



SECHABA

official organ of the african national congress south africa

AUGUST 1987



SECHABA

AUGUST 1987

CONTENTS:

EDITORIAL

Shot Yet Again 1

THE WAY FORWARD

ANC Statement, June 26th 1987 2

USHAKA: A MILITARY GIANT

By Ralph Mzamo 4

A WORKERS' VICTORY: THE SARHWU STRIKE

By Sara 12

ANC INTERNATIONAL 14

CENTRE PAGE

Women of South Africa 16

WOMEN, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

A Conference Paper 18

PEOPLE'S POWER OR POWER-SHARING?

By Mzala 23

SOUTH AFRICA AT THE CROSSROADS

Canon Collins Memorial Lecture

By O R Tambo 29

Send your subscriptions to:

Sechaba Publications

P.O. Box 38, 28 Penton Street, London N1 9PR

United Kingdom

Telephone: 01-837 2012

Telex: 29955ANCSAG Telegrams: Mayibuye

Donations welcome

COVER PICTURES: The cover photographs show the great demonstration at the Union Buildings, Pretoria, organised by the Federation of South African Women, August 9th 1956.

SHOT YET AGAIN

There is no crime in the book of crimes which Botha and his generals have not committed. Be it murder of detainees, assassination of political and trade union leaders, raping women detainees, mutilation of genitals of thousands of men in torture sessions in detention, street executions with vigilantes and SADF death-squads, destabilisation and acts of aggression on neighbouring states, you name it, Pretoria has committed it, not once or twice but many times over. But each crime must be recorded separately, because the time to punish the guilty is fast approaching. No one can hold back the day of reckoning.

The Pretoria boers have killed thousands in the townships. Tens of thousands are still in detention. Not content with these killings they have been carrying out inside the country, they are now trying to police Southern Africa as a whole, killing and executing not only members of the ANC but local people who stand in the way of Pretoria and its racist policy.

Pretoria has placed the trade union movement under siege. Hundreds of trade unionists have been detained. Several are among the more than 30 South Africans who have been tortured to confess to crimes they have not committed, and sentenced to death. An even bigger number of people are on trial, obviously earmarked for death sentences. The attack on the trade union movement is just one aspect of a multifaceted campaign to crush resistance.

On July 9th, a unit of the SADF, brazenly using South African registered cars in Swaziland, attacked two comrades who were travelling in a taxi from Mozambique. Comrade Cassius Make, a member of the NEC of the ANC, Comrade Paul Dikeledi and another passenger travelling in the same taxi were killed. This crime follows another two weeks earlier in which Pretoria's armed bands killed three other members of the ANC who included Comrade Viva Mkhonto, again in Swaziland.

These attacks on members of the ANC in Swaziland are a clear indication that the Pretoria boers in their desperation, are at all times bent on terror and cold-blooded murder against its opponents who are dedicated and committed to the

ending of the hated and evil system of apartheid. The SADF and the SAP have turned Swaziland into a playground where they arrest, kidnap and kill people in the streets in broad daylight.

During the same months in Botswana, houses have been bombed, cars booby-trapped and an attempt made to kill a prominent member of the anti-apartheid struggle from Port Elizabeth by a British security officer, ostensibly hired by the SADF. Furthermore, the Pretoria regime is trying to force the Botswana security forces to act as its watchdog, hunting ANC members.

In Lusaka elaborate schemes and manoeuvres are being undertaken in an attempt to organise units of the regime's 32nd Battalion to carry out executions and killings of members of the ANC, especially its leaders. SADF units, made up of British SAS officers and American Marine Corps personnel are continually being apprehended trying to organise safe houses and other facilities to carry out attacks on the ANC.

All these actions were clearly carried out by units of Pretoria's so-called security forces. They are intended to divert attention from the crimes the regime is committing in the townships by pretending the armed struggle is being fought in and from neighbouring states. They show Pretoria's complete contempt and disregard for the sovereignty and independence of the surrounding states whose territories are dealt with by Botha as if they were dependent bantustans.

And yet there is more to the killings in Swaziland than meets the eye. The timing of the attack, the style of its execution clearly bears all the hallmarks of the special units of the SADF. Botha's generals have clearly been hard at work preparing what is called 'stamping out terrorism' in Swaziland and Botswana. The deployment of the SADF counterinsurgency units in Swaziland is a result of the ascendancy of the SADF in Pretoria and its total control of the racist state.

The steady rise of attacks by Umkhonto we Sizwe units, despite the state of emergency, is unnerving the brass hats in Pretoria. That is why they have resorted to waging terrorist attacks in Angola and Alexandra, Swaziland and Sebokeng, Botswana and Soweto.

ANC STATEMENT

THE WAY FORWARD

South Africa Freedom Day June 26th 1987

Today we observed the 32nd anniversary of the adoption of the Freedom Charter by the people of South Africa. As we mark the occasion of the birth of this historic document, we reaffirm that the ANC, the leader of the democratic forces of our motherland, remains loyal to the goal of the transfer of power to the people.

The oppressed masses of our country are observing this year, the 75th anniversary of the ANC, as the Year of Advance to People's Power. This imposes an obligation on all South Africans to address themselves to the issue of where sovereign power in our country ought to reside. Having answered this question honestly, it remains for all of us to pursue our strategies relentlessly and with the common aim that we, both Black and White, put in place a legitimate power that will advance and defend our common destiny.

On May 6th, the Botha regime took its opportunity to state its own objectives. Unequivocally, it reaffirmed its determination to fight for the perpetuation of the apartheid system. On the same day, and in our millions, we further intensified the struggle for the victory of the perspective of a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa.

Democracy and Racism Cannot Coexist

It is clear that between these two visions, the one racist and the other democratic, there can be no co-existence. Through struggle, one has to give way to the other. History and justice demand, and make it inevitable, that the oppressed will triumph over the oppressor, whatever the cost. Life itself decrees that the hopes and aspirations contained in the Freedom Charter must emerge victorious even in the face of the desperate armed resistance of the colonial and racist past that is represented by the forces of White minority rule, regardless of any guise they might assume.

The enemy of freedom in our country speaks of negotiations when it intends to mount a treacherous process aimed at persuading the oppressed to accept their condition. Botha's declared intention to talk to the representatives of the subjugated majority has no other aims than to legitimise his apartheid authority and to win Black agents for the perpetuation of White minority rule.

All who see themselves as democrats and genuine representatives of our people can have no quarrel with the statement that **the people shall govern**. Accordingly, none but the opponents of democracy will allow themselves to be duped into joining the racist regime as it stages the circus performance it describes as the National Statutory Council. In our situation, any meaningful negotiations can only be about how to transform our country into a united, democratic and non-racial entity, without any delay. On these issues, the oppressed and democratic majority cannot compromise.

We cannot but recall that many who participated in the drafting and adoption of the Freedom Charter are today prisoners of the apartheid regime. Among them are outstanding leaders such as Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, Govan Mbeki, Harry Gwala, Elias Motsoaledi, Ahmed Kathrada, Andrew Mlangeni and others. While it holds these as its captives, the apartheid regime tries very hard to spawn an offspring that it wants to describe as our representatives.

This is merely to add insult to injury. Never shall the people accept the paid agents of the apartheid system as their representatives. Any deals that the Pretoria regime enters into with these can be nothing more than an attempt to cement a pact of treachery whose cornerstones are the bantustan system, the tri-cameral parliament and other elements of the so-called separate development programme.

SHAKA A MILITARY GIANT

By Ralph Mzamo

One of the most widely known military geniuses ever produced by South Africa was born of a small tribe, the Zulus, but came to be respected not only for his charismatic personality but also for the military revolution that he introduced when he began his rule of the Zulus and his nation-building. The innovations that he introduced were to have an everlasting impact on the societies that dwelt in Africa south of the equator. The way of life changed; customs, political organisation, and even thinking, was radically transformed. 50 years after his death, his innovations enabled the Zulu army to humiliate a highly trained and experienced British army, heavily equipped with sophisticated armaments.

He was born at Ncube Village, the son of Senzangakhona, a chief of the Zulus, and Nandi, of Langeni. He was born around 1787, during the beginning of the turbulent years farther down, ama-Xhoseni when the White colonialist plunderers were initiating a movement that was to result in total upheaval, the uprooting of the nationalities and cultures in South Africa.

The Zulus occupied a small area between u-Mfolozi o'Mhlophe and Hlathuzi Rivers, owing allegiance to the powerful Ba-Thethwa of Jobe, the father of Dingiswayo. Up north reposed the Ndwandwe of Zwide, ominously casting covetous eyes and planning ill of their southern neighbours. But aba-Thethwa were not a force to be trifled with and so the Ndwandwe were forced to bide their time cautiously.

Nandi, like any mother, apparently became protective of her son; Shaka did not grow up at his father's royal place but at his mother's home place. This was not necessarily due to his so-called illegitimacy, but might have been because of the usual practice at the time when heirs-apparent were born in their mothers' homes for



a variety of reasons, including the fear of their being poisoned or bewitched or even assassinated by aspiring relatives desirous of attaining the chieftaincy or eminence in political life.

Nandi constantly shifted from place to place. This, however, is said to have been the result of her innate querulous nature and her inability to humble herself at the royal place, to a point where she became something of an embarrassment to the chief.

The Young Boy Learns to Fight

It is alleged that Shaka was subjected to ill-treatment by his age-mates because he was illegitimate, but again that may not be so. In any society, 'boys will always be boys,' and their pranks will include what to adults will appear as cruelty. But Shaka fought back with all he had, and, because the harassment was constant, he naturally became a good fighter, with a sharp eye, agile in limb, and was possessed of an incredible capability of endurance in defence and the ability to strike effectively, where it hurt most. He became adept at dealing with bigger members of merciless attackers.

Naturally, his mother would not be overjoyed with reports of the daily torment her son underwent in the grazing fields, and would try to prevent his taking part. This, however, is ever a futile endeavour on the part of any parent, for if the boy does not report for duty other young boys have usually a large stock of stratagems they apply to get him to join them. When all attempts fail to dislodge him from the protection of his home, they will deliberately neglect to drive the livestock from his home to the pastures, the repercussions of which are terrible for all concerned because the menfolk of the homestead will investigate and invariably decide against accommodating a coward who fears his age-mates. He will go to the bush, crying, galloping, with nose running, but firmly clutching a stick in one hand and a daredevil determination to express his anger in the proper way befitting a man.

Shaka Observed, and Learned Quickly

The other trait which Shaka obtained while still young was the power of observation. He observed nature in all its ways, especially the behaviour and actions of animals. He studied their conduct in adverse situations. His observations were later

to be applied to practical situations in military actions both as a warrior himself and as a commander of fighting forces. They were to stand him well and imbue him with dynamism in his leadership.

He appears to have revelled in hunting, which served both as a military sport as well as an economic activity. He studied the shape of horns of different animals, their manner of attack. From these studies he particularly noted the lapping of waves on the river banks, following upon each other at short intervals; the method of attack used by wild dogs, by which the intended victim is stalked for long distances and then suddenly a running attack is mounted, in which each of the attackers make off with a part of the body and the victim is dismembered before he hits the ground; the storks pouncing on a snake, flying off and passing it among one another right in the sky, right up in the air, where wriggle as much as it might it has no ground on which to grip with its scales, rendering it useless.

Moving from place to place with his mother meant that Shaka often changed social sets and in each new locality he would, as customary all over, be tested so that he could be allotted to his weight division and placed in his rightful position in it. The wanderings with his mother had another educative effect on him. As the fauna and flora varies from place to place, depending on the type of geographic conditions prevailing, his knowledge of animals, their shapes, colours, behaviour and the different vegetation, broadened his knowledge greatly, which knowledge was later to be invaluable when he reached manhood and engaged in animal husbandry, and when dispensing medication to his warriors.

He grew up like all the other young boys, undergoing the same education and training everyone else went through, in the process of the tempering of the steel. When he came of age he enlisted under Dingiswayo's Army and served in izi-Chwe Regiment in which he rose up, ultimately to become its Commanding Officer. He entered into a situation that he liked, that fitted him and in which he quickly distinguished himself by his fighting prowess. He was later to earn a promotion to be the Commander-In-Chief of the Ba-Thethwa Army. Dingiswayo had decided to leave the business of fighting in Shaka's more able hands, and confine himself to matters of state. He could not have been more shrewd.

Dingiswayo Introduced Revolutionary Ideas

Dingiswayo was actually the person who introduced the innovations that were later to assume the proportions of a wide-ranging military revolution in Zululand and in southern Africa as a whole. He certainly did introduce a loose kind of standing army by reorganising it into age-mates, though it was assembled only when necessity arose. His form of military service was practically organised along the lines of irregulars, a citizen force, as it were.

Dingiswayo also brought some cultural changes in that he abolished some customs that he found redundant, among which was circumcision, though this is sometimes ascribed to Shaka. But Dingiswayo's era was relatively sedentary and did not make for wide-ranging changes in military structure and warfare; moreover, he himself was motivated by no ambition to widen his territory or build a nation. He went on military campaigns only when he thought his state needed livestock or when he felt threatened. Shaka was different. He was thorough — a perfectionist of the first order. In whatever he undertook he wanted to achieve excellence. He had served Dingiswayo loyally, carried out his directives, and surrendered to him whatever booty he had captured. He was clearly never possessed of jealousy, which was to grip Mzilikazi later on.

During this period wars were undertaken more for the purpose of capturing cattle than for conquest and annexation; therefore, Dingiswayo was not bothered with annihilation of his enemy. But if Dingiswayo was content with what he had already and only went out for foraging, Zwide, northwards, was not. He was jealous of aba-Thethwa and the fact that many of the smaller clans found refuge under the protective wings of aba-Thethwa irked him the more. He set forth a movement that was to engulf him powerlessly. He started by attacking smaller clans as a prelude to his major aim of subjugating aba-Thethwa. A few successes made him think he was ready for Dingiswayo, which perhaps he was, but by this time Shaka was in command of izi-Chwe. Zwide had not done his homework well. In a battle at Qokli Hill Zwide's forces were checked by Shaka's regiment but hostilities ceased because Zwide's forces were ordered back and Dingiswayo did not order a pursuit.

The Man, the Right Ideas and the Right Time

At about this time Senzangakhona died. Dingiswayo gave Shaka izi-Chwe Regiment to escort him when he went to claim his rightful place in the throne of the Zulus. He was installed without much bloodshed. He became the ruler of the Zulus, his fervent ambition realized. South Africa was about to undergo far-reaching changes drastically transformed from its state of lassitude. Shaka had arrived at the position that allowed him free rein to introduce changes he had already found efficacious in izi-Chwe. These changes led to his transforming the structure of the army, his amalgamation and the knitting together of all the clans into a nascent state. He quickly rode through them all, from Thukela to Pongola River. He was thirty years old.

Within Zululand, Zwide, who had unceremoniously ushered Sobhuza out of Zululand, was preparing to overrun the other nationalities but aba-Thethwa, as has been noted, were strong and not to be taken up lightly. Added to that, the upstart Shaka, serving under Dingiswayo, had gained a disconcerting reputation as an able commander. He had already fought and crushed the Ndwandwe at Qokli Hill.

Lesotho's Moshoeshe was steadily building up his nation though at this time he was still engaged in internal squabbles about land rights. In the north, Sekwati of Marotaland was doing the same. All of these nationalities were unfortunately embroiled in internal wrangles of family and clan domination. The people who were already engaged in a grim and bloody struggle against foreign invaders were the Xhosa, the Khoikhoi and the San, in the south. They had by now been waging wars of resistance for more than 150 years.

Chungwa of Nkonkobe, ema-Gqunukhwebeni, had been callously murdered in his sick-bed in 1812 and his subjects, together with ama-Ndlambe, ama-Mbalu, Khokhoi and the San, were locked up in a protracted see-saw guerrilla warfare in all the territory between e-Cacadu and Swellendam, under the rallying declaration of Chief Ndlambe that, "This land is mine." The colonialist governor kwa-Rarabe, was Lord Charles Somerset. There was slavery. Passes had been introduced by the Caledonian Proclamation of 1809, which limited personal freedom. The Khoikhoi were compelled to carry

passes in their movement from one district to another. In practice they were forced to live in White farms or in mission stations. War among the people conformed with the sedentary way of life prevailing in the country at the time, except kwa-Rarabe, more for the purpose of acquiring livestock.

Jacob Knew the Real Intentions of Whites

This situation, however, was changing; the country was seething with the desire to reorganise itself. There may not have been many indications in Zululand itself of the impending invasion and catastrophic usurpation of the land and its wealth by foreigners but tidings of it would have reached Zululand. There was, for instance, the interpreter Jacob, a Xhosa who had been imprisoned on Robben Island and was later to be killed by Dingane at the instigation of Whites who were disconcerted by his reports of their real intentions. He comes through history as a man who warned the Zulus against taking the colonialists into their confidence. It became difficult to preclude the probability of there having been many others like him who had travelled to other regions of the country with the same foreboding.

Shaka might have perhaps not known of what was taking place outside his known world but he did possess an earnest desire to unite his people into a nation. He was quite clear that to achieve that goal he had to build a stable situation of centralised government and singular leadership for all the nations. He realised that a prerequisite for the attainment of that principle was the building of a strong army.

In any case, the segmentary chiefdoms themselves were no longer content to live in isolation, if they ever had been. The very fact of segmentation imposed limitations on development and the need to unify was manifested. Wars have been fought for economic reasons, the desire to increase stock wealth being the foremost. Weaker clans would therefore be well disposed to accept any attempt at amalgamation because the more cattle there were, the more could be produced — milk, amasi and meat — and agricultural activities could be better organised, including opening up new lands for tilling. Moreover, taxation could be levied and paid to the coffers of the state rather than with a perpetual fear of cattle raids and confiscation in which human life was also lost.

Shaka Builds the New Nation

Unification would cause an expansion in the economic organisation. The pooling of resources would result in greater output because it would be followed by increased use of implements and technology, removing much of the burden of individual clans on stretching the existing manpower to cover all the economic, social and security requirements. It would lead to a much higher degree of efficiency. The smaller clans would certainly acquiesce because they would see the possibility of protection, even if they were not so sure about other advantages.

From Shaka's standpoint, unifying the clans into a single entity, a nation-state, would enable a division of labour and specialisation, which in turn would facilitate his building a professional army to concentrate on the business of security and defence of the nation-state. But the clans, the principalities, the nationalities, were not united nor did they interact harmoniously. They were, instead, constantly involved in internal strife as well as in needless inter-clan wrangles. There were elaborate population movements as various clans and their regiments attempted to found family kingdoms and settlements. They competed for land. This led to a crystallization, to some forms of centralised governments where the ruling clan combined with other weaker clans to provide collective protection, and through direct action and persuasion the larger clan attracted larger groups and nationalities to form bigger units, so that families succeeded in strengthening their political authority and subsequently extended their territorial claims.

These kingdoms, however, were run as private estates, everyone within them a vassal of royalty in one way or another. People paid homage to the chief or king, not to the state. These are the circumstances under which Shaka emerged. There was a generally recognised requirement for strong and effective leadership. Such a leadership could not have functioned had there not been a need for it and without the consent of the people of Zululand. Any leadership emerges in response to necessity, and functions by consent.

Leaders Are Created by Situations

In Zululand a vacuum in the leadership situation arose in which Shaka was the most appropriate answer and he responded athletically. Why was it not Zwide, who was reigning over a bigger clan

which had military experience, who had kicked Sobhuza out of the territory? Why was it not Mzilikazi, who had just succeeded to his father's position after the latter had been killed by Zwide? And why was it not Shaka's half-brothers — Mhlangana, Dingane — who shared the same royal blood and who can be presumed to have been groomed by Senzangakhona as they grew in the royal place?

To qualify for leadership it is necessary to establish a dominant position that will be acceptable to the people — the potential followers or subjects who require that leadership. The need for leadership exists and the people are aware of it, but certain qualities are indispensable in the leader before he can be acceptable. To make a commanding position it is necessary for the aspirant or candidate to possess in a higher degree some qualities that are appropriate to the situation. He has to possess expertise in relevant skills that are not just respected but are also needed by the situation as a whole. A medical doctor is generally required in many situations but is he required in the actual laying of railway tracks across the country?

It became necessary not just to be able to coordinate and manage but to be good in the skills performed by professionals under the leadership. The better director in the provision of medical services is a medical doctor; in the running of law and order it is a lawyer; an academic would be best in the educational activities of a country. By the same token a skilled warrior would make a respected commander. In such a situation the leader-follower relationship happens of its own accord, subordination is by consent not coercion.

In Zululand they had seen that Shaka had the interests of his warriors at heart, for, when he was promoted to the command of izi-Chwe Regiment by Dingiswayo the latter also gave him a "herd of my best breed of cattle." Shaka politely asked to be allowed to share "this gift among my brothers of izi-Chwe Regiment." Shaka was an accomplished warrior and commanding officer. He was battle-tested in both offices. It is important to know what to do, but how to do it is even more important. The ability to find a solution to a problem, and also the power to help others overcome their difficulties, is what distinguishes a leader; the capacity to assist when they are faced with difficulties and then lead them

out of the those difficulties.

Leaders Must Lead by Example

The leader must possess qualities that the others lack — and they will accept him because it is only he who can provide them. He also must possess management abilities — how to use those qualities he has imparted to them. Mzilikazi, whose father, Mashobane, had been killed by Zwide, was faced with a difficulty when he succeeded to the chieftaincy of ama-Khumalo. His people were a small clan and Zwide attacked them at will, with impunity, for sport. Mzilikazi was a good warrior but he was young and inexperienced. Shaka had beaten the Ndwandwe at Qokli Hill, and, what is more important, he had been entrusted with leadership of the whole Ba-Thethwa Army by no less a statesman than Dingiswayo himself, and Dingiswayo never regretted that decision. Shaka was a warrior of high repute, and an able general. Mzilikazi then decided to take his people, ama-Khumalo, to Shaka and pledge allegiance.

Another of the qualities that are necessary for acceptance is the power of example. An exemplary conduct draws admiration and pliancy on the part of the followers and they will tend to hero-worship because they are subconsciously aware of their own limitations and will realise that from the leader they will gain. This is particularly important in times of stress, when the brain has suddenly stopped functioning and the individual looks from one side to the other for directive, for command, for leadership.

Shaka had risen in izi-Chwe Regiment; his reputation and fame had been born and nurtured in that regiment, which was commanded by General Chuza, who saw in the young stalwart "a wisdom beyond our time." His acceptance by respected and popular military leaders of the time was an added bonus in an already long list of qualities required for leadership. Not only that, he had shown total loyalty to Dingiswayo, had served him devotedly, something which some over-ambitious men tend to ignore under the mistaken impression that if they make it their business to be constantly denouncing those in leadership they will gain popularity.

Shaka Revolutionises Military Warfare

Shaka had learnt a few things from Dingiswayo who appears to have been his only patron. He

was content to bask in the plaudits showered on him by admirers, including the king himself. But it was after he had become chief of the Zulus that he showed his full potential. Introducing a number of innovations in military structure and warfare he radically changed even the relationship between the ruler and the community at large. The basis of his strategy was founded on his dissatisfaction with the old methods of fighting wars. "How many times," he lamented, "have we gone to battle and returned without victory? We conquer and yet come back like the vanquished. The defeated re-emerge, again and again. They launch new wars. Like the menace of weeds in a fertile field they are ... Yet victory must be final."

To Shaka, clearly, battle had to be decisive. It had to be carried to its logical conclusion, the enemy decisively neutralised, and this could not be achieved with the present weapons and methods of warfare where at times a "battle would involve only a a single chosen representative from each side." Such situations can be likened to our present boxing matches between champions. Shaka wanted a war to be a war.

The first thing he did was to do away with the long, throwing assegai as a standard weapon of the army. He was not happy with "the weapons that we carry," long spears of fragile wood where "each one who can carves his own weapon" and "many returned empty-handed, having exhausted their supplies of iron." For his army he introduced the long-bladed but short-staffed spear that became very effective in hand-to-hand combat. He ordered the manufacturers of armaments to produce "a spear made short and of the toughest wood" which would not be thrown but would be used to "rip their naked chests at close quarters." He thus instituted a properly organised armaments industry, designating specialists. Not anyone would make arms, but specially selected people, experts; this was a rudimentary form of standardisation and specialisation.

The change was important in that it enabled the warrior to use his one weapon against any number of opponents without the possibility of being unarmed for some anxious moment in the midst of battle. As an essentially hand-to-hand weapon this short spear had terminal results in a fray, because the moment of impact is when the force and momentum of a thrust is at its

greatest, the target near.

He trained his soldiers personally, staying with them for hours on end, impressing upon them the shamefulness of running away from battle when it became tough. He much preferred men not to go to combat in the first place rather than going and then running away. He always addressed his men before battle and offered them the choice of pulling out. He introduced the regular army, not the standing army of Dingiswayo that was permanent in the sense that regiments were formed of the same age-mates but dispersing back to civilian life after every battle. Shaka reorganised the army systematically and created a professional military service in which the soldiers served until final demobilisation after which the individual would become a citizen, allowed to marry and lead a normal civilian life of ploughing the fields, hunting, building houses and bringing up children, just as the Spartans in Greece did in ancient times.

He named each regiment and gave it its colours, encouraging a spirit of competition among the regiments. Those that had surpassed the others in battle earned a high position as well as a larger slice of the spoils; all of which is more than can be said of some European military services of the time.

Military discipline demands total, continuous and unconditional subordination of personal interests or the individual to group interests so that aims and objectives of the campaign can be achieved. This leads to the surrender of the individual's life to the cause of the state. It requires, and in turn engenders, loyalty to the state, courage to carry out any mission, devotion to duty and determination to succeed. A force that has these qualities, if it has also advanced military technology in the form of arms and military knowledge, will defeat an equal force with less of such qualities, and will even win against a bigger force.

These are essential qualities that Shaka, from raw untutored intelligence, recognised as indispensable. He therefore designed training, the organisation of his regiments and the whole pattern of life, to foster them because they are crucial to military efficiency. His genius lay in that these had never existed before. He was introducing a totally unknown phenomenon which brought him instant success, authority and power.

Shaka Personally Trained and Led his Army
His army achieved the highest military efficiency that had ever been known in South Africa because it possessed those essential qualities, and high technology in the form of the long-bladed, short, stabbing spear. When a young man enlisted he was allocated to a regiment of his age group and trained. His life became completely military — the way of talking, walking, eating; the songs, poetry, conversations, dancing; all were geared into churning him into a fighting machine. No longer was the art gleaned only from the desultory discourse of men who tended to add more spice to what had actually been the case. Shaka systematised the whole business by revising every aspect of it, right from conscription to the demobilisation of the soldier. In Shaka's hands they rode through any opposition with the ease of an axe cutting into water.

He did away with sandals for his soldiers because he considered them a hindrance to mobility and fleetness, which are prerequisites for victory. Looked at from the context of modern warfare, this may be viewed with qualms; but modern warfare includes kicking, which is more effective with boots than with sandals or bare feet. But Shaka considered fleetness, which no boot or sandal could enable. Addressing his regimental assembly, he once said, "the essence of war is speed ... speed is of the feet not encumbered by sandals." His intelligence perceived that the short spear he introduced would be facilitated more by speed.

Shaka created more than 20 regiments and erected barracks which he flung out throughout his territory and each of these comprised not less than 2 000 men. The whole state was thus adequately defended. Shaka taught his men uniformity of action where a skirmish line moved together, with no stragglers nor men who moved in front and so exposing themselves to attack before their comrades. Putting into practice his observation of waves lapping into the banks he taught them how to form echelons that closely followed each other into battle and the enemy would have no chance of reforming and reorganising because he would be overwhelmed by continuous onslaughts of a relentless force.

He was very astute and able to evaluate the situation, gauge the enemy strength and recognise where his force would be disadvantaged because of the enemy's far greater numbers

and experience. One such situation arose shortly before the battle that precipitated the downfall of the Ndwandwe and the disgrace of Zwide. Realising that he stood no chance he ordered a retreat. Non-combatants were ordered to empty all the granaries, carry away the stores, burn the crops that could not be carried and drive the livestock. The whole community then marched southwards.

Soshangane, an able commander, fell into the trap and pursued the Zulus from Mfoloz' o mhlophe to Thukela River. Shaka deployed a few regiments as decoys, who were always tantalisingly not far from the pursuing Ndwandwe. At nights, whenever the Ndwandwe were camping, Shaka's warriors would suddenly storm the sleeping Ndwandwe, attack and as suddenly disappear into the night, leaving the stupefied Ndwandwe licking their wounds.

When at last Soshangane decided to give up the pursuit, his force was panicky, looking over their shoulders, hungry, demoralised and depleted. He about-turned and headed north, but then the roles were reversed. The Zulus followed discreetly keeping the Ndwandwe in sight, until they reached the banks of Mhlathuze where the Ndwandwe rested. Shaka unleashed his full force and attacked ferociously. The Ndwandwe dispersed and disintegrated. Soshangane marched homewards but found it deserted. He then continued on, northwards and crossed the Pongola River, beyond which he carved out a name for himself, subjugating all the smaller and less organised nationalities, but always looking over his shoulder, in fear of Shaka. Shaka's strategy had been carefully planned and was effectively implemented. It gained him the whole territory of Zululand as it was, including what is now called Natal.

Shaka crossed the Mfolozi River and wrought havoc in Ndwandweland. Zwide had the biggest force at the time. He had mustered them near the banks of the river; a great force that was more than five times Shaka's.

This was again where Shaka displayed his genius in warfare. He camped on the other side of the river and waited. Among his store of battle tactics he had perfected to razor-sharpness reconnaissance activities that also included penetration. A carefully selected band of men was sent to infiltrate into Zwide's forces, as returning foragers. This was quite easy because there

was no language nor sartorial difference.

Shaka's warriors dispersed among the unsuspecting Ndwandwe and bided their time. In the middle of the night they struck, each attacking a few Ndwandwe near him, and in the chaos that ensued he would take cover, by which time the Ndwandwe would be furiously engaged in man-to-man combat. They continued this until dawn when they quietly withdrew to their own camp with the satisfaction that each of them was responsible for 15 enemy men down.

There had been about a hundred warriors in that operation. When the battle began in the following morning the reconnaissance group, widely known to have been under the command of a cunning warrior called Ndlebe, went round to the unprotected villages and set fire to houses and attacked non-combatants.

The confusion caused by wildly running old men, women and children, the bellowing of cattle and smoking and burning cattle-folds served to distract an already bewildered Ndwandwe army. Burning the cattle-pens also facilitated the capture of cattle which the Zulus drove at full speed to the River Mfolozi.

The incidents of the previous night had sapped the morale of the Ndwandwe; they thought Shaka had also marshalled the services of sorcerers because they had been attacked by forces they did not see and had ended up fighting each other, which they alleged to have been induced by witchcraft. The Ndwandwe could fight any other mortal but they could not be expected to fight against witches. They were not armed for that. That apparently indicates the source of Shaka's scepticism as regards witchcraft.

The Ndwandwe were decisively defeated, dispersed and captured. Zwide fled and was to die in exile. Shaka offered the captives a choice of either joining his army or lining up in front of the firing squad. They chose the first and were then incorporated into an already strong army. They were trained and formed into new regiments. Mzilikazi was to adopt the same tactic later on. By the time he reached Bulawayo in the present Zimbabwe, his subjects were 2 000 times more than the original Zulu nucleus.

The Chest and Horns Tactic

It was Shaka who invented the 'Horns of a Buffalo' battle formation. This is formed by placing the main body in the centre (the 'chest' of

the advancing force) and two flanks — the 'horns.' This formation advanced and attacked in echelons like waves lapping on a river bank, the front line being continuously fed from the back. 50 years after the death of Shaka this method of attack was to be used against the mightiest of the imperialist armies, the British, when they were humiliatingly crushed at Sandhswana.

Some writers would allege that the main assault came from the chest and that the aim of the horns was to effect an encircling manoeuvre. But following closely the battle at Sandhswana one is led to conclude that there was no hard and fast rule in actual battle because there, e-Sandhswana, the brunt of the battle was borne by the horns. Their job was to envelop the enemy and having penetrated from the rear they attacked ferociously and that was where the sun of the British was thrown mud at, that was where it began to dip. This is not to belittle the role of the chest, but its operations at Sandhswana were just mopping-up actions after the horns had neutralised and subdued the invaders.

One thing needs to be said about the battle of Sandhswana. It proves a lie to the widespread distortion that the Zulu people "perished" at the Battle of Blood River in 1838. The blood of those fallen heroes nurtured the spirit which resurrected at Sandhswana. Friedrich Engels writing from far away in Germany praised the Zulu military tactics saying that given their conditions the Zulus did what no European army could do.

That was the effect of Shaka's revolutionary changes in warfare, that his innovations were applied against a formidable army with centuries of experience in warfare, armed with sophisticated arms. The Zulu army, founded by Shaka, defeated them in 1879 at Sandhswana. His military strategies and tactics had not been discarded after his death and there is no evidence that they ever were refined or bettered by his successors. He is second to none of the world military geniuses before and after his time.

A WORKERS' VICTORY THE SARHWU STRIKE

By Sara

On June 5th there was an historic and victorious end to a three-month strike by the South African Railway and Harbour Workers' Union (SARHWU). The strike was one of the biggest ever to be recorded in South African history. 22,000 transport workers were on strike, costing the South African Transport Services (SATS) bosses one million man-days.

The strike started on March 12th when a driver, Andrew Nendzanda, who works for the City Deep Container Depot, was dismissed for an alleged offence committed in October 1986. He was accused of not immediately handing over the sum of R40 paid to him for a delivery. The instant dismissal of this driver angered the 600 workers at that depot, who then stayed away from work. What began as a minor dispute grew into a major issue centred around many long-standing grievances, including being beaten up, called 'kaffirs', dismissed without representation and being paid starvation wages. They protested against the rigid security measures, poor food, overcrowding and against the appalling conditions in the hostels.

The unity and the courage of these workers was tremendous. They decided they would pursue the strike until their grievances were redressed. One migrant worker was reported in the press as saying that withdrawing their labour was their only way of dealing with their problems. Their White superiors in the SATS racial Industrial Relations system did whatever they liked. The striking rail workers demanded that all workers be involved in all the decision-making processes. Their message was loud and clear: "Enough is enough!" They demanded democratic control in every aspect of their life.

African railway workers in fact have been working under feudal and repressive conditions for decades and for too long.

Workers' Support: Unity in Action

Industrial action hit 23 goods and container depots, as well as other departments and areas in the Transvaal. Ticket conductors in more than 55 stations between Randfontein and Springs abandoned their posts when it became clear that a settlement was not in sight. The biggest threat came from the workers at the strategically vital international Jan Smuts Airport in Johannesburg. About 700 workers there joined the strike, demanding the unconditional reinstatement of the dismissed driver, and full wages paid to workers for the time they had been on strike. As the strike spread the 30,000 strong Post & Telecommunication Workers' Association (POTWA), the sister union of SARHWU in the public sector, pledged its full support for the railway workers.

These striking workers had strong support from many other trade union organisations and in their communities. In effect, SATS management, employers and the government had no alternative but to give in, because of the economic destruction and chaos that could have arisen. This organised support from fellow workers defeated the intransigence of the SATS management.

Bosses Attempt to Smash The Strike

The employers tried every pressure they could possibly apply to break the strike. When SARHWU officials and representatives called the bosses to the negotiating table to settle the dispute, the SATS management rejected the call. They were willing to speak only to the representatives of the Black Transport Union (BLATU)

their puppet or 'sweetheart' union. The striking workers, however, had no confidence in BLATU which was ineffective and did not take any actions to eradicate or resolve their grievances. It was not the authentic representative of the workers. Jay Naidoo, General Secretary of COSATU, stressed that racism pervades every level of SATS management and this was one of the reasons why the bosses refused to negotiate with the workers' elected union representatives.

In the past, homelands such as Venda and Gazankulu have become favourite scab-recruiting centres. Migrant workers have been the most vulnerable section of the workers, forced into the most dangerous and low-paid jobs. The South African regime banned indoor and outdoor meetings. Banning was specifically aimed at strikes in essential services.

In an attempt to destroy the strike, the SATS bosses threatened to sue SARHWU and its top officials for the R15-20m they estimated the strike had cost them. Never before in South African history had an employer threatened to sue a union whose members were involved in industrial action.

White scabs were brought in but they were unable to cope on their own. In fact White railway workers are employed on a casual basis by SATS. Their casual rates of pay are higher than the full-time rates paid to Black workers. The gulf between Black and White workers' wages is enormous. White workers do not actually do the arduous tasks but are being paid for supervision and as overseers.

Most employers used their Black workers as scabs to fetch goods that the SATS workers usually deliver. However, more and more workers refused to cross the picket lines in a number of areas. COSATU warned that it would not allow its members to be used as scabs against the railway strikers.

Settlement

SATS was finally forced to agree to the following settlement:

- To reinstate the 18 000 railworkers sacked by SATS in an effort to break the strike.
- To reinstate all sacked workers on the same grade without loss of benefits except annual bonuses and pay while on strike.
- To guarantee no loss of industrial benefit and no victimisation of strikers.

- To accept the rail union's demand for parity with White employees by providing guarantees of permanent status to Black railworkers employed for more than two years.

- To re-employ workers currently in detention within a week of their release provided they were not found guilty on criminal charges.

- To allow workers to democratically elect their own representatives.

- To upgrade facilities at Delmore and Kaserne in response to workers' grievances.

The settlement was celebrated as a massive victory by SARHWU and the SATS workers. These courageous workers endured the hardships and harassment, the arrests of the legal advisers and senior union representatives.

The list of violence and repression perpetrated against the trade union movement by the South African regime and its agents is endless. Union members and leaders have been detained, and some are still in detention. COSATU House was under siege for a week and finally bombed. Six SARHWU workers were killed.

Because of the growth of militancy in trade unionism in the railway and other sectors, the balance of power, we believe, is shifting into the hands of the workers. The greatest strength of the strike was the united support it received from the SATS workers. COSATU praised the striking workers for the disciplined manner in which they pursued their struggle against their bosses.

We say to these gallant sons of Africa:

**"Stay united and you will never be defeated!
An injury to one is an injury to all!"**



ANC INTERNATIONAL

UK CONVENTION ON SANCTIONS

A Convention for Sanctions Against South Africa, held in London on June 27th, by the Anti-Apartheid Movement, was attended by 450-500 delegates from all over the country — from local Anti-Apartheid groups, trade unions, political parties, church, women's and local community groups.

The Convention was opened by Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, and addressed by Comrade Aziz Pahad of the ANC National Executive Committee, Comrade Theo-Ben Gurirab, SWAPO Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and Vella Pillay, Treasurer of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. Stanley Clinton Davis, once a British MP and now employed by the European Parliament, spoke on the question of sanctions and the European Community.

Norman Willis, General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress (TUC), was another speaker. He praised the courage and militancy of the South African unions:

"The recent attacks on COSATU ... have done nothing to weaken the resolve of trade union members and their leaders. Indeed, in the midst of the state of emergency repression, the trade unions have scored significant victories ... the courage and fortitude being displayed by our South African colleagues is a lesson to us all."

He added:

Any (British) trade union which undertakes effective and deliverable action to harm or disrupt trade with South Africa will have the support of the TUC."

During the course of the day, the delegates discussed campaigning against military, nuclear and economic collaboration with apartheid South Africa, and strengthening the sports, cultural and diplomatic boycott. They also discussed the question of sanctions in solidarity with the people of Namibia and the Front Line States..At the end of the afternoon, they discussed a programme for campaigning in different sections of the community in Britain.

SUPPORT FROM INTERNATIONAL LAWYERS

The Secretariat of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, meeting in Brussels in May, took resolutions in support of the struggles for freedom in South Africa and Namibia.

The resolution on South Africa saluted the ANC and the South African trade union movement, and paid tribute to the people of South Africa organised in democratic structures. It denounced the "violence and viciousness" and the "increasing brutality" of the apartheid forces, and the Whites-only elections. It deplored "the tendency of Western media to treat relations with South Africa as normal." It called once again for comprehensive sanctions against "the illegitimate regime" and expressed the support of the Association for the struggle of the people of South Africa, led by the ANC.

The resolution on Namibia warned that the South Africa regime is preparing to destroy the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, reaffirmed the belief of the Association that SWAPO is the sole authentic voice of the people of Namibia, and welcomed "the resurgence of trade union militancy" through the National Union of Namibian Workers. It demanded that western countries implement the terms of the United Nations Council for Namibia Decree No 1, which, if implemented, would prevent the illegal exploitation of Namibian resources by the multinational companies.

INDIA SALUTES

SOUTH AFRICAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS

On March 9th 1947, the "Joint Declaration of Co-operation" (known as the 'three doctors' pact') was signed by Dr A B Xuma of the ANC, Dr G M Naicker of the Natal Indian Congress and Dr Y M Dadoo of the South African Indian Congress.

In March of this year, 40 years later, the All-India Congress Committee in New Delhi held a public meeting and an exhibition to com-

memorate the anniversary. The Indian Minister of State for External Affairs presided at the meeting, which was addressed by officers of the Congress Committee, Indian members of parliament and Comrade Moosa Moolla, ANC Chief Representative in India.

In a message to the meeting, the Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, said:

"The racist regime has recently tried to set brother against brother and to drive a wedge between different communities through sham Chambers of Parliament and engineered violence. But their strategy cannot succeed ... Persons of Indian origin know that their aspirations are identical to those of the great mass of the South African people ...

"We salute the freedom fighters of South Africa."

Major General J N Garba, Chairman of the UN Special Committee Against Apartheid also sent a message, of which we quote part:

"... the Joint Declaration of Co-operation ... cemented the common bond and just aspirations among the oppressed majority in South Africa ... The wide observance of this important event in India is another example of the unequivocal support of the people of India and their Government for the fulfilment of the noble aspirations of the suppressed people in South Africa."

President Tambo sent a message, in which he said:

"It was also in 1947 that the (Indian) Government broke relations with the racist regime, spearheading the campaign for international action against apartheid and support for our liberation struggle. This role on the part of the people of India, which takes origins from the heroic struggles led by the great Mahatma Gandhi in South Africa, has always been a source of inspiration and strength for all opponents of the apartheid system ...

"Your Government and people have throughout the years responded resolutely to our appeals to isolate apartheid South Africa, and have given us political, material and moral support — we salute you."

At the meeting, the writer Mulkraj Anand read a poem written in 1938 by Rabindranath Tagore, supporting the freedom struggle of the people of South Africa.

ANC WOMEN'S DELEGATION AT MOSCOW CONFERENCE

The ANC sent a delegation of 21 to the World Congress of Women, held in Moscow from June 23rd to 27th. About 2 000 women from governmental and non-governmental organisations in over 100 countries attended the Congress, which met to discuss questions of nuclear disarmament, peace, equality and development.

The Women's Section circulated a central paper at the Congress and a series of background papers. Our delegation took part in all the commissions, and in all commissions the South African apartheid regime was condemned. About 500 delegates attended a solidarity meeting with South African women; the hall was packed.

Winnie Mandela was given an award by the World Federation of Democratic Women. It was received on her behalf by Comrade Adelaide Tambo.

Our delegates left the Congress inspired to return to the struggle and give their utmost to it, on whatever battleground they may be fighting.



Comrade Ruth Mompoti of the NEC with some of the other ANC delegates at the Women's Congress

SOUTH AFRICAN WOMEN IN ACTION



SOUTH AFRICAN WOMEN IN ACTION



WOMEN, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

This is one of the background papers that were circulated by the ANC Women's Section at the World Congress of Women in Moscow in June.

In South Africa today the oppressed Black population fights for liberation, dignity and physical survival. The struggle begins from conception. The poor diet and nutrition of women means that children are born underweight and malnourished. Their chances of survival compared to those of White children are thirteen times worse. Most deaths occur in children under five years old, with poverty and malnutrition being the major killers of Black children in South Africa.

Women and Migrant Labour

As workers, Black women are the most exploited of the work force, and as citizens they have the fewest rights, being bound not only by repressive legislation but by oppressive traditions that are fostered by the racist government. One of these 'traditions' is migrant labour; it is at the centre of the problems Black women face.

After the Second World War, the suffering associated with migrant labour grew worse under the impact of the apartheid policies of the Nationalist government, which came to power in 1948. These policies — 'influx control' and 'resettlement' in particular — have had a devastating effect on the Black family. While the impact on women's physical well-being has been profound, the psychological stress inflicted has been no less severe. South Africa is a vast country and the regions vary. What women experience in the Transkei bantustan is often very different from what other women experience in the border regions of the Transvaal. But all women who live on the land are faced with a central contradiction. The absence of men is an economic condition of a family's survival, but the absence of men also undermines the stability of the family.

Women take care of the day-to-day management of households, but they have little control over the household budget. In the bantustans as many as 60% of the households are headed by women. Dependent on money sent by their men, they suffer constant anxiety and insecurity. Living as 'grass widows,' as the majority of the men are migrant labourers who 'visit' home for not more than one month each year, Black South African women are forced to shoulder virtually all family responsibility. The traditional support that the extended family gave has further been eroded by widespread and severe poverty.

The situation has become so acute, that some women talk like this:

"We feel deserted. We feel lonely in this desolate place where so many of our husbands must leave to find work, and stay away all year, sometimes many years ... I do not hear from my husband for many months. The money has stopped coming, even when I cry for it, it does not come. My children are hungry. I am hungry. No food. No money."

Migrant labour earnings account for between 70% and 80% of household income in the bantustans and only those bantustans sending out migrant labour can survive. What this system does — apart from destroying families — is to ensure continued low wages in the urban areas. Initially low wages were justified by employers on the grounds that they were simply an addition to the subsistence production of women in the reserves. This is no longer the case, and has not been true for several decades. The bantustans are heavily overpopulated, owing to apartheid's policy of forced removals, which has affected over three and a half million people. They cannot produce enough food for this ever-increasing population.

Health

In South Africa today there are about ten million children, of whom eight million are African. Nearly 70% of these live in the rural areas. Health is a racial matter, for it is racial legislation which determines access to nutrition, medical care, education, housing, community resources, employment and often family cohesion. Our country is one of sharp contrasts. The health of the White and affluent is on a par with that of children in the major industrial countries. The health of the rural African is similar to that of the poorest of Third World countries. This can be seen most sharply in the causes of infant mortality. African children die of diseases like gastro-

enteritis, malnutrition and pneumonia — common in poor countries — while White children die of immaturity, anoxia and congenital heart diseases in common with developed countries.

Sickness amongst Africans is the direct consequence of poor housing, poor sanitation and totally inadequate water supplies. Often modern sewerage disposal is non-existent, with devastating consequences for infant health — diarrhoea and intestinal parasites (round worm) are widespread. Lack of water also leads to skin diseases like scabies and scalp infections. Overcrowding in the cities encourages airborne infections like TB which in turn is taken back into the rural areas by migrant workers.



*In the richest country in Africa —
"poor housing, poor sanitation and totally inadequate water supplies."*

Physical growth, we know, is rapid during the last three months of pregnancy. This period, together with the first 18 months, is also the period of maximum brain growth. Malnutrition at this stage severely retards development. Weight-for-age is a good global indicator of health. Where there have been surveys in South Africa, they have all shown that about one third of African, Coloured and Indian children below 14 are underweight and stunted for their age.

The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund has adopted four recommendations to protect young children in poor communities. They are referred to as GOBI: (growth monitoring; oral rehydration; breast-feeding; immunisation against TB, polio, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough and measles). Three further stages are recommended: family spacing; female education; and food supplements.

There is little that is new in the four key GOBI-FFF components, but even they are not implemented in our country. They can be implemented very easily, involving communities in their own health care. This, of course, would require a single health service for all races, not part of apartheid policy or practice. The average number of people per hospital bed tells its own story: 61.3 for Whites, 504 for Africans, 346 for Coloureds and 337 for Asians. Segregated health services mean that the worst care goes to the poorest.

Women in Rural Slums

The worst cruelties of the apartheid system have been enacted under the name of 'resettlement.' The regime boasts that over 3.5 million people have been resettled to promote consolidation of bantustans — to remove so-called 'Black spots.' Let us take one example of what happens to women and children who are 'resettled'.

In 1977, the regime moved 78 400 families at gunpoint from a number of small reserves in the lower Tsitsikama forest near Humansdorp in the Cape, took them 300 miles away and dumped them at Elukhanyweni.

They were deprived of the agricultural base of their society and the men and a third of the women were forced to migrate to find work. One grandmother described the situation in 1985:

"Things were good when I was a child. They were good and right and we knew how things

were done. I learned many things but the most important thing I learned was to love and respect all grown-ups ... But these children now. They are not me. They are different ... What can we teach our children? My father told me: 'This land is yours. We bought this land with our life. We fought for this land.' And we knew: our children will inherit this land, and our daughters, yes, our daughters too will have their piece of earth. But what can I tell my sons? I see what has become of my daughters. They already have daughters who have sons, and the sons don't have fathers and they don't have names and they will never, never have land. No, indeed God has left us."

This description of the end of a way of life and its values brings into focus what the youth have lost with the land: a feeling of certainty about their future; the supportive family network based on family ownership of land and the faith of their elders in a Christian God.

The children now feel that there is nothing that their parents can teach them. They are trying to build a new world without the support of their elders. Money is scarce and, although rural struggle is escalating rapidly, they are divorced from urban centres of political activity. They look to the youth culture and politics of the children of Soweto, Mdantsane, Guguletu, Mamelodi and others for inspiration.

Women in the Urban Areas

Since World War II the number of African women entering the urban work force has climbed dramatically. In 1946 only 2% of African women employed outside agriculture were in the industrial labour force; by 1970 this had risen to 10%. Between 1973 and 1981 the proportion of women in the Black work force increased from 14% to 22%. The vast majority of women were and are employed in the service sector (mostly as domestic servants) and as farm workers. Increasingly, African women in towns are having to face the problems of being poorly paid with a double shift (wage and domestic work).

Once again the stability of family life is affected. In the townships there are very limited recreation and day-care facilities. Working mothers often return to work when their children are only three months old. This seriously affects the physical and emotional health of mother and child.

On top of this, there is a shortage of housing which has resulted in overcrowding and ill-health. The average Black person in South Africa lives in a space not much larger than a double bed. The average township resident occupies a patch of floor 3 metres square in which he or she washes, eats, sleeps, studies and relaxes. Reports indicate that in Soweto each house has an average of 16 occupants, while in Uitenhage as many as 42 people occupy a two-bedroomed house. In Kimberley, renowned for its diamonds, four-roomed houses hold as many as 30 occupants each.

Children and Survival Skills

Insecurity and little hope for a better future confront the township child from an early age. Parents find themselves in a vicious whirlpool of apartheid legislation such as influx control — the regime has abolished the old system of passes, but replaced it with a more sophisticated and ruthless system — migrant labour and forced removals. The first Whites the township children meet at the earliest of ages are policemen. They come in the night, break down doors and humiliate parents. Thus, children learn survival skills when they are very young. But always their early experiences are dominated by empty bellies, absent or tired parents, and every form of violence, the consequence of apartheid.

Children participated with their parents throughout the campaigns of the 1980s, particularly against the community councils and the fraudulent new constitution of 1983. They boycotted classes, joined picket lines, and called on residents not to vote in 'puppet elections.' Many children lost their lives. When the 1985 State of Emergency was declared, one of the first organisations the state banned was COSAS, an organisation of school children.

The following description of turmoil in the townships was provided by Frank Chikane, General Secretary of the Institute for Contextual Theology and Deputy President of the Soweto Civic Association:

"As the resistance to oppression and exploitation intensified, state repression increased to alarming proportions. The revolt in the Vaal Triangle in 1984 resulted in a bloody confrontation between the people and the police. In the early hours of October 23rd some 7 000 police and troops besieged the Vaal townships, conducting house-

to-house searches to stamp out the resistance and to restore law and order. As more and more Black townships revolted against the regime, the SADF moved in and occupied the townships. There have been allegations of rape, torture, assaults and brutal killings by the security forces ... But the state action did not stop the consumer boycotts, particularly in the Eastern Cape. The people demanded an end to the Emergency and the withdrawal of the troops from the townships. In the minds of the people in the townships there is a war between them and the apartheid army, which is perceived as an enemy army..."

This description of the war situation in South Africa depicts the conditions under which the township child is growing up. They have affected children more than people realise. The world of the township child is extremely violent. It is a world made up of teargas, bullets, whippings, detention, and death on the streets. It is an experience of military operations and night raids, of roadblocks and body searches. It is a world where parents and friends get taken away in the night to be interrogated, no one knowing who will return in the morning, who will be dead and who still alive.

A World Where People Disappear

It is a world where people simply disappear, where parents are assassinated and homes are petrol bombed. Such is the environment of the township child today.

Children, thousands of whom have been detained, tortured and kept in solitary confinement, spend much of their time thinking and planning how to outwit the security forces, how to take defensive action. For instance, to fight the effects of teargas, they organise cloths and water. When there are mass funerals, buckets of water are put along the route of the funeral procession in case of a teargas attack. They have learnt how to set up barricades and how to keep the security forces out. Life in the townships has changed irrevocably. A township resident said:

"When my two-year-old daughter sees a military vehicle passing, she looks for a stone."

Nursery school children are no exception. They too have learnt the language of *siyayinyova!* (we will destroy), which is the popular slogan used by the youths when attacking what they call 'targets,' meaning the buildings, vehicles and in-

dividuals regarded as symbols of the apartheid regime and its security forces.

The exposure of children to outrages in the townships has resulted in adaptive behaviour patterns. They are learning a different set of survival skills. Their songs tell of the world as they perceive it, a violent world, a war situation. They move in groups in the townships: a commander, his 'armed forces' around him. Their ammunition is stones, sticks and probably petrol bombs. They have different values. No longer are the local football players or Bruce Lee of the movies their heroes. They know now only of the Mandelas, the Sisulus and the Tambos. And there are those who are joining the ranks of Umkhonto we Sizwe to fight the system. The youth in the churches and church groups are also adapting to this new reality. This is manifested in their songs, prayers, and various forms of expression of faith. There are indeed some children in the townships who are not as radical or even politically conscious as the majority of their contemporaries, but the pervasive atmosphere of violence and confrontation tends eventually to plunge all into active participation. They find themselves either confronting the system or running away from teargas and bullets.

The upshot of all this is that there are many who have lost up to four years of schooling between 1976 and 1986. The school boycotters have fallen behind those in apartheid's bantustan and private schools. The war that is being waged on the streets of the townships by the SADF is waged mainly against children. The chaos created in the lives of the children, coupled with their physical elimination, is a major threat to our very survival, and a denial of the future generation that must lead our country.

Women and the Future Generation

It is a widely held belief amongst White South Africans that if Black population growth was slowed down, under-nutrition would not be so widespread. If there were fewer Africans, so their theory goes, there would be more food and resources to go around. This is an argument the racist state has actually gone to great pains to try to make effective. In 1973 — following hot on the heels of a series of major strikes and combined with a growing White awareness of the scale of Black unemployment — the Pretoria regime launched a massive family planning pro-

gramme. At clinics and in advertisements Africans were told: "A small family for a big future." But at the same time Whites were told to have large families for the Republic. White mothers of ten children are even rewarded with a special medal from the the racist State President. By 1978 the Health Department boasted that its family planning programme was the eighth biggest in the world, and taking population size into account, it was surpassed only by China. Over the next five years, expenditure on family planning increased threefold. In 1983-4 approximately six rand was allocated for every African woman aged 15 to 45 years. At that time the total health budget for the bantustans of Transkei, Ciskei, Bophuthatswana and Venda amounted to 24 rand per person.

The regime's emphasis on family planning is an integral part of its policy of Black population control. Family planning, as practised by apartheid South Africa, includes the use of Depo Provera and sterilisation. It has been fiercely resisted, for in a land where a child's survival is so precarious, many children increase the chances of at least some reaching adulthood.

Conclusion

The catalogue of state violence against Blacks in South Africa is a long one. Arbitrary arrests and detentions, floggings and torture, shootings, political assassinations and executions are only the most dramatic. Blacks — and particularly Black women — do not suffer only from the violence of the state. Apartheid breeds anti-social and criminal behaviour, which manifests itself in drunkenness, robbery, assault, rape and murder. The deliberate manipulation by the state of ethnic identity has exacerbated the tensions between people already forced to compete along ethnic lines for scarce resources. All these forms of violence make life a daily struggle for survival.

Yet, despite the enormous hardships faced by Black women in South Africa, they have not simply become victims of apartheid. In the churches, in community organisations, in self-help groups, in the trade unions and in the African National Congress, women have struggled for survival and have shown quite remarkable strength, courage and resilience.

It would be wrong, however, to underestimate the price paid, or the problems that will confront a democratic South Africa.

PEOPLE'S POWER OR POWER-SHARING?

UNITED STATES POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA

By Mzala

The belief within the US State Department is that the interests of the South African Communist Party are served by an inflexible attitude on the part of the Pretoria regime towards negotiations with the ANC, and by the ANC's focus on increasing military pressure on South Africa. Should broader options become available for the ANC leadership, their thinking goes, then the questions of the extent and direction of SACP influence could become a major issue. The confidential 11-page report the US State Department submitted to Congress in January 1987 states:

"If Pretoria reconsiders its opposition to negotiations or if the ANC relations with Western countries continue to improve, serious policy differences could surface within the ANC. The internal stability of the ANC and its main political tendency will be shaped by the extent to which Pretoria tests — or fails to test — its shaky cohesion. If the South African government pursues only repressive policies, the ANC will be able to enjoy the luxury of postponing or avoiding the real issues in its own ranks." (p.11)

This belief shows a complete misunderstanding of what the ANC is and what its members are united about. It further demonstrates lack of real knowledge about those issues which the ANC and the SACP are unshakeably united and in agreement about.

The Question of Negotiations

One of those basic common issues between the ANC and the SACP is precisely their approach to the question of negotiations in South Africa. No revolutionary organisation, even a Communist Party for that matter, can reject the question of negotiations in principle. When the SACP

drew up its programme in 1962, it maintained:

"The Party does not dismiss all prospects of non-violent transition to the democratic revolution."

But then the Communist Party qualified the circumstances under which such an eventuality is possible:

"... this prospect will be enhanced by the development of revolutionary and militant people's forces. The illusion that the White minority can rule for ever over a disarmed majority will crumble before the reality of an armed and determined people. **The possibility would be opened of a peaceful and negotiated transfer of power** to the representatives of the oppressed majority of the people.

"Whether its end is brought about through such a peaceful transition or by insurrection, the vicious type of colonialism embodied in the present Republic of South Africa cannot long endure." (My emphasis.)

The ANC, through the various statements of its leadership, has also stated its viewpoint on the question of negotiations, which does not differ from that of the SACP. To suggest that the ANC would, under the present circumstances, place the disarmed people on the altar of negotiations with a fascist regime is to insult the ANC, and to question its sincerity and sense of responsibility to the leadership of the South African oppressed people.

Transfer of Power

We stand for the dismantling of apartheid and the transfer of power to the people. Decolonisation of South Africa cannot have any meaning other than this transfer of power to the colonis-

ed. That is how the General Assembly of the United Nations phrased the famous Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted on December 14th 1960. This Declaration unequivocally called for immediate steps to be taken to:

"transfer all power to the peoples of those territories who are not yet self-governing, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

Keeping these ideals constantly in mind, inspired and guided by them, the people of South Africa have, year after year, and each day, with extraordinary courage, rededicated themselves to the struggle for "the transfer of power to the people" as stipulated by the United Nations Declaration. To strive for less would be unworthy of these universally held principles as well as the honour of those who have sacrificed supremely for them.

Since the Communist Party also supports this principle, then its members are most welcome within the ANC, because, to us, transfer of power to the people is the only principle that is consistent with the right of nations to self-determination. This point must be made clear, that this is the perspective of the ANC, and it truly represents our positions as we adopted them in 1955 when we drafted the Freedom Charter. This position was not arrived at during a special joint meeting of the ANC and the SACP; it was adopted by a representative Congress of close to 3 000 delegates of the South African people. The ANC leads a revolution that will result in the building of a new state in South Africa, one in which the people shall ascend to the position of rulers of their own country.

The Sovereignty of the People

It is precisely this fact that obliges us to fight, not for the inclusion of the Blacks into Botha's parliament, nor for the reform of apartheid, but for the dismantling of apartheid and the establishment of people's sovereignty through an elected People's Assembly. An Assembly that can set about drawing up a new constitution for South Africa (after the draft has been thoroughly discussed by the masses in all their walks of life) can only be that which has been invested with supreme authority and power to do so, one that

is vested with the sovereignty of the people.

Negotiations can be useful provided they are themselves the process of transfer of power from the racist minority to the democratic majority. If negotiations can hasten this process, then we shall be the first to campaign for them, and we shall do so openly and vigorously. We do not want our slavery to be prolonged even for a day. We are not happy to see our people being daily pushed into overcrowded graveyards. We would like to shorten this misery. If our freedom can come about tomorrow, we are ready for it! Only it must be the kind of freedom which would allow us to form our own government and shape the economic destiny and future of our children without dictation.

Power-Sharing?

As we see it, the possibilities for negotiations with the Botha regime at the moment are absolutely non-existent, because this regime is not yet prepared for a transition to a non-racial democratic society. This is not just the viewpoint of the ANC, which might be regarded as subjective, but rather that of an objective and independent panel of investigators: the Commonwealth Eminent Persons' Group (EPG). In their report, *Mission to South Africa*, which has been widely distributed, the EPG concluded:

"It is our considered view that, despite appearances and statements to the contrary, the South African government is not yet ready to negotiate such a future — except on its own terms. Those terms, both in regard to objectives and modalities, fall short of reasonable Black expectations and well-accepted democratic norms and principles." (p.131)

But not so with Dr Chester Crocker, the US Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, and his colleagues. It is not the question of transfer of power that they have in their policy documents, but that of "power-sharing." For them, if the negotiations have to take place, they must not be between the government representing the oppressors and the ANC, the political representative of the oppressed people. The agenda for a 'square table' will be transfer of power as the logical process of decolonisation; but negotiations among the variety of organisations that appear in the South African political, economic, academic and cultural catalogue, that is, the agenda for a 'round table', would inevitably be about

methods of power-sharing. Dr Crocker was explaining precisely this on February 27th this year, 1987, when (as reported in *The Washington Line* of March 6th) he explained to Nigerian and Kenyan journalists what the US hopes to finally achieve with this negotiation approach:

"The recent meeting between Secretary Schultz and Mr Tambo was the first. We have, of course, been in touch with the ANC at lower levels for some time now, and we recognise that the ANC is one of the important parties that must be included in the process of dialogue and negotiation. I emphasise the word 'one'. It's not the only one."

The same approach is expressed in the report made to the US Secretary of State by the Advisory Committee on South Africa in 1986:

"Short of a revolutionary overthrow of the existing government, any viable settlement will have to take into account the resources, military force and skills of nearly five million Whites. Moreover, once they accept the principle of a political and economic system not based upon one race, Whites would not be alone in negotiating for constitutional guarantees of individual rights. A host of other leaders representing limited but still significant constituencies — including 'homeland' officials, members of the Indian and Coloured houses of parliament, Black union leaders, Black and White businessmen, and the academic community — also have a strong interest in establishing reasonable checks on the powers of a future majority-controlled government." (p.9)

The concept of power-sharing in the colonial context of the history of South Africa is a misguided approach to the country's problems. It is a concept that may appear 'logical' and 'fair' only to those who are not at all acquainted with the history of our country, and the source of our national oppression. This 'logic' and 'fairness' exists only in so far as someone proceeds from an incorrect premise that in South Africa there is no colonial question and that the problems of the Black people are essentially questions of civil rights. Our oppressed people are therefore placed at the same historical level of struggle as, for example, Black Americans in the United States. In such a situation there is no programme for decolonisation.

The report of the Advisory Committee on South Africa is a typical example of this

ahistorical approach to the South African question. It says:

"A first step to understanding the prospects for a resolution of the problem of apartheid in South Africa is to recognise that there are no historical analogies to developments in other African countries. Elsewhere in Africa, the extension of political rights to Blacks came through decolonisation. Except in Namibia, that process is now complete. In South Africa, decolonisation occurred with the establishment of the union of South Africa in 1910." (p.6)

The report further says that it is:

"... the United States that does provide a dramatic example of how a system in which some citizens are politically, socially and economically discriminated against, solely on account of race, can be changed."

South Africa's Colonialism of a Special Type
Perhaps, in the geography manuals of the United States policy-makers, South Africa is not in Africa, but attached to the American continent, or even to Europe. Perhaps it has been forgotten that, when Africa was carved and colonised after the Berlin Treaty towards the end of the 19th century, the imperialist powers did to the inhabitants of South Africa exactly what they did to the inhabitants of Algeria, Congo, Zimbabwe, Namibia — all countries in Africa, with the exception of Ethiopia and Liberia. Our struggle in South Africa is continuing the one and indivisible struggle for Africa to rid itself of colonialism.

South Africa decolonised in 1910? Who had been colonised in South Africa as from 1652? It was the African people. Who colonised them? The White colonialists. Who then got decolonised? Did the coloniser decolonise himself? This would be absurd!

The apartheid system of today is the outcome of a process of historical development which has led to the entrenchment of White settler colonial domination. This pattern was not changed when the British government handed political power to the White settler colonialists. As far as the Black people of South Africa are concerned, South Africa has all the features of a colony. They are subjected to extreme national oppression, they lack constitutional rights. The oppressor nation does all it can to emphasise its alien character. Until only recently, public buildings

in South Africa carried the sign: "Europeans Only."

The fact that in our country there was a uniquely large settlement of the colonisers, who subsequently severed all ties with their countries of origin, and constituted themselves into an internal colonising nation within the same geographical boundaries, does not remove a single inch of the fact that the Black people are colonised and are therefore fighting to exercise their right to self-determination. A truly independent South Africa will join the Organisation of African Unity, and that has yet to occur.

It is true that as far as the Whites are concerned, South Africa is as independent for them as France is for the French or Norway for the Norwegians. But Whites alone do not form the total population of South Africa, and it would be wrong to believe that they alone can constitute an independent country. Such a notion is tantamount to denying that Blacks exist in South Africa. This is ridiculous imagination!

Our Right to Self-Determination

If the founding fathers of American society felt, at a particular stage, that they were absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connections between them and the state of Great Britain was totally dissolved, equally the oppressed people of South Africa are, and of right ought to be, free to determine their political and economic life without restraints.

The right to self-determination, which is applicable to our people no less than to any other in the world, has always been understood historically to mean the right to free political

separation from alien national bodies and parliaments, their right to form an independent national state and constitution. It would be absurd for the principle, to insist on the term, 'self-determination', if ultimately the oppressed nation does not have the right to create its own government and choose its own economic system.

It is therefore not the question of the oppressor state determining the constitution alone and then calling on the oppressed to fit themselves into it. Neither is it the question of the oppressor and the oppressed debating over a constitution in a conference or convention, because in that way it will no longer be self-determination but joint-determination. The idea of power-sharing, which is synonymous with joint-determination, infringes on the right of the oppressed and colonised, and no serious organisation representing the aspirations of the people can compromise such a principle either for peace or any other convenience. Those who play down, or even refuse to support, this right of the oppressed in South Africa are recognising the leadership of Botha and Malan, and they are recognising the oppressors as the model nation and one possessing the exclusive right of forming a 'model' state.

What makes the present-day policy of the United States tragic, once more, is that it regards our country from an angle completely divorced from concrete, historical reality. To the United States, South Africa is no more than a Cape sea route, a source of raw materials or an arena for East-West conflict. That this country is principally the native land of 26 million people, who, because of an historical process of colonialism,



President Tambo with Harry Belafonte in the United States.

are denied by the constitution the right to govern themselves, is smartly ignored, in order to favour simplistic solutions such as civil redress for, and power-sharing with, the Blacks.

If we insist on transfer of power to the people, and the imperialists disagree and call for power-sharing, may we ask: with whom should the people share power?

Plans to Create a Third Force

According to the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, the United States' idea is to get the apartheid regime to declare its intention to hold negotiations, even long before it can be prepared to negotiate the transfer of power, and, if the ANC refuses to participate, to get together puppet forces of the Muzorewa type, and go ahead and fix a neo-colonial solution for South Africa.

Such a neo-colonial solution, however, is bound to collapse even before it takes off, because the present uprising and war of liberation in South Africa is not led by those puppet forces; moreover, the people of South Africa are politically conscious enough to know who are their genuine leaders, and they equally know what they want.

If it does get off at all, such a neo-colonial solution may only give the apartheid regime a temporary breathing time, just as Rhodesia's Ian Smith got a breathing time during the period when Bishop Muzorewa assumed the leadership of colonial Rhodesia. But where did it all end up? No political trickery has ever succeeded in stopping a political storm of the masses, particularly when they are organised and armed. The imperialists are forever scouting for the Muzorewas of South Africa. They are developing political groupings and grooming various personalities, whose task is to attempt to abort our revolution. As these political groupings and personalities come to the fore, so will they discredit themselves in front of the people.

There is no lasting solution that can be found to South Africa's problems without acknowledging the central role of the ANC as the genuine leader of the people. Attempts to bypass the very force that is leading the people in revolution against the apartheid regime can only end up in failure. The ANC has survived the tribulations and storms of the past 75 years of its existence precisely because it is the organisation of the people, created by them and serving their interests.

The ANC is not about to wither away now that it is United States imperialism that plans to create a third force to negotiate with the apartheid regime.

What About 'Minority Rights'?

Interconnected with the notion of power-sharing is another question of particular interest to the United States with regard to post-apartheid South Africa; the new government should guarantee in the constitution the safeguard of 'minority rights.' This idea is clearly stated in the report of the Secretary of State Advisory Committee on South Africa.

The question is cleverly put as a sincere concern of democrats about the rights of the minorities.

There are several problematic issues that confront a political scientist when the question of 'minorities' is raised in the context of South Africa. I shall list them in the following order:

■ Who are these minorities? What is the criterion used in designating certain population groups as minorities? Race? Culture? Language? Wealth? Common origin? Legal norms? What exactly? And who has come up with this concern about the rights of minorities? Is it the designated minorities themselves or certain individuals claiming to be their spokesmen?

We raise these questions because P W Botha says today that he does recognise that South Africans constitute a single nation, but that the problem is that this is "a nation of minorities." Consequent to this reasoning, it is argued that the only solution for South Africa's problem shall be one that ensures that there is no domination of one minority by the others. The apartheid regime then differentiates these minorities as the various African ethnic groups — Zulus, Xhosas, Sothos, and so on — and groups the Whites together as a single and undivided 'minority.' This apartheid theory of 'minorities' cleverly avoids comparing African ethnicity with White ethnicity, because if it did so it would soon discover that among the Whites there are other minorities such as the Afrikaners, the English, the Jews, Greeks, and so on. Our question would then persist: who are the minorities in South Africa?

■ Usually, when we look beyond what claims to be democratic concern about the rights of

minorities, we find that the phraseology refers only to the Whites as a group in South Africa. In other words, if we interpret this phrase literally, the concern is for 'White rights' or 'rights of the Whites' as the case may be. Now this creates problems. For more than three centuries, Whites in South Africa have enjoyed special privileges which have been the direct result of the oppression and exploitation of the Black people. Is this not, in fact, a concern for White privileges? The retention of White privileges means the continuation of racism.

We oppose and fight against the apartheid system today precisely because it grants privileges to the Whites at the expense of the overwhelming majority of the population of the country. And we are told today that the future government of a liberated South Africa should guarantee them these privileges.

■ Suppose we acknowledge the notion that Whites as a group form a single minority with common interests that are either different or distinct from those of the other nationalities in South Africa. Where, then, do we place the thousands of Whites in South Africa who are joining organisations like JODAC and affiliating to the UDF as well as declaring the Freedom Charter to be their lodestar? Where do we place the thousands of White Christians affiliated to the South African Council of Churches, who have declared through their representatives that apartheid is a heresy and is morally unjustifiable? What about hundreds of White students, who sent their representatives to meet the ANC, and at the end of the meeting wrote a joint communique, saying:

"The delegations agreed that the real interests of the majority of White South Africans do not lie in the system of racial domination and national oppression. Both were at one that White South Africans have an important role to play now in the endeavour to achieve a **non-racial** and democratic South Africa."

Can persons like Helen Joseph, Barbara Hogan, Steve Marais, Marion Sparg and scores of sincere White democrats in South Africa agree to be grouped by any constitution as a White minority seeking its own exclusive rights?

All National Groups Shall Enjoy Equal Rights

In terms of the Freedom Charter, South Africa

shall be a free country where all its people shall enjoy equal rights whatever their colour, race or creed. The statement, "South Africa belongs to all who live in it, Black and White," in the preamble of the Freedom Charter, should serve as sufficient guarantee to the White section of our population that when South Africa is free, franchise and other rights shall not be confined to those belonging to the Black race and over the age of 18. Instead, every man and woman shall have the right to vote and to stand as a candidate for all bodies that make laws, without any distinction whatsoever, and all people shall be entitled to take part in the administration of the country.

It is therefore clear from the perspectives of the Freedom Charter that people shall be citizens of South Africa on an individual basis and not as racial groups. And it follows from this principle that voting rights shall equally be exercised by individual citizens, whether Black or White, and our constitution shall not tolerate the retention of exclusively racial constituencies, since this will definitely feed on the obsolete racial ideas which our liberation struggle is meant to put to an end.

People who insist on so-called 'minority rights' are the mischief-makers who have no desire for the end of racial inequality and the establishment of true democracy. The very posing of this question at this period of our struggle is in itself a racist act, because the main problem of South Africa is the rights of the **majority**, but this argument diverts our attention to an imaginary problem. Any preoccupation with this question of 'minority rights' would amount to suggesting that the real freedom-loving people in South Africa are the Whites, who are so concerned about rights and freedoms that they insist on their being guaranteed in a constitution.

From the point of view of the imperialists, the purpose of this concern is to keep national exploitation intact in South Africa, since monopoly capitalists are to be found only within the White group. Protection of White rights, therefore, also implies the retention of the means of production, as a right, in the hands of the private White owners.

SOUTH AFRICA AT THE CROSSROADS

CANON COLLINS MEMORIAL LECTURE

When President O R Tambo delivered the Canon Collins Memorial Lecture in London on May 28th, 1987, about 1 000 people came to hear him and gave him a standing ovation. The Canon Collins Memorial Lecture was established by the British Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa to pay tribute to the memory of Canon Collins and further the work to which he devoted his life. We give here an abridged version of President Tambo's speech.

It is now almost five years since Canon John Collins passed away. With his departure, many of us lost a dear friend. As a people, we lost a fellow-combatant for justice and liberation, a dependable ally in the struggle to abolish the system of apartheid. Yet, such was the durability of his good works that it was inevitable that they would outlast the short life that is given to us all and thus serve to turn the memory of the man into a material force that will continue to transform the destinies of the living.

Canon Collins came into our lives at the inception of the crisis which the imposition of the apartheid system was to bring to the people of South Africa. In 1952 and from 1955 onwards, he intervened in the persisting drama of South African politics to comfort the persecuted and to help save some of the most outstanding representatives of our people from possible death sentences or long terms of imprisonment. He came to our aid not in pity but in solidarity. He stretched out his hand to our people because he saw that what was happening to us was an unacceptable attack against humanity itself. He acted because he could not stand aside.

When the racist regime arrested and charged with high treason 156 leaders of our democratic movement in 1956, it hoped that it would destroy that movement and create a situation in which it would expand and entrench the apartheid system without opposition. John Collins took the side of those on trial, as he had supported the patriots who joined our Campaign in Defiance

of Unjust Laws in 1952. His actions carried the message that in the struggle between the forces of democracy and those of racism, there can be no neutrality.

The Crisis Has Matured

The crisis which was in its early stages when Canon Collins joined us for the emancipation of our people has matured. The septic boil caused by the apartheid system is ready to burst, as the brutally repressive casing which contains the putrefaction of this system ruptures irrevocably and for all time. South Africa is at the crossroads. It has taken many years of struggle to reach the point at which we are today. In that period, tens of thousands have been killed, injured and imprisoned within South Africa. Thousands of others have suffered a similar fate in Namibia. The rest of Southern Africa has also seen enormous numbers of people die, economies forced to the verge of collapse and social programmes brought to a halt.

And yet there are those in this country who, unlike John Collins, doubt the certainty of our victory. These calculate that the racist regime is so powerful, and the White minority so steadfast in its commitment to the maintenance of its domination, that the oppressed are condemned to a futile and self-destructive battering at the ramparts of the racist fortress. But, of course, these doubting Thomases also profess an abhorrence for apartheid and declare a desire to see it brought to an end.

Will the Racists Dismantle Their Own System?

These positions have resulted in a policy which amounts to appeasement of the apartheid regime. Of central importance to the logical integrity of this policy is the notion that the Pretoria regime can and must be persuaded to turn itself into its opposite. Accordingly, it is required and expected that the racists should themselves dismantle the oppressive system they have instituted and over which they preside. Thus would we see the miraculous conversion of oppressors into liberators and the consequent transformation of the liberation movement into an irrelevance.

Another important element in this equation is the definition of the essence of the policy that the White minority regime must follow, as repression and reform. In terms of this perspective, it is required that this regime should gradually reform the apartheid system out of existence. To do so, it is considered necessary that the supposed reformers should work their wonders in a situation of stability. Consequently, it is viewed as a *sine qua non* for the abolition of the apartheid system that the forces that are fighting against this system should be kept in check by repressive means.

It therefore seems clear to us that the major western powers have not departed from their old positions. According to these, the White minority regime is seen and treated as the defender and guarantor of the perceived interests of these powers. We, on the other hand, are viewed as a threat which must be dealt with in the appropriate manner.

In response to all this, the questions might be posed — what of the fact that the governments of the principal western powers have, especially during the last twelve months, entered into direct contact with the ANC? And what of the fact that these governments have repeatedly called on the Pretoria regime to enter into negotiations with everybody concerned, including the ANC?

The western powers entered into official contact with the ANC because the argument that they were seeking change by talking exclusively to the Botha regime could no longer be sustained. It had lost credibility. In addition, and as the Commonwealth Eminent Persons' Group understood and reported, it became clear to the western governments that the majority of our people

within South Africa recognised the ANC as their political representative. Hence it was inevitable that, if they were still interested to project themselves as brokers, honest or otherwise, these governments would have to be seen to be talking to the ANC.

However, the decisions taken in the various capitals to relate to the ANC did not in any way imply that there had been any change of attitude towards our policies, strategy and tactics. It is also obvious to us that in all the discussions we have held, by and large we have failed to move such major western powers as the USA, the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany, to view the South African situation from the perspective of the oppressed.

On all major questions pertaining to the issues we are discussing, the coincidence of views between the Pretoria regime and the powers that be in most of the west, persists. Where the racists describe us as a communist front, western governments go so far as to order secret investigations of the ANC to establish the extent of this alleged communist domination.

The West Speaks with the Voice of Pretoria
Pretoria calls on us to renounce violence. The west calls on us to lay down arms. When the sole aggressor in Southern Africa talks about so-called regional security, the western powers condemn 'cross-border violence from all sides'. The White minority regime conducts a vigorous campaign against sanctions and is joined in that campaign by the western powers.

We can go on *ad infinitum* and speak even about the questions of formulations and terminology. For example, our armed struggle is never that, but is either terrorism or violence. The limpet mines we use are never simply limpet mines, but are either of Soviet or communist origin. On the other hand, the guns and planes that Pretoria uses with such relish are never of British, American, French, Belgian or West German origin, but are mere guns or planes. The conclusions to draw from all this are obvious to all honest people.

The West Must Choose

This places the western powers in the position in which they have to choose either to work for the total elimination of the apartheid system or, in fact, to connive at its perpetuation, as they do now. We are, however, certain that sooner or

later they will come to realise that there has emerged an alternative democratic power within South Africa, an indigenous product of struggle which holds the future of South Africa in its hands.

The west will then have to decide whether it takes the side of this alternative power and the rest of the anti-colonial and anti-racist forces of the continent of Africa made up of nearly five hundred million people, or whether it ties itself to the doomed course followed by far less than five million Africans of European origin. It is no longer possible to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds.

The alternative power in our country is as real today as it is impossible to vanquish in the future. It is here to stay and will grow in strength despite all efforts to suppress it, until South Africa is liberated and peace returns to Southern Africa. As a consequence of this development, it is becoming impossible to avoid confronting the question of the legitimacy of the powers which are contending with each other within our country. These two cannot co-exist, as fascism and democracy could not, but have to give way one to the other.

The broad perspectives of our country's democratic power are spelt out in the Freedom Charter. Organisationally, it is represented by many formations which recognise the leading role of the ANC in the struggle for a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa. Whether or not they support or engage in armed struggle, they are at one with us in seeking this outcome and are active in the struggle for its realisation.

I should state here that when we say we are fighting for a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa, we mean what we say. It is very clear to us that unless our country becomes such an entity, we shall know no peace. To propose any so-called solutions which fall within the parameters of the apartheid system is no more than to prepare a recipe for a continuation of the conflict which has already claimed too many lives.

It is to ask for the continued murder and imprisonment of children, which has become a permanent feature of Pretoria's policy of repression. It is to prepare for the extension of the policy of the deliberate impoverishment of the masses of the Black people, the forced removal and banishment of millions, the break-up of families and

everything else that you know about the apartheid system.

Shift of Strategic Initiative

Given the changing balance of strength in our country and the shift of the strategic initiative into our hands, there is a sense in which the apartheid forces are becoming the opposition to the ascendant democratic movement rather than the other way round. The recent White elections demonstrate this point inasmuch as the Botha regime contested them on the specific platform of opposition to the ANC. Subsequent to its victory, this regime has not changed its tune but has continued with its threats to act vigorously against the democratic movement and has actually carried out these threats as well as murdered a young Zimbabwean woman who was married to the Administrative Secretary in our Office in Harare.

In the recent period intense debates have arisen about the academic and cultural boycotts. In a critical sense these debates arise from the successes of our all-round struggle and reflect attempts to get to grips with new dimensions that the emergence of the alternative democratic power entails.

Progressive, Democratic Culture

At the same time we must take into account the changes that have taken place over time. In particular, as in almost every other field of human endeavour in South Africa, there has emerged a definable alternative democratic culture — the people's culture permeated with and giving expression to the deepest aspirations of our people in struggle, immersed in democratic and enduring human values.

This is a development, however, that is taking place within the context of the emergent alternative democratic power whose duty it is to draw on the academic and cultural resources and heritage of the world community to advance the democratic perspective in our country. For it is only with the realisation of a non-racial, democratic and united South Africa that such a people's culture shall be able to flourish in full glory.

To a lesser or greater degree, there has always been a tradition of progressive culture which has struggled for survival and growth against colonial domination and commercialisation. The change that has occurred is that this people's culture,

despite the extreme hostility of the racist state, has grown into a mighty stream, distinct from and in opposition to the warped and moribund culture of racism. Its foremost exponents are today part of the democratic movement. The core of the cultural workers engaged in creating this people's culture are simultaneously engaged in developing our own institutions and structures which are aligned to mass democratic organisations in our country.

As in politics, trade unionism, education, sport, religion and many other fields, these developments at the cultural level both contributed to and are part of the emergent alternative democratic power at whose head stands the ANC.

Without doubt the developing and vibrant culture of our people in struggle, and its structures, need to be supported, strengthened and enhanced. In the same way as apartheid South Africa is being increasingly isolated internationally, within South Africa this people's culture is steadily isolating the intellectual and cultural apologists of apartheid.

Support the Alternative Structures

Indeed, the moment is upon us when we shall have to deal with the alternative structures that our people have created and are creating through struggle and sacrifice, as the genuine representatives of these masses in all fields of human activity. Not only should these not be boycotted, but more, they should be supported, encouraged and treated as the democratic counterparts within South Africa of similar institutions and organisations internationally. This means that the ANC, the broad democratic movement in its various formations within South Africa, and the international solidarity movement need to act together.

On these questions John Collins entertained no doubts whatsoever. Having taken positions against racism, discrimination, oppression and war, he accepted that to bring these to an end he must march side by side with those of like mind, against the racists, the oppressors and the warmongers. His example is eminently worthy of emulation.

Everywhere in our country, and after a year of national state of emergency, the democratic forces are at work to expand and strengthen their ranks and to raise the level and intensity of the

offensive against the apartheid regime to new heights. For its part, this regime prepares itself for more atrocities, for the campaign of repression of which PW Botha boasts — as though to shoot and kill children, to imprison and torture them and their parents, to carry out one outrage after another against independent Africa, — were the worthiest activities that one could ever imagine.

Battles Will Be Fought

A terrible collision between ourselves and our opponents is inevitable. Many battles will be fought and many lives will be lost throughout our region. In preparation for this, the Pretoria regime has identified the defeat of the democratic movement as the centrepiece of state policy. Yet the outcome is not in doubt. Having reached the crossroads, the masses of our people have decided that our country must advance as rapidly as possible to the situation where they, Black and White, will govern themselves together as equals. Whatever the cost, there is no doubt that we will win.

We cannot but regret that such titans of our struggle as John Collins will not be with us to celebrate the birth of democracy in our country. In a fortnight you, who are his compatriots, will be casting your votes to choose representatives to your parliament. How terrible it is that in the Southern tip of Africa millions have to go through the furnace of violent struggle to win for themselves a right which you take for granted!

What a tragedy that many more will have to die simply because this, a democratic country, refused to heed Canon Collins' plea for his motherland to side with the oppressed and to declare war on the tyrants! What a tragedy that those who exercise power have become so bereft of vision that they have learnt to treat as no more than a slogan, the objective of the expansion of the frontiers of democracy to the Black oppressed of Namibia and South Africa!

**When freedom comes, what will they say then?
What will they do then?
Will they finally claim Canon Collins as one of their own?**

**SECHABA and other ANC
publications are obtainable
from the following
ANC addresses:**

ALGERIA

5 Rue Ben M'hidi Larbi
Algiers.

ANGOLA

PO Box 3523
Luanda.

AUSTRALIA

Box 49 Trades Hall (Room 23)
4 Goulburn Street
Sydney NSW 2000.

BELGIUM

25 Rue du Conseil
1050 Brussels.

CANADA

PO Box 302
Adelaide Postal Station
Toronto
Ontario M5C-2J4.

CUBA

Calle 21a
NR 20617
Esquina 214 Atabey
Havana.

DENMARK

Landgreven 7/3
1301 Copenhagen K.

EGYPT

5 Ahmad Ishmat Street
Zamalek
Cairo.

ETHIOPIA

PO Box 7483
Addis Ababa.

FRANCE

28 Rue des Petites Ecuries
75010 Paris

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Angerweg 2
Wilhelmsruh
Berlin 1106.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Postfach 190140
5300 Bonn 1.

MADAGASCAR

PO Box 80
Antananarivo

ITALY

Via S. Prisca 15a
00153 Rome.

INDIA

Apt 350 KP Thacker Block, Asian Games Village
Siri Fort Road
New Delhi 110040

NIGERIA

Federal Government
Special Guest House
Victoria Island
Lagos.

SENEGAL

26 Avenue Albert Sarraut
PO Box 3420, Dakar

SWEDEN

Box 6183
S-102 33

Stockholm

TANZANIA

PO Box 2239 Dar es Salaam.
PO Box 680 Morogoro.

UNITED KINGDOM

PO Box 38
28 Penton Street
London N1 9PR

UNITED STATES

801 Second Avenue Apt 405
New York NYC 10017

ZAMBIA

PO Box 31791
Lusaka.

LISTEN TO:

Radio Freedom

**Voice of the African National Congress
and Umkhonto We Sizwe, the People's Army.**

Radio Luanda

short wave: 30 & 40 m. bands
medium wave: 27.6 m. band
7.30 p.m. daily.

Radio Lusaka

short wave: 31 m. band, 9580 KHz
7.15-8.00 p.m. Monday to Friday
10.05-10.35 p.m. Wednesday
10.30-11.00 p.m. Friday
7.00-8.00 p.m. Saturday
8.00-8.45 p.m. Sunday, 17895 KHz.

Radio Madagascar

short wave: 49 m. band, 6135 KHz
9.30-10.00 p.m. daily.

Radio Ethiopia

short wave: 31 m. band, 9545 KHz
9.30-10.00 p.m. daily.

Radio Tanzania

Short wave: 19 m. band, 15435 KHz
Sunday, Monday, Wednesday, Friday,
8.15 p.m.
31 m. band,
Tuesday, Thursday & Saturday,
6.15 a.m.

Published by the

**African National Congress of South Africa
P.O. Box 31791, LUSAKA, ZAMBIA
Printed by the Druckerei 'Erich Weinert',
2000 Neubrandenburg, G.D.R.**

AUGUST 9TH — SOUTH AFRICA WOMEN'S DAY

