

# mayibuyye



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

# CONTENTS

EDITORIAL . . . . .	2
Two Philosophies . . . . .	4
White Cities By Night . . . . .	7
A Monthly Calendar Of The Struggle For Freedom In S.A. . . . .	9

# ANC-SWA

We do not propose to discuss the details of the "fearless" sell-out. It was a foregone conclusion and there is no more to be said. We agree with all those progressives and democrats who have attacked and exposed Wilson's treacherous, undemocratic and anti-socialist behaviour throughout his handling of the Rhodesian rebellion.

However it is vital for all progressives and particularly those of us who are directly involved in the Southern African liberation struggle to be absolutely clear on the issues at stake. To do so properly we must, first of all, permanently put to rest certain shibboleths which have resulted in a certain amount of confusion. Two such shibboleths are often in the forefront of explanations as to why Wilson has been so ready to deal and negotiate with the Smith rebels.

- (1) That Wilson has been anxious to wash his hands off the Rhodesian issue which he has found politically embarrassing.
- (2) That Wilson has persistently dealt with the rebels with kid gloves because they are his own kith and kin.

There would appear to be some superficial justification for ascribing to Wilson these motives. Certainly the Conservative Party has applied considerable political pressure to get a settlement of the Rhodesian situation in the interests of the rebels. Also the British government has been known to use force where Blacks have rebelled (Guyana, Aden, etc.) so why not in Rhodesia? But it would be wise to eschew these apparent motives for the real ones. For it is absolutely imperative that we view the situation calmly and objectively. Far too much is at stake for emotional and muddle-headed thinking.

One reason and one only exists for Wilson's readiness to come to terms with Smith and that is, to put it crudely, investment and profit. It is not necessary to remind the reader that Britain has over K2,500 million invested in South Africa out of which superprofits are acquired annually; that the United States has K1,500 million investment; that West Germany, France, Japan and other imperialist countries also have vast investments in South Africa. It is this that they seek to protect and preserve till eternity, if that were possible. And South Africa is the bastion and the gendarme of imperialism in Southern Africa. To try and keep its borders secure and intact racist South Africa will send its military forces wherever they are needed to defend reactionary and amenable regimes as we have already seen in Zimbabwe.

Of course, Wilson and the imperialists would much rather have a Banda type of stooge Black regime in Zimbabwe but, unhappily for them, no such grouping is available to them. Instead they find themselves facing a principled organisation like ZAPU which, in alliance with the

ANC, is determined to continue the armed struggle until total victory is achieved. After the battles of Wankie in August, 1967, this alliance and its potential for waging disciplined guerrilla warfare has sent a chill down the spines of the imperialists. This is what Wilson referred to when he said, after the "fearless" talks, that he had warned Smith of the "serious dangers" he faces unless he comes to a settlement.

A negotiated Wilson-Smith settlement would immediately confer legality on the rebellion. Aside from the immediate economic advantages, such legality would enable South Africa to send in more of her armies and air force. Nay, more it would enable Britain to send her forces to "assist" the "legitimate" government of Rhodesia against the "terrorists" as President Kaunda has already pointed out.

The enemy in Southern Africa is then not only the racist White minority regimes but imperialism as a whole. This we must be absolutely clear about if we are not to lose sight of the wood for the trees. While, from time to time, strategic needs will demand changes in tactics, we must forever be conscious that the struggle for national liberation in Southern Africa is at one and the same time a struggle against imperialism.

= = = = =

### MAYIBUYE ANNUAL: A SPECIAL APPEAL

Preparations are afoot to publish a "MAYIBUYE ANNUAL" early next year. The publication would be a comprehensive, well-documented and informative document containing factual and educational material aimed primarily to further enhance the cause of human freedom in Southern Africa. The need for such a publication cannot be over-emphasised in view of the armed struggles currently being waged in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and Namibia.

The printed publication, we trust, would be useful to organisations and students of Southern African events and be of historical value.

We make a fervent appeal to readers to assist us in the publication of the "ANNUAL" by making a special contribution to offset printing and production costs.

TWO PHILOSOPHIES

- Veteran

We - members of the ANC (SA), Freedom Fighters and sworn opponents of White minority regimes - hail Zambia's National Independence Week.

We welcome the opportunity to join our brothers and sisters in celebrating their four years of peaceful reconstruction under African rule. We rejoice in their great advance to political and economic maturity under the wise leadership of President Kaunda and his party. We admire the sacrifices they have made in their steadfast, courageous stand against the illegal Rhodesian regime, against racial discrimination and social injustice.

Those of us who were privileged to take part in the celebrations have been inspired by seeing a free people rejoice in their freedom. We pledge ourselves to defend Zambia's borders with the same loyalty and determination that we expect of ourselves in our own struggle for national liberation.

That which Zambians have achieved our own people too will achieve one day, when they have driven the racists from their seats of power and have uprooted the poisonous fungus that produces colour bars and apartheid.

In his message marking the fourth anniversary of independence, President Kaunda contrasted the theories of Humanism and Apartheid. The one serves the interests of the common man of all races; the other separates White and Black and Brown. Humanism is utterly opposed to class or colour privilege; apartheid breeds both, gives four million Whites a monopoly of political and economic power, and denies citizenship to sixteen million Africans, Coloured and Indians.

'Our philosophy is international', says Dr. Kaunda. In his visits abroad, he found statesmen, men of religion, writers and workers all commenting favourably on Zambian Humanism. 'The road does not lead to us alone. These friends believe in it themselves in their own way, so it is a truly human philosophy'.

South Africa spares neither money nor trouble in its attempts to gain friends abroad, but without success. The international community, all genuinely independent states in Africa and Asia, the socialist countries and democrats everywhere condemn apartheid for what it is, a vicious and degrading system of discrimination and oppression.

Humanism succeeds where apartheid fails because it accepts and asserts the great radical principle of our age, which declares that children

shall/.....

shall not be made to suffer because of their parents' poverty, ignorance, disease or skin colour. The ultimate goal of Zambian Humanism is to provide all children, regardless of sex, colour or class, with equal opportunities for education, health, work and leisure.

Apartheid is a doctrine of separate and unequal treatment of Black, Brown, and White people in every institution and social sphere - in family life, courts of law, work and play, government and religion. Education in the south prepares the White child for the position of a master, and the African child for the position of a servant. The difference between apartheid and slavery is a difference of degree and not of kind.

Humanists look ahead to the new world that is taking shape, to a world without colour bars, racial conflict and class privilege.

Apartheiders look backward to the old colonial days, when their Boer ancestors traded in slaves and made war on independent African States. The modern Boer may be a black coated predikant, a politician with a university degree, a rich industrialist or mealie king, but he retains the mental blocks, the double dealing techniques and racial arrogance that characterised the Voortrekkers.

What could be a worse form of double dealing than to offer 14 million Africans 'self-government' in one-eighth of their own country, while the 4 million Whites claim the remaining seven-eighths, with all the mines, factories, farms, ports and towns? What could be more racially arrogant than to suppose that Africans will ever consent to anything less than full ownership of their whole country?

Nothing in apartheid is generous or just to the African. The entire policy is designed to entrench White supremacy, strengthen the position of the White race and extend its privileges at the African's expense. That and nothing else is what Afrikaner nationalists have in mind when they talk of 'separate development', of 'Bantu homelands', of diverting the flow of African workers from the towns and farms to their 'own' areas.

Die Transvaler, the official organ of the Nationalist party, explained the reasons for this policy in its issue of September 9th. No greater threat to 'White civilisation' in Southern Africa, wrote the editor, could be created than the danger which resulted from the presence of a non-White proletariat around the big industrial centres. Such a non-White proletariat would always incline to communism. Therefore it was essential to industrialise the border regions. Only in this way could Africans be kept out of the 'White' towns.

Zambian Humanism seeks to develop rural industries in the interests of the people. Apartheid seeks to promote only the interests of the Whites. It has nothing to offer Black and Brown South Africans. They can liberate themselves only by destroying apartheid and apartheiders.

= = = = =

### APARTHEID AS A WAR CRIME

NEW YORK. - An extraordinary recommendation to be considered by the United Nations General Assembly would, if ratified and under certain circumstances, classify any official concerned with the implementation of apartheid as a "war criminal."

The controversial draft convention that would bar statutory limitations on war crimes and crimes against humanity was approved by the United Nations General Assembly's Social and Humanitarian Committee.

South Africa, Portugal, Britain, the United States, Australia and Honduras voted against the measure but they were outvoted by 58 to six with 27 abstentions.

If the convention is approved by the General Assembly it is then submitted to nations for ratification. Informants in New York said that a minimum of 40 nations must ratify the document for it to have official status within the framework of the United Nations apparatus.

Taken to its logical extreme and within the phraseology of the recommendation as it now stands, passage of the convention would mean that any South African irrefutably concerned with the implementation of apartheid would be subject to arrest as a "war criminal" should he or she set foot in a country that has ratified the document.

Another even more improbable effect, but still theoretically possible under certain circumstances, would be that should a coup even occur in South Africa, the new Government would have a "legal" base on which to try officials concerned with carrying out the policy of apartheid as "war criminals."

A majority of two-thirds in the General Assembly is necessary before the draft convention is adopted. Observers sympathetic to South Africa in New York said that although the measure would have strong support from various Afro-Asian and Communist countries, it was at this stage impossible to predict whether it would receive the required support.

There is likely to be a "considerable delay," in the view of observers here, before various nations agree to ratify the document.

THE STAR (Johannesburg)  
October 19, 1968.

WHITE CITIES BY NIGHT

- Anti-Pass

Pietersburg is an average small town in the Transvaal with little claim either to fame or notoriety—until this year. Suddenly Pietersburg has hit the headlines in the White South African Press and has given rise to a raging controversy in White circles. Readers will not be surprised to learn that as usual in racist South Africa, aside from rugby, the main subject of raised passion and heated argument is the Black majority. But we are jumping ahead. Let us first look at the background.

The fascist Nationalist Party which has ruled South Africa since 1948 is committed by its policy of apartheid to a total separation of the various national groups. It is, of course, quite true that this not practical nor is it, in fact, the intention of the fascists to carry out this policy to the letter. For the very basis of racism in South Africa is economic exploitation of the oppressed Black majority and the government is hardly likely to sacrifice the super profits derived from such exploitation in the cause of some nebulous theory. However, in order further to control and regiment the Black population residential and regional separation is being carried out in certain aspects. There is naturally, a rider to this in that such separation is never carried out at the expense of or to the discomfort of the White population. We thus have the Group Areas Act whereby hundreds of thousands of non-Whites are being uprooted from ancestral homes and transferred to barren veld; we have the notorious and tottering Bantustan scheme which pretends with little conviction to give "self-government" to the African people in overcrowded and destitute reserves; and there are many other such. One of these is the Bantu Laws Amendment Act of 1963 better known as the "Locations in the Sky" Act.

The main purport of this Act is to ensure that all urban areas remain White at night. Since the majority of Africans working in commerce and industry have willy-nilly to live in the locations which invariably border on White areas the main victims of the "Locations in the sky" Act are the house servants without whom no White household in South Africa can function efficiently. It has been traditional in South Africa that such servants sleep in the backyard or the kitchen floor. The chief clause of the Act states that, after the Minister gazettes it, all African servants will have to leave their place of employment after work and travel to locations to spend their nights there. There is also required that transport to and from work should be provided free of charge and that "adequate" accommodation be provided in the locations. But after five years the government has not yet compelled municipal authorities to carry out the Act. The reasons are not far to seek.



Whites have been used to having servants at their beck and call 24 hours a day and would not be happy about dispensing with the services of their servants at 5 p.m. until 8 a.m. the next morning. Further free transport and "adequate" accommodation would be costly and the Whites are obviously reluctant to provide the money. So the Government has not implemented the Act; after all apartheid is an attack on the Blacks, not on Whites. This is where Pietersburg comes in.

Without waiting for the Government the diligently racist Pietersburg Town Council has decided to go ahead and implement the Act. Employers are being instructed to send their servants to locations at night. Already 400 have been moved. Needless to say neither free transport nor adequate accommodation has been provided. Those moved are being housed in derelict houses and are living in over-crowded conditions. But this aspect of the Act was not taken seriously even by the government. The transfer of servants has caused a furore among the White residents of the town.

Not that they are opposed to the Act in principle. It is only that THEY did not expect to suffer from its effects. The reasons given for their objections are revealing. They protest that transport provided is inadequate - so servants come late to work; accommodation is unsatisfactory and the overcrowding could result in the outbreak of disease which the servants would bring to the White homes. Their protests are completely selfish - they care not a whit for the feelings of the chief sufferers under the Act, the Black servants. As a business man put it:-

"We are resisting.....because we want to keep our servants."

This, in a nutshell sums up, the real reasons for protest. Nevertheless, the Pietersburg Town Council is determined to continue the removals. No doubt the White householders will mount stronger protests. There is already talk of a test case in court.

But as far as the Black majority is concerned the protests are as meaningless as the legislation is oppressive. The problem can only be solved in the context of a radical transformation of South African Society. The only means to this end is a People's War for National Liberation. The A.N.C., as the sword and the shield of the people, has already given the lead, - the people will follow.

A MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE STRUGGLE

FOR FREEDOM IN SOUTH AFRICA

- by Optimist

Some Memorable OCTOBER Dates in Our Country's History

\* 1887 - Over eighty years ago - believe it or not - Africans under the Cape Colony Government in South Africa enjoyed the right to vote, provided they owned land worth £75. This requirement had effectively limited their franchise over a long period, but with the advance of diamond and gold mining and consequent rise of land values, more and more Africans were able to meet the property-owning qualification. By 1886 the non-Europeans, mostly African, comprised 47 per cent of the voters in the five Eastern Province constituencies, and in two of them even held the majority of votes. The Cape Government, in order to change this embarrassing state of affairs, drafted and enacted a law stipulating that a person's share in tribally owned land should not count in determining his property ownership for voting purposes. This had the effect of striking 30,000 Africans off the voters' rolls. It marked the first step toward the ultimate complete disfranchisement of Black South Africans.

There were loud African protests against this action, and appeals were made to the Governor to withhold his signature from the new law. When this demand was ignored, a lengthy petition to the Queen was drafted, and thousands of Africans throughout the Cape signed it. A meeting at Port Elizabeth on the 2nd September 1887 was quickly followed by an important conference on the 6th October at Kingwilliamstown. Every area of the Cape was represented by the delegates and observers who assembled there to decide on the deputation to carry their petition to London. Among the African leaders who were present or sent messages were the Rev. Elijah Makiwane, S. Sigenu, James Pelem, Daniel Dwanya, James M. Dwane, and John Tengo Jabavu. An editorial at this time in Jabavu's paper, Imvo Zabantsundu, founded in 1884, remarked that the African people were aware that the object of the Government was "by means of disfranchisement to pave the way to doing what it likes with the rights and privileges of Natives, especially with rights to land."

\* 1920 - Of the many criminal acts perpetrated by South African authorities in shooting down African workers, one of the most outrageous occurred at Port Elizabeth on the 23rd October 1920. A popular leader of the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union (I.C.U.), Samuel Makama Martin Masabala, had come there to organize a drive for increased wages for African workers. He had addressed one enthusiastic open-air meeting and plans had been announced for another meeting in a week's time. The day before it was to be held, Masabala was arrested and jailed. There was no warrant for his arrest; it was said by some that the order

for his/...

for his arrest had come from Pretoria. A delegation of Africans went to the police authorities and offered to put up bail for the release of the prisoner. This was flatly rejected by the Police Inspector. The angry workers warned the police that if Masabala was not freed by five in the afternoon, they would storm the jail and release him.

Some three thousand Africans, with some Whites among them, gathered in front of the jail. They had only sticks as weapons. The police, on the other hand, besides being well armed, passed out guns and ammunition to White civilian volunteers. Four mounted police tried to charge into the crowd, but three of them became unhorsed. A fire hose was tried without much success. The workers retaliated by throwing stones. Then someone fired two shots, whereupon the police opened general fire directly at the retreating crowd. Twenty-one Africans were killed and over a hundred wounded. Three Whites were also killed by the police fire.

The press put the blame on "Communist agitators". But a Government-appointed Commission of Inquiry, which included Dr. A. Abdurahman, leader of the Coloured community, correctly pointed out that there would have been no trouble whatsoever if the Police Inspector had not refused to release Masabala on bail. The Commission further noted that "all of the firing (by the police).....was directed against fugitives; it was unnecessary, indiscriminate, and.....brutal in its callousness, resulting in a terrible toll of killed and wounded without any sufficient reason or justification."

\* 1943 - The decision to draft a "Charter of Rights of the Native People of South Africa" was made at a conference held in Johannesburg in October 1943 and attended by 220 leaders of labour, religious, and other organizations. The leaders demanded official recognition of African trade unions and a minimum wage of £2 per week for all African workers. They issued an appeal to trade unions and other organisations abroad, particularly in England and the U.S.A., to support their demands and "help do away with the poverty and degradation in which Africans are forced to live."

\* 1945 - Immediately following the Battle of the Johannesburg City Hall in September, a movement known as the Campaign for Right and Justice drew up and circulated a petition calling upon the South African Government to punish racial incitement as a crime, dissolve all pro-Nazi organisations, ban private armies, dismiss racist-minded employees from all branches of government service, and bring South Africa's quislings and war criminals to trial. Within a month 40,000 citizens of Johannesburg had signed the petition. But Prime Minister Smuts refused to face a deputation which proposed to present the petition to him personally.

The month of October 1945 also saw the marshalling of democratic forces in the Cape Province to prevent the Government from introducing pass law regulations in that area as planned by the Department of Native Affairs. A number of protest meetings were held in Cape Town and a conference there on the 21st October, attended by about a hundred delegates representing fifty organisations with a total membership of over 80,000, resolved to mobilize the people to fight against the imposition of pass regulations in the Cape.

\* 1958 - The Government in October 1958 made another attempt to force African women to carry passes, this time in the Johannesburg area. The women reacted with their usual vigour and determination. They organized a big anti-pass demonstration through the streets of the city. Some two thousand of the women demonstrators were arrested and carried away, singing, to jail.

\* 1959 - As part of its general plan for brain-washing all the youth of South Africa and educating them along strictly apartheid lines for an apartheid society, the South African Government enacted legislation to transform the educational institution at Fort Hare in the Cape from what the Nationalist Minister of Bantu Education disparagingly described as an English university for non-Whites into a Xhosa tribal college. Following passage of the Fort Hare Transfer Act, the Council of that institution was reconstituted and made entirely White, among those removed being the Vice principal, the late Professor Z.K. Matthews (he was promised reappointment if he would resign from the African National Congress, which he of course refused to do). Then in September 1959 the Minister of Bantu Education, declaring that he refused to allow a penny "to be paid to any persons who are known to be destroying the Government's policy of apartheid," sacked several White staff members, including the Registrar, Librarian, and heads of four departments. Other prominent staff members immediately resigned, among them being Dr. D. Mtinkulu, Prof. C.L. Nyembezi, Dr. M. Webb, S.B. Ngcobo, and A.M. Phahle.

When the newly appointed Principal and Registrar made their first visit to Fort Hare in October, it was the students' turn to show how they felt about the new order of things at their school. They wore black armbands, let the air out of the tyres of the officials' cars, and shouted protests and threw tomatoes at them. In a formal resolution the students declared, "Let it be noted, once and for all, that our stand as students at Fort Hare and as the future leaders of our country, upholding the principles of education as universally accepted, remains unchanged and uncompromising. Our outright condemnation of the university apartheid legislation remains steadfast.....We wish to warn the architects of White domination....(that) this apartheid policy....in the foreseeable future will destroy the entire social, political, and economic structure of our country."