Mozambique has no alternative other than supplying energy to South Africa.

The Portuguese state holds a share of 14%, and the rest is held by Portuguese finance institutions. The Portuguese side is in charge of the enterprise until all commitments resulting from the construction of the Cabora Bassa scheme have been met. Thereafter Mozambique will take over the majority of shares, and three years later will become the only shareholder, i.e. Cabora Bassa will then be transformed into a state enterprise. It is likely to be 30 or 40 years before that is achieved.

#### **Sanctions against the illegal Smith regime**

Much of what has been said about South Africa was true about Mozambique's relations to the white settler regime in Southern Rhodesia as well, before Mozambique applied the UN sanctions against the Smith regime. Migration labour and the use of transport facilities were the two key elements of these relations. The United Nations team investigating the impact of sanctions on the economy of Mozambique estimated that more than 80000 Mozambicans were working in Zimbabwe when sanctions were applied.

For the Smith regime Mozambique was a vital trade outlet as Zimbabwe is a land-locked country and the Beira-Salisbury railway line is the shortest connection to the sea.

For Mozambique itself applying sanctions against the Smith regime meant accepting considerable economic burdens, because given the externally oriented structure of its economy sanctions were bound to have repercussions. The most important factor was the loss of earnings from transport and harbour traffic. Migration labour to Zimbabwe was also interrupted causing a loss of money transfers by the labourers to their families in Mozambique. This, in turn,

made immediate measures of support for the labourers and their families necessary. Other fields where sanctions caused losses to Mozambique were tourism, trade, and employment generally due to lower production in various economic sectors.

Needless to say all these losses are also foreign exchange losses and, therefore, aggravate Mozambique's balance of payments situation with their full amount. For the first year after sanctions the UN mission established the need for immediate investments in Mozambique to the tune of 31 million US-dollars. These investments result from Mozambique's dependence on Zimbabwe in a number of economic and infrastructural fields. For instance, the only railway link between Mozambique's two main towns, ports and industrial centres, Maputo and Beira, runs inland via the Zimbabwean capital, Salisbury. When that line was closed in 1976 additional transport capacity was needed in Mozambique to maintain internal trade links between these two towns and their hinterland via road traffic.

All in all the UN mission concluded that the economic consequences of *sanctions on Mozambique would total an estimated 139 to 165 million US-dollars in the first year, and between 108 and 134 million US-dollars for each following year*. In addition, the damage caused by the countless incursions of the rebel Rhodesian army onto Mozambican territory between 1976 and 1979 has to be taken into consideration. Not only were infrastructural installations, roads, bridges, railway lines etc., worth millions of US-dollars destroyed in these attacks but hundreds of innocent people in the border provinces died and many villages and fields were ransacked.

Mozambique's situation as a result of sanctions was similar to Zambia's situation when it imposed sanctions against the Smith regime in 1973. Though in both cases the United Nations appealed to all member nations to help these two countries meet the consequences of sanctions and though quite a number of nations did make contributions to the Assistance Programme in various ways, in both cases Zambia and Mozambique had to carry the brunt of the weight themselves. In either case the main outside help came from other Third World countries. However, on more than one occasion



members of either government have stated, as Mozambique's Finance Minister did that his country "had received very little economic help to offset the massive losses incurred after the closure of the border with Rhodesia."

### **Economic sabotage and the exodus of white settlers**

The last, but certainly not least important, aspect of the colonial legacy in Mozambique we have to look at relates to the consequences of the colonial bourgeoisie's widespread acts of economic sabotage before and after independence, which caused great damage and disrupted the country's economy. They were not prepared to relinquish their political and economic power and their privileges without a last-ditch struggle. The main forms of economic sabotage used by the colonial bourgeoisie were::

- capital flight, i.e. the transfer of all liquid assets out of the country. During the pre-independence period, when FRELIMO was not yet in power, whole factory units were taken out of the country;
- escape of settlers and factory owners to Portugal or South Africa leaving their employees to their own fate;
- outright destruction of factory and farm buildings, machines and other fixed assets which were left behind;
- running down of production, thereby creating bottlenecks and crises, particularly in the distribution of consumption goods;
- disseminating fear among white employees by organising criminal acts, murders and so on in order to precipitate their flight from the country and thereby to further cripple the economy and throw it into chaos, as these people had hitherto supplied the manpower in nearly all fields of government administration and economic enterprises in industry, trade and agriculture.

## **2. Armed liberation struggle and the development of FRELIMO's ideology**

### **The struggle of two lines, 1968 - 70**

The national liberation struggle in Mozambique was initiated and developed as a complete negation of the established Portuguese colonial

system. Uniting three nationalist organisations and other patriotic individuals FRELIMO, the Mozambique Liberation Front, was founded in 1962. (31) The Front's platform centred around the demand for unconditional and complete independence. The intransigence of Portuguese colonialism, however, quickly made it apparent that to achieve that aim the use of force was inevitable.

### **The struggle of two lines, 1968 - 70**

Between March 1968 and May 1970 a rapid sequence of events occurred which illustrate the various contradictions which FRELIMO had to tackle during this period.

In March 1968 the pupils of the FRELIMO secondary school in Dar es Salaam staged a rebellion in protest against having to go to work in the liberated zones during their holidays and, more generally, subordinating their education to the requirements of the liberation struggle. Furthermore, their action was directed against a number of white teachers and other experts who were supporting FRELIMO in Tanzania. The Tanzanian authorities had to close the school.

In May 1968 a group of unorganised refugees from Mozambique, who lived in Tanzania and all belonged to the Makonde people from the province of Cabo Delgado, stormed the FRELIMO office in Dar es Salaam. A member of FRELIMO's Central Committee, Mateus Mutemba, was killed in this clash.

In July 1968 the 2nd Congress of FRELIMO was held in the liberated zones of the Niassa province.

In December 1968 the deputy chief of staff of the FRELIMO liberation army, Kankhomba, was murdered as he was crossing the Rovuma river from Tanzania to Mozambique.

In January 1969 Lazaro Kavandame, FRELIMO Provincial Secretary of Cabo Delgado province, was dismissed from his post by the Executive Committee and as a result automatically lost his seat on the Central Committee. A FRELIMO commission of inquiry had established that he was misusing his posts for his personal enrichment. He was also suspected of having organised the murder of Kankhomba. Shortly afterwards Kavandame defected to the colonial administration and later put himself at the disposal of

the Portuguese colonial regime's campaign of "psycho-social warfare" against the liberation struggle and FRELIMO.

On the 3rd February 1969 the President of FRELIMO, Eduardo Mondlane, was killed by a letter bomb in Dar es Salaam most probably dispatched by the Portuguese colonial regime.

In April 1969 the Central Committee of FRELIMO appointed a three man collective to lead the organisation. It was composed of Simango, who had been Mondlane's vice-president, Samora Machel, commander-in-chief of FRELIMO's liberation army, and Marcelino dos Santos.

In November 1969 and February 1970 Simango published two documents in which he raised serious charges against Samora Machel and dos Santos as well as against Mondlane's widow and other white FRELIMO collaborators. He called for the broadest unity of the "black masses", of all Mozambicans within FRELIMO. He claimed that Machel and dos Santos were conspiring to kill him.

In November 1969, after the publication of Simango's first pamphlet the Executive Committee suspended Simango from his membership in the presidential collective. In May 1970 the Central Committee expelled Simango from its ranks and from FRELIMO. Furthermore, Samora Machel was appointed as the new president of FRELIMO and Marcelino dos Santos as his vice-president.

In the analysis of these events we pinpoint those positions and attitudes first of all which stood in opposition to the successful advance of the national liberation struggle: the aspiration towards the privileges of a new elite, racism, tribalism and economic exploitation of the mass of the people.

During the liberation struggle an attitude had emerged which Mondlane had characterised in his report to the 2nd FRELIMO Congress when he said: "... some Mozambicans want to have privileges now and after independence." This remark was directed particularly at an important section of the pupils at the Mozambique Institute whom FRELIMO had given the possibility to attend a secondary school. "They want to learn and at the same time they want independence without having taken part in the struggle to achieve this aim. For



they believe that after independence not those who have fought will rule the country but those who have studied – the so-called intellectuals.”

In contrast, the position which FRELIMO asserted frequently during the liberation struggle was to identify “the enemy not on the basis of race or national origin but of attitudes” and to commit itself to work for “the complete abolition of racism and tribalism.”

The contradictions with Kavandame had already sharpened before the 2nd Congress. It became apparent that Kavandame had always put tribal aims above national consciousness. He refused to participate in the 2nd Congress and also prevented the other 7 delegates from the Cabo Delgado politico-administrative apparatus from attending. As a result Cabo Delgado province was only represented by the 9 delegates nominated by the liberation army. After the Congress a meeting was arranged between the FRELIMO leadership and Kavandame by Tanzanian mediators. At this meeting Kavandame announced his intention to found an organisation of the Makonde of Cabo Delgado whose aim would be the independence of that province alone. He asked Tanzania to support his organisation as they were supporting Biafra at that time. Only after the Tanzanian side had made it clear that they would continue to support FRELIMO and the national unity of Mozambique did Kavandame step down from his stated intentions and, therefore, retained his post as FRELIMO Provincial Secretary for Cabo Delgado.

However, that compromise did not solve the contradictions between FRELIMO and Kavandame. Behind Kavandame's tribalism and regionalism stood his material interests. He was using his position as Provincial Secretary and his responsibility for trade in Cabo Delgado to instrumentalize the system of cooperative peoples shops, which was being established in the liberated zones, for his own personal enrichment. This was the real root of his contradictions to the developing requirements of the liberation struggle and, therefore, to the political line of the FRELIMO leadership which ultimately led to his dismissal and to his defection.

The 2nd Congress was of considerable importance in the struggle of

two lines within FRELIMO. For one it confirmed the leadership of Eduardo Mondlane and the group around him which had consolidated itself since the 1st Congress. What is more important, however, is that it dealt with all the tasks of the organisation on the basis of the requirements of the armed struggle. The Congress adopted resolutions on armed struggle, on the administration of the liberated zones, on national reconstruction, on social issues and on foreign policy. The armed struggle, characterised as “hard and protracted” and as “a popular struggle”, had, in other words, been determined as the main front in the national liberation struggle.

Under the undisputed leadership of Mondlane the 2nd FRELIMO Congress elaborated a clear programme for the intensification of the armed struggle. But the still unsolved contradictions within the organisation did not surface fully until 1969 after his assassination. The issue now was who would hold power in FRELIMO after Mondlane, and it was, of course, related to the issue who would be able to implement his political line in the further development of the liberation struggle. After Mondlane's death the Executive Committee had made Simango acting president, but the Central Committee refused to confirm him in that position in April 1969. The appointment of a three man presidential collective was clearly a partial removal of Simango from power. It resulted from the first open ideological discussion of difference, of criticism and self-criticism, as it was characterized afterwards, in the course of which Simango had been criticized for, at least objectively, pursuing a line similar to that of Kavandame, Gwengere and other members of this group in order to satisfy his own political ambitions.

The communique on the Central Committee's session in May 1970 mentions three contradictions in the ideological struggle since the foundation of FRELIMO, which were brought to the surface in the process of the liberation struggle and had to be solved:

- first the issue of how independence is to be achieved, through armed struggle or by peaceful means;
- then the issue of the strategy in the armed struggle, protracted people's war or rapid war to conquer power;

– finally the issue of the social aims of the struggle, establishment of a society without exploitation of man by man or just the takeover of the colonial system substituting black for white faces.

#### The “values gained”

The advance of the liberation struggle in Mozambique was not purely related to military achievements, the re-opening of the north-western Tete front in 1968, its expansion south of the Zambezi and the opening of a new front in the central Mozambican provinces of Manica and Sofala in 1972, the opening of a fifth military front in Zambezia province in 1974. It was equally, if not more fundamentally related to the establishment and consolidation of liberated zones in which political control had largely passed out of the hand of the colonial administration. In these zones, particularly in the northern most provinces of Cabo Delgado and Niassa where the armed struggle was launched in 1964, FRELIMO and the guerrilla units of its liberation army proceeded to lay the foundations for new forms of economic production, social services, political administration and self-defense. It was here that the “values gained during the national liberation struggle” were developed on the basis of the collective effort of the peasant masses and the cadres of the liberation forces.

The crucial elements of FRELIMO's liberation ideology which emerged during this period were the close association with the people in every situation; the principle of independence and self-reliance; the priority of man, of politics over technical solutions. These principles were seen as the guidelines which facilitated the determination of a clear political orientation and the establishment of the unity of the people needed to advance towards national liberation.

An editorial in FRELIMO organ „Mozambique Revolution” declares: “Man is the decisive factor for victory. Furthermore, it is necessary to rely on one's own forces to achieve victory. Therefore, the liberation of the creative energy of the popular masses is a fundamental task.”

The same point about the priority of man over technical situations is reiterated in 1978 in the “Resolution on big economic problems” adopted by the 4th session of the FRELIMO Central committee:



"The solution of the manifold problems which we face in our economic and social life demands a correct mobilisation of our forces and possibilities in all spheres and an energetic struggle against tendencies to fall back upon highly technical solutions where conditions are present to solve the problems of the people by relying on our own forces."

This statement does not reflect an underestimation of the importance of technical progress. Speaking to the People's Assembly, also in August 1978, Samora Machel made this clear:

"The participation of the people in the solution of our problems however important and complex they may be is one of the fundamental points of our line. We do not neglect science and technology, factors which must necessarily be used for the progress of our revolution, but the determining force is the participation of the masses."

A further point of great importance for FRELIMO's ideology is the idea of the necessary relationship between the political line and knowledge and cognition generally with practice, and their further development to more profound insights through practice. The creative activity of the masses finds its expression in practice and, therefore, so does the association of the cadres with the masses. In his directive for the production campaign 1971-72 Samora Machel elaborated on the relationship of knowledge and cognition:

"How can men improve their methods of production, how can they know what is wrong and what is correct if they do not engage in productive work? We often say that we learn to make war through war itself, i.e. by tackling the revolution we learn to lead it more effectively, through the struggle we learn to fight better, and through productive work we learn to produce better. We can study a lot, but what use does knowledge have if it does not reach the masses, if we do not engage in productive work? Will somebody harvest maize if he leaves the seed in the drawer?"

"If somebody studies a lot and does not go among the masses, if he has no practice his knowledge remains lifeless, he remains a storyteller who can quote many passages from scientific or revolutionary works by heart, but who will not write a single new page, a single new line throughout his life. His

knowledge remains sterile like the seed in the drawer. We need constant practice, we must participate in the revolution and in productive work to broaden our knowledge and so advance our revolutionary work, our productive work."

"The seeds of knowledge only thrive if they are sown in the soil of struggle, of productive work. If we have already transformed our country so profoundly, if we have achieved such numerous successes in production, in education, health services and the battles, we have done so only because we always rely on the masses. We learn from them and teach them what we have learnt. We persistently apply our knowledge to productive work, correct our mistakes and make our cognition more profound. But we must never be satisfied with what we have achieved."

"Practice alone is not enough. We also need knowledge, have to study. Without practice, without being related to it, knowledge remains sterile. Without intelligence, without knowledge practice remains blind, a primitive force."

Finally, we may refer to the "Economic and Social Directives" adopted by FRELIMO's 3rd Congress in 1977 when the front was transformed into a vanguard party. At the beginning of this document the experiences made in the liberated zones are summarized as the principles and values gained there are to remain the basic guidelines for development under the new conditions after independence:

"The constant aspiration towards and application of solutions which rely on the masses was not only a way out dictated by circumstances, but a fundamental achievement of the people in the liberated zones. It reflects the principle of putting politics in command and raising the level of political consciousness of the masses so that they increasingly become the active and conscious main force of social transformation.

The deeply rooted and persistent struggle for the elimination of exploitation finds its concrete expression in the form of organisation of production and social life generally.

Production organised in collective forms liberates man from hunger and misery and represents a decisive factor for the progress of the struggle.

The correct application of the prin-

ciple of self-sufficiency makes it possible to increase and diversify the production of food crops and of products for the market. Thereby a decisive contribution to the struggle against the spirit of dependence on foreign countries is made.

The mass of the people participated actively side by side with the guerrilla fighters and the cadres in education and the health service in the implementation of the tasks of defense, production, transport, education and health services; they adopted fully the principle of relying on one's own forces, developed production in all spheres and consolidated unity between the masses, the cadres and the fighters."

## **Soviet Union Plunders Namibian Resources**

The exploitation and plunder of Namibia's uranium resources by the Soviet Union and some western countries under South African protection were revealed at the recent hearings on Namibian uranium.

The hearings were organized by the United Nations Council for Namibia from July 7 to 11.

Dr. Geisler of the West German Anti-Apartheid Movement, stated that the enrichment of uranium plundered from Namibia was done in the United States and the Soviet Union and through this enrichment the Governments of both countries had reaped a profit of 750 million U.S. dollars.

He pointed out, "the most surprising involvement in the matter is that of the Soviet Union because this country voted in favour of decree no. 1 of the U.N. Council for Namibia which prohibits the export and processing of natural resources originating from Namibia without the U.N. Council's consent."

The Soviet representative tried to white-wash his country by alleging that "the Soviet Union has been playing an active role in the United Nations in protecting the interests of the Namibian people," but couldn't deny its participation in plundering the natural resources of Namibia.

Mr. Geisler said his movement had discussed this matter with Soviet diplomats in Bonn and asked them if they imposed conditions on the enrichment that no uranium from Namibia would be enriched in the Soviet Union. The Soviet ambassador replied that there was "no such condition."