

mayibuyye

BA 322.405
MAY
S. 89/173
1996
U.C.T. LIBRARIES



23

bulletin of the A.N.C., South Africa

CONTENTS

E.D.I.T.O.R.I.A.L	1
Ons Die Bruine Mense: We The Brown People	3
S.A. Mulungushi, Mulungushi And Gaberones	6
France And Africa	8
The Armed Struggle	11

ANLSA

SOME JUNE 26 HIGHLIGHTS

Have you started implementing your resolution to ensure the observance of June 26 Week becomes an international campaign against apartheid? If you haven't then we hope you will draw inspiration from and even be spurred on by hearing of some of the dynamic plans to staunch fighters against apartheid.

Anti-Apartheid Movement

- * June 23 (Sunday). A big march to the Portuguese Embassy to protest Portuguese colonialism.
- * A huge Rally at Trafalgar Square to be addressed by prominent personalities.
- * A March from Trafalgar Square (after the Rally) to Rhodesia House to confront Smith!

International Defence & Aid

- * A Concert, on the theme "Come Back Africa" will take place at The Royal Albert Hall, Wednesday 26 June, 7.30 p.m. The list of artists who will perform is an imposing one. These are top rankers in the field of art - observing June 26. The list of names comprise outstanding personalities such as: Producer Ted Kotcheff, Marlon Brando, Dick Gregory, John Dankworth, Julie Driscoll, Brian Auger & The Trinity, Julie Felix, Captain Fish and his Limbo Troupe, The Alf Garnett Family, Warren Mitchell, Dandy Nichols, Una Stubbs, Anthony Booth, John Hendricks, Cleo Laine, Jonathan Miller, Marion Montgomery, Annie Ross, The Scaffold, Fou Ts'ong, John Williams. 'The Alf Garnett Family' sketch is by Johnny Speight. Also Igor Distrakh.

TICKETS: £5. 5. 0, £3. 3. 0, £2. 2. 0, £1. 1. 0, 15/-, 10/-
7/6.

Apply to the BOX OFFICE: The Royal Albert Hall, Kensington Gore, London SW7.

U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid

- * Coinciding with JUNE 26 WEEK, the U.N. Special Committee on apartheid will hold a special session in London from June 21 to June 26 as part of "its efforts to promote an international campaign against apartheid" according to an official Press Release issued by the U.N.

A DECAYING SOCIETY

On Wednesday the 5th of June a numbness and then a shudder of horror spread across the world. Robert Kennedy lay at death's door on that day and was to go through it on the next. This Kennedy, like his brother John F., former President of the United States, was felled by an assassin's bullet.

There was of course much sadness and anger amongst Kennedy hangers-on, supporters and admirers. But the horror was generalised - horror not at the specific news that Robert Kennedy had been assassinated but at the sickness that now grips the United States. The murder of Malcolm X, of the Kennedys, of Martin Luther King and of numerous Civil Rights workers; the attempted assassinations; the rioting which is now almost scientifically predictable; the attitude of the police towards civilians - these are a clear manifestation of the violence that is now a way of life in the United States.

This is now generally recognised but the solutions suggested reflect the superficial thinking on the subject. Calls have been made to restrict the sale of arms in the United States as if the violence originates in the easy accessibility of guns. Some have condemned violence from a pacifist angle as if those violated against must not take up arms to break the hands which bind them. Predictably President Johnson has set up a Commission of Inquiry to go into the whole question of violence. This is the usual escape route of the reactionary, of the Establishment. Commissions of Inquiry in the United States have sat year after year looking into the "Negro problem" but have come up with no real answers.

And there can be no answers from Commissions whose whole outlook is circumscribed by their attachment to the Establishment. For the answers are to be found in the very fibre and structure of U.S. society - a structure which has become thoroughly decayed and ripe-rotten, ready for change. Violence in America is only an over-flow from the violence by which successive U.S. Governments have sought to solve problems internal and international.

The U.S. has used its marines and gunboat diplomacy for so long that it has become almost a joke except, of course, to those at the receiving end of the guns. Since the Second World War the United States has taken on the mantle of gendarme of the so-called "free world" and in this role has perpetrated violence on countless millions. Latin America has been for a long time the stamping ground of U.S. jackboots - Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Panama are but recent examples. The Bay of Pigs debacle (for the U.S.) was masterminded by the American Central Intelligence Agency. In 1962, during the Cuban missile crisis, the United States under John Kennedy almost plunged the world into a nuclear holocaust. The United States' Sixth Fleet is always threatening and ever ready to take violent action in the "interests" of the United States.

And, of course, the horrors of Vietnam - Vietnam, that land of Agony, that sad, proud, blood-soaked, unhappy land; the tragedy of Vietnam must be laid squarely at the door of the United States' billions of Dollars, millions of bullets/...

of bullets, hundreds of thousands of soldiers, thousands of planes, napalm, gas, bombs, all come from the United States to prevent a people from deciding for themselves how they wish to live. It is said that hundreds of thousands of dollars go towards the killing of a single National Liberation Front. Mankind is revolted, horrified by the violent crimes of the United States in Vietnam. Yet the war goes on, Vietnam shudders in the agony of suffering, because the United States wants it so.

And within the country the violence against the Afro-American people, against poor people is the violence of the State Machine.

It would indeed be surprising if State violence on this immense scale did not seep into the very pores of American society. The violence and insane killing practised on the international and wholesale level permeates every facet of America. Violence is now endemic in the United States. There can be no end to the rioting, the shooting and the killing without a radical transformation of United States society, physically and psychologically.

The answers are not to be found in a condemnation of violence, in restricting the sale of arms, in Commissions of Inquiry. What the United States needs is a Revolution.

* * * *

NEWS ITEM:

INTERNATIONAL DEFENCE AND AID FUND

World Campaign For The Release Of
South African Political Prisoners

The Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts to investigate prison conditions in South Africa appointed by the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations will shortly be hearing further evidence.

The Working Group is likely to be in Britain for a short period during August of this year to receive evidence.

The World Campaign for the Release of South African Political Prisoners has been asked to co-operate once again in making arrangements and in contacting witnesses who will be prepared to testify. The Working Group wishes to hear evidence from former political prisoners and has enlarged its terms of reference to include, apart from South Africa, Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea (Bissao).

Names and addresses of any persons who could be asked to testify before the Group should be sent in for further particulars please write to:

Mr. Dennis Brutus,
2 Amen Court, London, E.C.4.
Telephone: 01-606 6123.

ONS, DIE BRUINE MENSE: WE THE BROWN PEOPLE

- By H. Ziervogel

Readers will find in the current issue of Mayibuye copies of a leaflet distributed by the South Africa Coloured People's Congress among the Coloured in South Africa under the hard and dangerous conditions of political illegality. The keynote of the message is that we, the Brown people, cannot hope to free ourselves from the tyranny of the White minority regime except by and through common struggle with the African.

Whatever the physical and cultural differences between Brown and Black, they have the same basic interests in opposition to a social system that makes skin colour the test of citizenship, that gives Whites a monopoly of power and privilege, and that exposes the darker man to an intolerable burden of humiliations, poverty, disease, and social degradation.

This is not a new idea. Brown leaders have urged unity with Africans since the turn of the century. It is significant that our first mass movement, which was started in 1903, took the name of the African Political Organisation (the APO), and welcomed to membership both Black and Brown. The National Liberation League, formed in 1937 by Brown militants in the Cape, declared that 'Our only hope lies in unifying all those forces that feel the weight of oppression as we (the Coloured) do, into a cohesive and determined whole in opposition to Imperialism'. (The Liberator, Vol. I, No. 5, 1937).

The most courageous and far-seeing members of the Brown community have never lost sight of this goal of a united front against White supremacy and racial oppression. Brown and Black participated in passive resistance, defiance campaigns and general strikes during the liberation struggle.

Many Brown people did not follow this lead. They were unaware, or refused to admit, that their interests were basically the same as the African's. One must look at the reasons for this aloofness in order to understand the attitude and position of the Brown man under the Nationalist government's fascistic rule.

We, the Brown people, speak the White man's languages, both Afrikaans and English. Some of our outstanding writers find Afrikaans the more suitable medium. By and large, we share the White man's way of life - his 'culture', to use the common phrase. Indeed, we share his ancestry; the same blood flows in our veins as in his. We are linked to him by ties of language, culture and blood; and many of our people take pride in this association.

Another factor - which we do not like to recognise - is the submissiveness to White authority that has been bred by centuries of slavery and domination. We have been conditioned to 'baaskap', especially on the farms, and most of us still belong to rural communities. Like the Black folk in the Southern States of America, many of our people find it difficult to shake off their dependence on the White employer and habit of subservience to the White race.

Most important of all, perhaps, is our social position. Though excluded from the White society, we have long been accustomed to rights and privileges - if they can be so called - which are denied to the African. We retained the vote in the Cape after he had been deprived of the franchise; many of us do skilled work from which he is excluded; we belong to registered trade unions, whereas he is barred by law from collective bargaining procedures; we are not yet subject to the pass laws that deny him freedom of movement and residence; our teachers receive higher salaries than African teachers; and social service benefits of all kinds are higher for us than for him.

It is not surprising therefore that a section of the Brown community, led by conservatives and opportunists, has tried to hang on to the White man and to pick up scraps from his table. Rather than join the Black man in active struggle, this section has involved itself in White party politics, and has voted for one or other White candidate in the hope of obtaining a material reward - a bribe, or protection against colour bars.

Tom Swartz, who is quoted in the leaflet, is one of a long line of Brown careerists or 'collaborators', who have preferred servitude under the White baas to a policy of active struggle, side by side with the African. It is a matter of life and death to our people, and an issue of great importance to the liberation movement, whether they will reject the Swartzes, and become aware that they have the same class interests as the African.

White racists in the Cape, the home of 90% of the two million Coloured, are acutely sensitive to the possibility. A body of influential Afrikaners has urged for the past ten years that concessions should be made to secure the 'loyalty' of the Coloured to his white masters. Indeed, the government's declared policy of eliminating Africans from the Western Cape is presented both as a sop to the Brown man (who is promised 'protection' against the African's competition) and a military or security device.

White racists in the North refuse to compromise. The old Boer republics never distinguished between Brown and Black people; all were 'kleurlinge' (Coloured), and equally subject to discriminatory racial laws. This is the dominant view in the Nationalist Party, and the government has steadfastly imposed the Republican pattern of discrimination on the so-called 'liberal' Cape.

The Brown man is being steadily forced down the social scale to the African's position. I need mention only a few of the laws that have stripped the Coloured of their once highly prized 'superior' status: the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 and the Immorality Act of 1954, which make it a crime for a 'Coloured' to marry or make love to a 'White'; the Group Areas Acts of 1950 and 1957, which prohibit a 'Coloured' from owning or occupying land in an area zoned for another 'race'; the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956, which excludes Brown and Black workers from jobs scheduled for Whites; and the Population Registration Act of 1950, which the Nationalists regard as the cornerstone of their disgusting human zoo.

As the gap/...

As the gap between White and Brown widens, the gap between Brown and Black shrinks. New laws enacted this year have taken the process a long way further. The Brown people of the Cape have lost their century-old right to vote in parliamentary elections; and now prohibited from common political action with Whites, or, for that matter, with Africans. (See Mayibuye, No.9, March, 1968).

The African is told to console himself with a 'Bantustan' in which he can exercise a vote. The Brown people do not even possess a 'Homeland'. All that they have been given is a supermarket in Athlone, Cape Town.

There is now little prospect that the pale-faced 'Coloured' will be able to pass a White. The Population Registration Act, frequently amended to close loopholes, stamps him at birth as inferior, and compels him to carry a kind of dog licence in the form of an 'identity card', if any doubts arise.

A significant number of Brown families - teachers and skilled workers for the most part - have decided to clear out, and emigrate for good to Canada or other countries where a person's merits and status are not measured by his skin colour. But no such escape is possible for the vast majority, nor do they want to quit. They are South Africans, and must find a solution in their own country.

Swartz offers their services to the White supremacy regime in its war by the government against the Freedom Fighters. His offer has been rejected for the moment. Replying to critics of the extreme Right, the government has given an assurance that the compulsory registration of Coloured youth for 'national service' will not lead to military training. They are to be trained only to work harder for their White masters.

That policy may not last. If hard pressed, the Nationalists are likely to mobilise the Coloured in the war for White supremacy. There is historical precedent for this. Both the old Dutch East India government at the Cape, and the Boers in the North, employed Brown soldiers in their wars against the British in the one case and against independent African States in the other. Did not Smuts undertake to arm Brown and Black people if the Japanese invaded South Africa during the Second World War?

It is for this reason that the CPC's message has great significance. Black and Brown people form a single social class in terms of objective conditions, that is to say, in terms of living standards, occupations, and position under the racial laws. But the Brown man will recognise this identity of class interests and act on it only if he receives the correct leadership and political education. Let us hope that the leaflet will be followed by many attempts to develop political understanding in our people and to cement an alliance between them and Africans in the struggle for national liberation.

SOUTH AFRICA, MULUNGUSHI AND GABERONES

- By Ndab'ezitha

In Mayibuye No. 19 we portrayed Zambia as the lodestar of Africa. President Kaunda's recent State visit to Botswana has given added proof to our view. Zambia's crucial role in the political and economic liberation of Southern Africa was never spelled out more clearly and forcefully.

Naturally this visit has further infuriated South Africa. The Mulungushi Economic Reforms were bad enough, but to be told right on your own doorstep that your policies are immoral is something totally beyond the ken of the South African rulers. No African leader has ever dared speak so frankly - hence the consternation in Pretoria.

Let us examine in some detail how and why South Africa reacted to the new economic reforms and to the President's visit to Botswana.

The pro-apartheid mouthpiece, Die Burger (22/4/68) chose to interpret the economic reforms in racist terms. It said: "It is still always the White man with his capital and ingenuity who provides the brains and nerves of Zambia's economic welfare and development, and this action is apparently directed against him. This means an acceleration of Africanisation of management and control at a rate that must intensify the existing feeling of frustration and despair amongst Whites. The driving force is certainly not a desire for efficiency, but an attempt to satisfy impatient ambitions in party members at the expense of White management."

The impression given was of Zambians covetously and immorally taking what was not theirs. More outspoken on this point was the Durban Sunday Tribune (21/4/68). In unbridled language, its editorial, with the angry heading, "The Big Grab", described the reforms as a "smash and grab raid on commerce and industry". The President was said to have decided "to plunder commerce and industry to the tune of 51 per cent." Elsewhere, it approvingly quoted a South African economist - one Dawid Marais - who said the Economic Programme was a "very tempting short term action, but in the long run nothing but political and economic madness" clearly, South Africa is seriously worried.

Last month's Presidential visit to Botswana has further disenchanted Pretoria. There, in Gaberones, President Kaunda fearlessly and frankly condemned apartheid. "We think apartheid must go, if peace and security is to be assured, not only in South Africa, but the world over", said His Excellency. This was in a speech repeatedly punctuated by tumultuous applause from the masses, to the ruling Botswana Democratic Party, on May 23.

In the same speech he issued this timely warning:

"As long as the 15 million (Africans) remain without a voice, no amount of coercion, no amount of tear gas, police dogs, or any of the other suppressive measures of which South Africa is capable, will suppress the unquenchable thirst for freedom and liberty."

How did/...

How did South Africa view this visit? A good clue to their reaction can be found in the columnist J.H.P. Serfontein. In his piece (Sunday Times, 6/5/68), he wrote that the visit presented a challenge to Vorster and apartheid and as a result, "South Africa is entering a crucial phase in its relations with Black Africa". More specifically, President Kaunda "has made a bold bid to weaken South Africa's - until now undisputed - influence in Africa south of the Zambezi, by strengthening the political and economic ties between Botswana and Black Africa". Coming from a source we rarely agree with, this view is significant.

It shows not only a confirmation of our own previous analysis (see Mayibuye, No. 19), but it further testifies to the state of alarm and uncertainty in the enemy ranks. The day of reckoning is steadily drawing nigh with the inexorable certainty of the progressive forces of history. The writing is starkly on the wall. Zambia has drawn clear attention to it.

Is it then any wonder that Pretoria should fume and puff? This is a Zambia they cannot fathom. Up to now, they had thought that their looting of Zambia's wealth would go unchecked. Alas, White racists and their sympathizers are with us here. They loathe and detest Africans, make all sorts of snide remarks about them, cast fond eyes across the Zambesi. Indeed, a good number spend their last useless days there after sucking Zambia dry. Posing as experts, they earn inflated wages which speedily leave the country. Then Mulungushi came. It caused a huge hullaballo, a veritable hubbub. Why? Simply because their ill-begotten gains will now stop. The people's wealth will be consumed by the people themselves.

Now the Gaberones speech is another Mulungushi Economic Programme. It points the way to the economic liberation of countries such as Botswana, which, like the old Zambia were in economic slavery. To be frank, the former High Commission Territories were deliberately impoverished for the benefit of South African capital and its international cohorts.

This economic imperialism or fraud diplomacy must end. The way has been shown. Now it must be walked.

* * * *

DOES IT NOT REMIND YOU OF SOMETHING YOU HAVE KEPT ON POSTPONING?

Please enter my subscription to MAYIBUYE for one/two/three years.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Enclosed is the sum of.....for 1 yr.....for 2 yrs

.....for 3 "

ALL CHEQUES AND POSTAL ORDERS SENT IN MUST BE CROSSED AND ADDRESS-ED TO:

"MAYIBUYE", BOX 1791, LUSAKA. ZAMBIA.

FRANCE AND AFRICA

- by Zola Bona

The recent upheavals in France, President Kaunda's note to the French government seeking French explanation for the French government policy towards South Africa especially in the supplying of arms to the Vorster Apartheid regime, recent reports of a conference of "Southern Hemisphere" countries of which France will be a major participant, to discuss "the defence of the Cape sea routes, (Sunday Express, 2/6/68) and the recent statement by the French Ambassador to the United Nations expressing his country's reluctance in participating in the U.N. sponsored action against South Africa in connection with South West Africa have drawn attention to French Foreign Policy towards Africa and especially Southern Africa.

At different times in the past the French Government leaders have expressed their friendship and readiness to co-operate with "under-developed Africa" and their half-hearted condemnation of South Africa's racist policies. African Patriots from all over the continent have not only viewed French objectives in Africa with suspicions but have rightly questioned the motives of these policies. To many of us the memories of French sabotage of Guinea's Independence are still fresh when that country refused to all French attempts to keep it as a neo-colonial appendage of metropolitan France. The subsequent withdrawal of all French aid, including all technicians who took with them everything from telephone wires to toilet seats was not only condemned by all democrats but also by men of good-will the world over.

The recent withdrawal of France's K7 million a year to Dahomey because Paris was "irritated" by that country's fourth coup in five years, and the sending of French paratroopers into Libreville to crush an anti-Paris coup against the Gabon Government are eye openers. Yet France succeeded in all this with very little protestations from Africa and the world. Why has this been possible?

The answer to this can only be found in the strong influence which France is still able to exert in her former colonies. The ties between Paris and many of her former colonies are still strong, in fact they are stronger than those of Britain and her former colonies in Africa. Most of France's former colonies in Africa except a few are grouped up in O.C.A.M. (Organisation Commune Africaine et Malgache). O.C.A.M. consists of 14 independent States with a population of 58 million, about a quarter of Africa's population. They mostly depend on agriculture but also produce iron ore, diamonds, bauxite, gold, oil and uranium which mostly explains why France cannot tolerate any threats to the breakage of these ties. Many imperialist countries have watched with awe, how France has been able to get away with it all with the least protestations from the Afro-Asian world while America has been rightly condemned in most countries for her aggressive policies in the newly independent Afro-Asia especially for her aggression in Vietnam and Britain for her double-dealing in Southern Africa especially Rhodesia. The involvement of the French banks in the Nigerian conflict has gone on with the least notice.

Perhaps/...

Perhaps many people attribute France's ability to evade the wrath of Africa in her machinations in the continent to the personal influence of General de Gaulle on many leading personalities in the former French colonies. How far true this is, we cannot ascertain. French aid to Africa has always been provided, like all Western aid, with the strictest of terms. Most former colonies of France especially those belonging to OCAM have mutual defence pacts with Paris and some 6,600 French troops are based in strategic spots in former French colonies. (Daily Dispatch, 8/5/68). French aid to Africa for 1966 amounted to K325.5 million and one of the strings attached to such aid was that it had to be administered by French nationals with the result that about 12,000 French government workers and technicians live in the countries, mostly former French colonies, where aid has been accepted. Many of the teaching staff in these countries are French Nationals. Most exports in the French aided countries are sold to the Europeans' Common Market through France. French finished goods from the raw materials are dumped in these countries on unfavourable terms, and most of these countries circulate a common currency easily convertible into French francs.

Perhaps the ignominy of French Foreign Policy in Africa has mostly been felt in Southern Africa. Because of the world's rejection of racial policies of the Apartheid regimes in Southern Africa the leaders of the French government have been forced to make half-hearted condemnation of Apartheid as evidenced by the recent statement by the French representative to the United Nations and the recent answer of General de Gaulle to President Kaunda's note protesting French supply of arms to the Vorster racist regime. And yet with the impudence that Africa has come to regard as typical to all the Western imperialist countries, France continues to supply arms to South Africa and to bolster the economy of that country (South Africa).

French support for the racist regimes in Southern Africa has been pushed to the fore mostly after public opinion in Britain, mostly engineered by the Anti-Apartheid Movement, has forced the British government from openly supplying arms to the South African regime and the United States has been forced to continue its business through other less public channels. In the circumstances Franco-South African economy relations are very important relations to both de Gaulle and Vorster. In this de Gaulle hopes to extend her imperialist contradictions with America and to strengthen his position as the leader of Europe by extending France's economic relations in the world and at the same time South Africa's economic importance in the African continent has not been lost to the General. On the other hand the French trade with South Africa is important to Vorster in that he can always point it to some of his followers that South Africa is not isolated from the White imperialist world.

The importance of the French exports to South Africa can be seen in the fact that the value of French imports from South Africa during 1966 was K54.9 million, an increase of about K6 million on 1965. French exports to South Africa during 1966 amounted to K63.6 million which trebled the 1961 exports, of K21 million. Of the 1966 exports, aircraft and parts amounted to K11.9 million machinery and mechanical appliances K10.5 million Motor vehicles K7.8 million, electrical equipment K6.2 million (Rand Daily Mail 27/6/67).

Perhaps it/...

Perhaps it will be seen that most of French trade with South Africa has been in arms and armament. The French government has given the South African racist regime a loan of K150 million (£75 million) at 6½% interest to help it buy French military equipment, arms and armament. Under an agreement France has allowed the Vorster regime to purchase three hunter class French Daphne submarines costing K8 million each. The order placed by the South African Defence Minister Mr. Botha provides for the building of these ships at the Dublignon Normandie shipyards at Nantes. During these talks the Minister was accompanied by top South African military officers including the Commander-in-Chief of the South Africa Defence Force, General Hiemstra and the Commander of the South Africa Navy, Vice Admiral Bierman. (D & A Information Service). Besides these France sells Mirage jets, A.M.X. tanks, Panhard armoured cars and Allouette helicopters most of which are used against our comrades fighting racism in Zimbabwe and to suppress any uprising of our people. Above these French aid has been offered for the building of the Verwoerd dam, which forms part of the Orange - Fish River irrigation scheme and French trucks are increasing by the day in the South Africa Defence Force used for transporting troops into Rhodesia.

France continues to assist South Africa in nuclear and space research and many other scientific undertakings. Despite World Sanctions against the Smith Settler regime in Rhodesia, French firms continue to do business as usual in Salisbury the Rhodesian capital. France continues to supply arms to Portugal for the suppression of the African patriots in Angola and Mozambique. It has been quite clear to many clear thinking Freedom Fighters in Southern Africa that France has been one of the many stumbling blocks to the implementations of United Nations resolutions on South West Africa.

Perhaps to many people it has not been clear why the honourable General de Gaulle has gambled so much in his dealings with Africa and Southern Africa in particular. Why has he risked the fair name of France which he claims to be so dear to him? The only answer to this is that France is driven by imperialist greed. de Gaulle is an imperialist and whatever he has done has always been based on this. He is leading France in the grabbing of the markets which Britain and United States have been forced to abandon by world public opinion and unfortunately the people of Southern Africa are victims of this greed. Perhaps President Kaunda's note came at the right time and might induce world public opinion to be focussed on France and her policies towards Africa.

The significance of the present upheavals in France have also not been lost to the racists in so far as they might replace the Gaullist government with a more democratic government which might refuse to continue the present arms deal with South Africa. This is clearly expressed in the Sunday Express, 2/6/68, when it says "[i]f the French electorate gives President de Gaulle overwhelming support, then South Africa can breathe easily as change in foreign policy would be unlikely. But any Gaullist set-back could well set in motion developments that could offset the present state of French-South African relations. An anti-Gaullist victory would certainly lead to a review of the current arms sales to South Africa."

To us/...

To us the removal of the Gaullist government seems on the one hand a necessary step for bringing France in line with the struggle of the oppressed people of Southern Africa for national emancipation; and on the other hand to enable France to take her rightful place along other progressive forces the world over in their condemnation of minority rule and racism wherever it still exists.

* * * *

THE ARMED STRUGGLE

- by Anti-Pass

The Launching of the armed struggle in Zimbabwe by the combined ZAPU-ANC forces has qualitatively changed the situation in Southern Africa. Because the ultimate support of racism in that area is fascist South Africa and the offensive in Zimbabwe is correctly recognised by the racists as a direct challenge to that stronghold. Hence, we find more open discussion of the war in South Africa than anywhere else. A Mozambique Soldiers Comfort Fund has been set up and there is even talk of more direct military support for the Portuguese who are rightly said to be fighting South Africa's war; South Africans are bearing the brunt of the fighting in Zimbabwe; threats to independent African States emanate mainly from South Africa; and the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare are more readily discussed there.

However, there is also much confusion as a direct result of the fighting in Zimbabwe. The racist regimes are faced with the dilemma that on the one hand they want to assure the Whites that all is well and the "situation is under control" and on the other they have to ensure that, at the minimum the Whites are fully awake to the "dangers" and are prepared to fully support the war plans of the racist regimes. So we find talk about the "terrorists" having been completely routed side by side with talk of the "communist" plot that threatens "peace and stability" in Southern Africa.

The latest of the prophets is Patrick Laurence of the Johannesburg daily newspaper "The Star". In a two-column article headed "GAPS IN THE GUERRILLAS' STRATEGY" (25/5/68) he goes into some details about the theory and practice of guerrilla warfare in the course of which he comes to the conclusion that things are all right and that the guerrillas haven't a chance. Laurence takes on the mantle of the "expert", no doubt to soft-soap the Whites but it is clear from the article that he is neither an expert nor is he well informed. It would seem that he, too, is a victim of the South Africa propaganda machine.

We will not go into his lengthy dissertation on the theory and tactics of guerrilla warfare. Enough has been written on the subject by people who have actually gone through a guerrilla struggle and have formulated general principles as a result of their experiences. Those interested are invited to refer to these genuine experts.

But/...

But in so far as the war in Southern Africa is concerned Laurence makes some wild and sweeping statements which need to be exposed. Throughout his article he refers to Freedom Fighters as terrorists. This is not unusual except that Laurence pretends to study the question "scientifically". He should know that the terrorists are the Whites who have usurped our land and kept it with the bullet and the baton. Then he speaks of the "adroit propaganda" of the "terrorists". What nonsense! A people oppressed for centuries do not need propagandists to tell them that they suffer injustice.

He also speaks of bases in Zambia and Tanzania. "With (inviolable?) bases in Zambia and Tanzania and ample space for manoeuvre, they have at least two factors operating in their favour, but that seems to be all." We will unhesitatingly state that we have received tremendous support from these two independent African countries as we have received from other parts of Africa and from all progressive mankind. But this "expert" on guerrilla warfare should know that such a struggle cannot be waged from bases in other countries; that a people's war must be rooted amongst the people if it is to succeed. This seems to be an obvious attempt to show that we do not enjoy the support of the people and at the same time, in classic fashion, to find external scapegoats. In this context the question mark after the word "inviolable" in the phrase "with (inviolable?) bases" is ominous, for here Laurence is obviously referring to possible attacks on these independent African countries at some future date by the racist South.

Laurence then goes on to "prove" that armed struggle in Southern Africa cannot be victorious. He states sweepingly:

"The chances of these guerrillas evolving into a regular army....are infinitesimal. African guerrillas have not even reached the "take-off stage...."

Laurence here indulges in jargon to show how "clever" he is. What does "take-off" mean in the context of the Southern African struggle? Perhaps he needs to be reminded that White rule survives and is maintained by violence; that below the much flaunted calm of which we hear so much there is seething discontent; that in the past much less than a trained guerrilla force has succeeded in rousing the wrath of the oppressed people. Has he forgotten Sekhukhuni and Zeerust? Has he forgotten Pondoland? Has he forgotten Sharpeville and its aftermath? There are numerous other instances and if there are not even more it is only because for so long we have sought to avoid bloodshed and the legacy of hate that would result. We have now taken up arms with the clear knowledge that there is no other way, that only by the bullet can we attain our freedom.

His talk of our not being able to build up a regular army is poppy-cock and he betrays his ignorance of the strategy and tactics of guerrilla warfare by indulging in such drivel. Our regular army is the broad mass of our people, who for too long were being violated against and have today adopted the only effective means of retaliation left to them - to meet armed repression with armed revolt. It is this very thing that Vorster and his fellow fascists/...

fellow fascists fear. Why else would he extend his frontiers to the Zambesi? Why this sudden interest in the struggle in Angola and Mozambique? Why, otherwise, would South African soldiers be permitted to die in Zimbabwe? We have a proud record of struggle and sacrifice, our history is replete with heroes who were from and with the masses.

Thus when he talks of our guerrillas having suffered "decisive defeats" inflicted on our Freedom Fighters he is either extremely ill-informed or he is deliberately lying. Any competent journalist based in South Africa should not find it too difficult to unravel the truth from the mass of verbiage dished out by Smith's propaganda department. He speaks of the African soldiers in Smith's army as being "without compunction or mercy". This is surely an attempt to portray a lack of support for the People's Army, as is the pseudo-sophistry of questioning whether the "nation" exists along the Zambesi. He goes on to state that the peasant population instead of supporting our guerrillas is informing on them. It is obvious that Laurence in fact has sold out to Vorster's information services and like them has to resort to lies, lies and more lies.

"...On the crucial issue of popular support, recent guerrilla incursions into Rhodesia show that border tribesmen, far from aiding them, have assisted the Rhodesian security forces. Hence the decisive defeats suffered by the guerrillas...

...Equally significant, the 1,000 African soldiers who help Rhodesia to man the Zambesi line have fought the guerrillas without compunction or mercy..."

(THE STAR, Johannesburg, MAY 25, 1968)

Reasons of security preclude our going into details about the situation in the "warfront". This word is used purely for convenience as there is no front except the people as a whole and this is something which makes the fascists very unhappy. The people have welcomed our guerrillas with open arms. Some who had heard of them were waiting for them and recognised them the moment they met. They have supplied food and shelter and a few have already carried out certain tasks allotted to them. With the large number of secret casualties suffered by the racist forces and with the open tension which now exists between Rhodesian and South African soldiers it should be obvious who has suffered decisive defeats. The African soldiers in Smith's army are an anachronism and will not be there for very long. They have been forced to go in front of the White soldiers and have therefore suffered the most casualties. They will not tolerate this sort of treatment for very long especially when they see the White Rhodesian soldiers reluctant to go into battle;

Mr. Laurence, you and your kind have nothing left but lies and that too you will not have for long.

TO ALL SUBSCRIBERS OF SPOTLIGHT ON S.A.
AND SECHABA

Our mailing list will be revised as from 1st March, 1968. Owing to high production and postage costs subscription rates have had to be increased. Current subscribers are for the duration excluded from the new rates.

Due to our financial circumstances, we have also been reluctantly compelled to discontinue free service either on exchange basis or for reasons of exchange control.

Following are the new rates for your weekly copy of Spotlight on South Africa and the monthly Sechaba(*), covering a six-month period, given in East African, British and U.S. currencies:-

DAR ES SALAAM	5/-
EAST AFRICA	10/-
WEST, NORTH, CENTRAL and SOUTHERN AFRICA	30/- (\$4)
BRITISH ISLES, Continental Europe, India, Burma, Indonesia and Ceylon	35/- (\$5)
The Americas, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the Far East	65/- (\$9)

(*) For subscribers in Africa only. Those outside the African continent should subscribe to: The Editor, SECHABA, 49 Rathbone Str., LONDON W.1., U.K. at reduced rates.

AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (S.A.)
P.O. Box 2239, Dar Es Salaam,
United Republic of Tanzania.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

NAME.....ADDRESS.....

.....
.....

Enclosed please find.....being subscription and donation

..... Total..... date.....