

78.12.12

IKWEZI

£ 1. 00p.

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

DECEMBER 1978

NUMBER 10



Double Issue – October December

The National Question in Azania

**The Relationship between
Racialism and National
Oppression in Azania**

The Youth of Azania

**African Revolutionary Intellectuals
and the Social Transformation
of Africa**

**ZANU and the Zimbabwean
Revolution**

Kampuchea / By Samir Amin

CONTENTS

Editorial

(1) Zaire and the Theory of the Three Worlds	p. 1
(2) The Non-Aligned Movement – The Contradiction between the National Bourgeoisie and Imperialism and Hegemonism	p. 4
(3) Social Imperialism in Namibia and Zimbabwe	p. 5
(4) The Pan Africanist Congress of Azania: Consultative Conference – A Great New Beginning	p. 6
From the PAC Consultative Conference	p. 8
The Youth of Azania	p. 9
The Struggles Continues (By Ethel Khopung)	p. 11
Racialism or National Oppression (By Harry Haywood)	p. 25
The National Question in Azania	p. 35
ZANU and the Advancement of the Zimbabwean Revolution	p. 49
African Revolutionary Intellectuals and the Social Transformation of Africa (By Kazu Wamba-dia-Wamba)	p. 60
The Real Nature of the Soviet/Cuban Occupation of Angola (By J.K. Chitunda)	p. 64
Democratic Centralism (By Mao-Tse-Tung)	p. 68
Lessons of Kampuchea (By Samir Amin)	p. 74
But What About Social Imperialism, Comrade Dan (By Ross J. Longhurst)	p. 76

SUBSCRIPTION:

Yearly Subscriptions: £4 Annually

Airmail £1.50p plus. Otherwise all overseas subscriptions are sent surface mail. If remitting in foreign currency please add equivalent of 50p to cover bank charges.

BULK PURCHASES: Discount of upto 40%. Monies must be paid in preferably within three months.

ADDRESS: 8-11 Victoria Centre, Nottingham, NG1 3PF, England.

SUPPORT IKWEZI

IKWEZI is a revolutionary Azanian Journal based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung-Thought, the highest revolutionary ideology of our epoch, synthesising the wisdom of the International Communist Movement from the time of the Paris Commune. IKWEZI is dedicated to the proletarian revolution in Azania (and the southern African countries) based on the leadership of the working class embodied in its Marxist-Leninist Party. IKWEZI strives to build such a Party in Azania, a party of the proletariat, the most revolutionary class in history, which will unite around it all the oppressed classes and strata of society – the peasantry (landless workers in the case of Azania), petit bourgeois, students, youth, women, etc., at this stage of the national democratic revolution.

The struggle against white racism/national oppression is a form of class struggle against the white settler colonialist bourgeoisie and imperialism. The first task of the national democratic revolution is to return the country and the land to the indigenous African people, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the Azanian people and only upon whose freedom and liberation can a truly Azanian nation be constructed. This task enjoins the active co-operation of the Indian and Coloured national minorities, who being equally politically deprived, can only realise their liberation by fully identifying with the African (and Africanist) struggle for freedom.

This concept (which was embodied in the Comintern resolution of 1928) is radically different from *Cont. on Back Cover*

ZAIRE AND THE THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS

Mao-Tse-Tung's Theory of the Three Worlds is a correct analysis of the contradictions in our world today, which enables the international proletariat to isolate the two main imperialist enemies of the peoples of the world — the two superpowers — the USA and the USSR. It is a guiding principle of Leninism that the international proletariat must isolate the main imperialist enemy at any particular time by mobilising all the forces that can be mobilised against it. Mao-Tse-Tung's Theory of the Three Worlds is based on this guiding principle of revolutionary struggle consistently upheld by Lenin and Stalin. Isolating the main imperialist enemy internationally strengthens the anti-imperialist struggle in every country, and indeed makes the condition for revolutionary struggle even more favourable. Did not the isolation of U.S. -imperialism around the Indo-Chinese struggles make the condition for the struggle against U.S.-imperialism favourable all over the world, a situation which social imperialism is attempting to exploit to its own benefit under the banner of anti-imperialism.

The two superpowers represent large countries with huge populations and enormous economic, technological and military resources. Their capacity to dominate and divide the world between them is a real one. This is not so with other smaller imperialist powers like Britain, France and West Germany. Indeed the main reasons for the formation of the EEC (European Common Market) was the desire for these countries to be able to stand up to the two superpowers which they cannot do alone. Even a strong imperialist country like Japan, with a population of 100,000,000 cannot contend with Russia's forcible occupation of her northern territories.

While the Second World imperialist countries do not undergo the worst effects

of superpower control anti-interference, nevertheless, they too have the choice either to tail behind one or other of the two superpowers, or stand up independently. This is the materialistic basis of closer cooperation *based on equality* between the Second World and Third World countries.

Nevertheless many revolutionaries still trip up on the question of the Theory of the Three Worlds when it comes to utilising this contradiction between the superpowers and the Second World imperialist countries to the advantage of the struggles of the countries and peoples of the Third World. This revealed itself recently during the Shaba incidents when French and Belgian imperialism went to the assistance of Mobutu. The thinking of many revolutionaries is understandably clouded by the atrocious history of European Imperialism in the Third World countries during the era of colonialism, a relationship between exploiter and exploited that still exists, even though the second world countries have perceptibly declined as imperialist powers. But we should avoid a subjectivist approach to the Second World imperialist countries today. Imperialism come and go and the history of the rise of the colonial and imperialist powers shows that major powers disappear and others take their place. Early Portuguese and Spanish colonialism was succeeded by Dutch colonialism, whose back was eventually broken by French and British colonialism. German and Japanese Imperialism eventually challenged the older powers in two world wars that enfeebled all of them and gave the opportunity to U.S. Imperialism to emerge as the leading imperialist power. Today the position of U.S. Imperialism itself enfeebled by the number of national revolutionary wars in the Third World countries is being challenged by Russian social-imperialism.

In looking at the question of the unity between the Second World imperialist countries and the Third World two points must be kept firmly in mind.

The first point, which refers to a long term, strategic approach to the question, bases itself on the fact that the independence of the Western European countries are directly threatened by the two super-powers.

For a long time the economic independence of the Western European countries was controlled by U.S. Imperialism which after World War II strengthened the capitalist governments in an effort to avert revolution in these countries and be able to use Europe's vast resources for its own domination. Indeed the bulk of U.S. Imperialism's investments after the War went into Europe. But this situation did not go unchallenged. De Gualle challenged it and went to the extent of withdrawing France from NATO to show his independence. This assertion of Western European independence found its formation in the Common Market, so that on the eve of his departure from the White House Kissinger had to admit that the EEC was a new independent factor in world politics.

Today the independence of Western Europe is threatened more directly by Russian social imperialism, whose forces far outmatch hers and who has a ready made fifth column in the so-called Euro-Communist Parties. The massive build up of the conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact countries is directly aimed at Western European independence. So is the military interventions of social-imperialism aimed at encircling and strangling Western Europe by threatening her vital mineral resources and oil routes that she is so dependent upon.

Of course Western European imperialism currently obtains these advantages from Africa (and the Third World in general) through exploitative economic policies, but it is precisely this danger from the both superpowers, and especially so-

cial imperialism, that must make her to eventually agree to more equitable trade relations with the Third World in the long run. The change in this relationship will become a greater reality as the danger from social-imperialism becomes greater and the war clouds of World War III become more evident than it is today and as the pressures from the Third World countries themselves upon Western Europe increases. On this general long term basis closer co-operation between the Second World and Third World can be eventually materialise.

The second point to take into account is that Third World countries directly threatened by the aggressiveness of social imperialism must take advantage of inter-imperialist contradictions in an effort to push back the thrust of the more aggressive imperialist enemy which is social imperialism. For it refuses to do so, and for revolutionaries to oppose this, means allowing Third World countries to succumb to more oppressive social-fascist regimes.

This point bears relevance to the assistance that French and Belgium imperialism gave to Mobutu. We have no illusions about the bankrupt and corrupt pro-U.S. neo-colonial regime of Mobutu who has brought the country almost to economic ruin and who viciously exploits the overwhelming majority of Zairean people.

In supporting Mobutu against the invasion engineered by social-imperialism in the name of the puppet FNLC we are merely upholding the sovereignty of Zaire against foreign domination, and in supporting the assistance given by French and Belgian imperialism we wish to use inter-imperialist contradictions to push back the aggressive thrust of a far more dangerous imperialist power. For the social-fascist oppression and control that social imperialism can exercise is far greater than that which can be exercised by France. Indeed the weakness of the French assistance was shown up — an indication also of the weakness of the We-

stern European flank against social imperialism.

But even more importantly if Zaire with its strategic geographic position in the centre of Africa and its great mineral resources, is brought under the control of social imperialism it would become a far greater base of aggression and subversion against the independence of other African countries, than Angola is today.

With firmly entrenched bases in African social imperialism's threat to Western Europe would be more direct and the acceleration towards a Third World War would be speeded up. Hence social imperialism is the greater imperialist danger in Africa today.

But this does not mean that the Zairean revolutionaries must abandon the struggle against Mobutu and the U.S. Imperialism. Definitely no. Our arrows must at all times be directed against both superpowers, and at each stage we must decide which one constitutes the greater danger. With the Shaba invaders repulsed the struggle against Mobutu and U.S. Imperialism for the success of the national democratic revolution in Zaire must continue. While directing the main blows against the main imperialist enemy the eventual aim is to wipe out all the foreign imperialist powers.

The situation in Zaire can in some respects be compared to the course of the Chinese Revolution. Under the leadership of the CCP the Chinese Revolution first directed its blows against the Kuomintang through which both the foreign and domestic reactionaries functioned. But when the Japanese imperialists invaded the CCP formed an alliance with the Kuomintang (and with other imperialist powers that were helping the Kuomintang and which were now opposed to Japan). When the Japanese imperialists were defeated the CCP resumed the war against the Kuomintang and thoroughly defeated them.

But the very aggression of social imperi-

alism opens up many opportunities for the Zairean revolutionaries. It enables them to form an alliance with Mobutu and thus achieve a degree of organisation which they would otherwise have to achieve under more difficult conditions of repression.

But forming alliances that advance the struggle does not mean that Zairean revolutionaries have to agree to the formation of Pan-African armies by Western European imperialism. They can give assistance against social imperialism on terms which are advantageous to the revolutionary struggle, but under no circumstances can standing armies of foreign countries be tolerated.

The aggressiveness of social-imperialism is sharpening all the basic contradictions in world society today. The build up towards a Third World War is making the conditions for the emergence of working class leadership in the struggle for national independence very favourable. For in our epoch of imperialism and social imperialism it is only the working class that can successfully lead the struggle for national independence against both superpowers. The Western European governments are today hitched to U.S. Imperialism, but there is no guarantee that tomorrow they will not jump onto the chariot of social imperialism. All over the world today bourgeois forces are increasingly being divided between U.S. Imperialism and social imperialism. For this reason too, whatever tactical alliances we may form with bourgeois forces it is only on the leadership of the working class that we must eventually rely upon.

The task of revolutionaries all over the world is to understand the new developing situation and to prepare for it. The epoch of imperialism is also the epoch of war and revolution. War and Revolution in our era also means the advancement of the proletarian struggle.

The class struggle in every country today takes place within the framework of the Theory of the Three Worlds. The revo-

lutionaries in each country must formulate their revolutionary strategy on the basis of their own internal contradictions. They must walk on two legs: they must pursue the class struggle in their own countries

and build up the revolutionary party based on mass support, and they must at the same time help in isolating the two superpowers.

THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT — THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL BOURGEOIS AND IMPERIALISM AND HEGEMONISM

Two important international conferences were held recently, and in both of them, strong positions were taken against imperialism and hegemonism. These were the Conferences of the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement and the OAU Khartoum Conference.

Both these Conferences are a landmark in the struggle against hegemonism. The Khartoum Conference is important because of the ambitions of the superpowers on the African continent in the new scramble for Africa. It is the duty of the revolutionaries of the world to support the positions taken up by the countries and governments of the Non-Aligned Movement against imperialism and hegemonism.

The Non-Aligned Movement reflects the contradiction between the national bourgeois and imperialism on a world level. Many of these governments believe in the capitalist system but they also believe in the national development of their own countries in terms of their own class interests, and this brings them into conflict with imperialism especially the two superpowers who wish to subjugate them perpetually and to incorporate them into their economic empires. There have now been a number of international conferences — UNCTAD and other U.S. agencies — where the Non-Aligned countries have made increasing demands upon imperialism. The demand for a New International Eco-

nomic Order comes from them. These demands weaken imperialism and they are an important aspect of the struggle of these countries for national independence from imperialism.

Over the past decade the non-aligned countries have made increasing demands with the imperialist powers on fairer prices for their commodities, and imperialism has been forced to concede; notably the OPEC countries, who created a grave crisis for imperialism and gave a clear signal that the old international economic order was not here to stay forever.

Together the non-aligned movement comprise the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world, and the overwhelming majority of its peoples. Acting together on an international level they are a powerful force against imperialism and hegemonism. As a political and moral force they command great power. Their opposition to military bases on their soil, their desire for national development even within the capitalist order, their common positions on issues like apartheid and zionism, helps to weaken the forces of reaction. They are part of the international anti-imperialist movement.

Those who criticise the non-aligned movement as not being non-aligned should ask themselves whether the position of the superpowers is strengthened or weakened by the positions that the non-

aligned movement take against them in their desire to strengthen their countries economically, and to gain a fuller measure of national independence.

The national bourgeois is vacillating ally in the struggle against imperialism, especially when they are threatened by their own workers and peasants, but the revolutionary advance necessitates that their differences with imperialism should be fully explained. Lenin long ago pointed out that revolutionaries should not only

utilise every chink in the armour of imperialism to weaken them, but that it was also their duty to do so.

It is from this point of view that China's attempts to strengthen the non-aligned movement and to unite governments of the world against the two superpowers should be seen. This does not in anyway mean class collaboration. On the contrary, it strengthens the general struggle against them.

SOCIAL IMPERIALISM IN ZIMBABWE AND NAMIBIA

The Zimbabwean and Namibian struggles today would have advanced towards a straight forward victory against the forces of imperialism, white settler colonialism and reaction if it was not for a new complicating factor that has crept into the situation. This is Russian social imperialism which wishes to bring these countries under its hegemony by installing its own minions into power. Regretably the intervention is not only diplomatic and political but one direct military intervention via its mercenaries, the Cubans.

Like all imperialist powers social imperialism takes advantage and feeds upon the rivalries of the different organisation. It supports one section of the liberation forces where its agents are well placed, and opposes others. In Southern Africa it strives to get certain liberation movements, like the ANC (South Africa) declared as the sole authentic organisations.

Western imperialism — and particularly U.S. and British imperialism — whose economic stakes in this part of the world is very high understands that the days of white settler colonialism are numbered and that it would be futile to rely upon them to protect its interests. But even more importantly they understand that their main imperialist rival for world dominati-

on, Russian social-imperialism, fighting under the banner of anti-imperialism, and solidly linked to a section of the liberation forces that can command some sort of popular support, is more favourably placed, and they do not wish to give them the opportunity to make the sort of military intervention that would put them in a decidedly advantageous position, similar to that in Angola.

Hence their disagreement with the internal settlement, which in days gone by would have represented the ideal neo-colonial solution. If they gave total backing to the neo-colonial internal settlement they would give Nkomo and ZAPU the opportunity to call in the Cuban mercenaries. Their dilemma is to get the settler regime to adapt to the new situation without in anyway giving leeway to the genuine revolutionary forces. Hence their anxiety to blunt the revolutionary struggle and to incorporate the Patriotic Front into the internal settlement.

In Namibia the situation is similar. Sam Nujoma in an effort not to be by-passed in the forthcoming election in the country will be quite prepared to call in Cuban troops to install him into power as this London Sunday Times truthfully revealed, and social-imperialism of course would be qui-

te willing to do so.

For Azanian revolutionaries, the lesson of Zimbabwe and Namibia are quite clear cut. Unite the mass of the Azanian people against white settler colonialism and the two superpowers for genuine African self-determination and national independence. Make use of the contradictions among

the imperialist powers but do not rely on any of them. Isolate the pro-Soviet comprador elements in our struggle by building the Pan-Africanist Congress as the people's organisation for genuine national independence.

THE PAC CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE – SUPREME POLICY MAKING BODY OF PAC – A GREAT NEW BEGINNING?

«We are glad that the PAC is washing its dirty linen in public, but it is washing its dirty linen positively.»

«We must be honest to ourselves first. This Consultative Conference is a step in that direction.» (applause) (Tsietsi Mashini, leader of the Soweto uprisings).

«When we have problems
We solve them not by running away
But we talk amongst ourselves
When we solve them
We have no sentimentalities
We have no personality affiliation
When we manage to solve them

We manage to prove
Our authentic leadership
Of the people.»

(Poem to the PAC C.C.
by Ndugu Khotso Seatlholo.)

... «This means that the unity must be truly representative of the popular will; it must involve the broad masses of the people throughout the country; the people must be free to support it and take part in making its decisions, and no decision should go against popular interest on matters of policy.» (P. K. Leballo in his Opening Address).

The Pan Africanist Congress Consultative Conference held in Arusha, Tanzania, last June, marks a new beginning for the organisation. It shows that the organisation is prepared to adapt itself to the new conditions inside the country and to respond positively to the new liberation forces that have emerged, especially among the youth of Azania, who are in the forefront of the peoples struggles.

Indeed it was the influx of the youth into the PAC that challenged it to move positively forward or to stagnate or die. The leadership under P. K. Leballo responded positively. This was the real heart of the

so-called «crisis» in the PAC. The old PAC leadership had obviously been out of touch with developments inside the country and there was especially a need to integrate with the new forces of liberation that had emerged around the Black Consciousness Movement. Neither were the youth prepared to receive orders from a leadership that had been in exile for fifteen years and who was nowhere to be seen when they faced the bullets of the fascist regime during the Soweto events. They wanted a say in the policy making of decisions of the organisation and not to be regarded as «mercenaries» fighting for self-elected,

bureaucratic leaders donning the garb of Marxism-Leninism to hide their incompetence in moving forward with the momentum of the struggle.

It is to the credit of the leadership that they responded to the challenge in a positive way, in calling the Consultative Conference to get a mandate from its representative membership to meet the new situation, despite the difficulties and obstacles that conditions of exile impose. Whatever criticisms might be levelled against the Consultative Conference it was a step in the right direction. The way forward is to move constantly in this direction.

The crowning glory of the Consultative Conference was the declaration that the C. C. is the supreme policy making body of the PAC. What does this mean, if it does not mean that the grass roots representatives of the rank and file members are the supreme architects of PAC's policy. It is not Leballo, not David Sibeko, nor the Central Committee who are the policy makers but the Consultative Conference, which is to be held every three years. It is here that rank and file members should present their own points of view, the leadership questioned, papers be presented about what policies to adopt, etc.

Without hesitation we say that this a correct and great step forward for the PAC. This will certainly ensure the dynamism of the organisation. In our recommendation to the C. C. published in the last issue of IKWEZI we called upon the organisation to uphold the mass line, practise correct relationships between leadership and masses, etc. We are happy

to say that all these recommendations were what was in the minds of those attending the C. C. The PAC must at all times have faith in the masses and rely on the masses. The masses are the true bastion of the revolution.

For a long time, because of the lack of consultation between the leadership and the masses there was dissatisfaction among rank and file members of the PAC. But now that this situation has been corrected, the PAC must make a concerted effort to integrate and bring back these members into the organisation. They should not allow their grievances to be exploited by others who are upto sectarian mischief in the name of Marxism-Leninism and who are guilty of the very things that they accuse others of.

The Azanian struggle has now reached a new phase. Liberation will come within the lifetime of the generation that gave rise to the Black Consciousness Movement. It is right and proper that the PAC integrates itself with this new generation whose political outlook and ideology is no different from its own and who have a contempt for the multiracial politics of the ANC-CP. Those who belonged to the Sharpeville generation, and who have been in exile for many years, must now integrate themselves with the new generation of youthful revolutionaries that have arisen in the interim, instead of regarding themselves as leaders who have an automatic right to lead the struggle.

(AZANIA NEWS, organ of the PAC has published a special issue on the C. C. It can be obtained by writing to PAC, Box 2412, Dar-Es-Salaam, Tanzania).

WORLD CONFERENCE ON APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA CALLS FOR END TO WHITE SETTLER COLONIALISM.

The World Conference on Apartheid in South Africa held in Geneva last month called for an end to the «white settler colonial regime» in the country. The Conference was attended by participants from all over the world.

FROM THE PAC CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE

AZANIA!!
by R. Kenny

End of Superpower meddling

Listen as it roars:
Nations want Independence!
Countries want Liberation!
People want Revolution!

**NATIONS WANT LIBERATION!
COUNTRIES WANT INDEPENDENCE!
PEOPLES WANT REVOLUTION!**

Azania — Azania
For 300 years you've fought
the Colonialist
Who were (And still are)
Trying to make you bend your
knees to the will of the Invaders.
First the Dutch!
Then the German!
Then the English!
Now the Afrikaner!

Azania — Azania
An Imperialist feast for one Superpower,
A future banquet for another
Listen to them as they rant
and rave about Human Rights
Who has more Human Rights?
Which is a paradise for its workers?

Ask Gary Tyler!
Ask a weapon factory worker in
Leningrad working 13 hours making
bombs.
Ask Cleophus Collins
Ask a peasant in Czechoslovakia.
They will tell.

Azania — Azania
Listen to the Thunder
Listen to the Thunder in
Soweto, Johannesburg.
Tired of Mr. Vorster's apartheid.
Tired of them running your land
Listen to the Thunder
Held high by the PAC.
The Thunder of Revolution
End of Apartheid

ON THE SUPERPOWERS AND HEGEMONISM

«The activities of these two superpowers have been increased and the amount of dust they have raised is certainly designed to confuse the correct revolutionary liberation struggle. The two superpowers have now assigned themselves the permanent role of international fire brigades to block revolutionary struggles for self-determination for the peoples of this region.»

US Imperialism disguised as champion of human rights campaign and sending its agents all over the continent of Africa — agents of different descriptions to seek the so-called peaceful transfer of power to the Black majority, by using shuttle diplomacy, economic blackmail, and mouthing anti-apartheid-slogans, engaging in anti-apartheid rhetoric, all designed to camouflage the true nature of imperialism led by U. S. Imperialism.»

«The mission and the ultimate aim of both superpowers is the same — creation of neo-colonialism with different labels and the establishment of spheres of influence — designed to keep other nations in permanent servitude. No doubt all this calls for more vigilance and intensified efforts to thwart these machinations of the superpowers.»

(Elias L. Ntloedibe,
Central Committee member, PAC).

«PAC is the Azanian People's Genuine Vanguard in the Azanian sector of the global struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and super power hegemonism.» (Final Declaration of the C. C.)

«Apart from the obvious weakness of a divided Movement fighting against a strong and united enemy, there is an even more serious danger. For Africa to arm

different Nationalist Movements of a single country is to prepare that country for civil war immediately upon the defeat of the common enemy — if not before. And it is then too late to prevent the Big Powers getting involved in Africa for their own reasons and their own advantages.» (H. M. Mkwizu, External Affairs Relations Dept. of the Tanzanian Party C.C.M.)

THE YOUTH OF AZANIA REPRESENT THE MOMENTUM OF THE STRUGGLE TODAY

The youth of Azania has appeared on the political scene as the leading and most powerful force in the Azanian peoples struggles. The shattering events of Soweto would have been inconceivable without them. It arose from their courage to dare to act and challenge the colonial-fascist authorities. But the revolutionism of the current generation of Black youth is deeper than anything known in the history of our liberation struggle.

The story of their achievements and struggles has an original history of its own. After Sharpeville when both the ANC and the PAC were banned there was a political vacuum in the country. The youth and students of Azania led by outstanding elements like Steve Biko and Abraham Tiro and others — the generation that the apartheid University system was supposed to tame — began their own political initiatives and began to develop their ideology based on their own immediate experiences. Their political terrain was their own *University environment* where they challenged the Bantu educational system, and evolved their political concepts, culminating in the ideology of Black Consciousness, a militant Black political outlook that rejected any co-operation with whites, that saw liberation not in terms of a dialogue with the white man, but defined it in terms of the Black man's needs and

aspirations. They saw the necessity for mass mobilisation and self-reliance. In correctly rejecting white leadership in the Azanian people's struggle the youth of the Black Consciousness Movement finally put paid to white tutelage in our liberation struggle. The white led South African «Communist» Party can only hijack our struggle through the ANC which it dominates on the basis of Cuban bayonets and Russian tanks. It can never evermore be able to maintain an ideological domination over the hearts and minds of Black people.

The main contribution of the youth of the Black Consciousness Movement was in attempting to free the Azanian masses from the mental fetters that enslaved them to their white masters. The overcoming of this psychological barrier of inferiority and a colonial baaskap mentality in itself released a great material force of resistance they did this by instilling into the Black population a sense of Black pride. Mao-Tse-Tung has pointed out that the overcoming of a sense of inferiority is an absolute first necessity for a colonised people. It is because of the liberating effects of this «Black Consciousness» ideology that the Azanian masses face their colonial-fascist enemies with a new determination and resoluteness, despite the brutal repression.

The youth of the Black Consciousness Movement did not get themselves bogged down about «multi-racialism» «non-racial democracy» etc. With one swoop they brought the Indians and Coloureds together as Black masses. As a consequence the leadership of the BCM came from all three groups. This was a great contribution to our struggle and shamed those who approached the three Black groups in terms of racial categories.

The youth declared too with a boldness that Azania was a Black man's country ... «inasmuch as Black people live in Europe on terms laid down by whites, whites should be subjected to the same conditions» (Abraham Tiro) ... ONE AZANIA: ONE NATION: ONE PEOPLE.

Nor did the youth allow themselves to be enticed by the blandishments of exile. For them the home going programme was a reality. Their sojourn outside the country was to equip themselves the better to return home to struggle. This was a change from the post-Sharpeville generation that found themselves to be trapped abroad.

The youth also integrated itself with the people and was able to successfully mobilise the masses to lengthy strikes during the Soweto events. On three different occasions during the months from June to October they brought the Azanian masses out on strikes. Compare this to the pitiable one day and three days abortive strikes that the ANC-CP attempted — the most revolutionary thing they ever attempted — when the masses were in a militant mood.

The youth have shown a relentless determination to struggle. Despite the banings, the killings of over 1 500 of their comrades during the Soweto uprisings they have relentlessly struggled on and thrown up new layers of leadership. After the banning of the various sections of the Black Consciousness Movement, they were able to form a new organisation, AZAPO (Azanian Peoples Organisation).

During the very recent death of one of their leaders who was killed in prison — like Biko — over 5 000 youth turned up at his funeral.

Ideologically in their enunciation of their political outlook of Black Consciousness they have produced some fine writings on the lines of Franz Fanon. This not only comprises of political tracts but also of some very fine literary writings.

Of course, the youth and the Black Consciousness Movement had to go much further in their political understandings. Their political ideas still contained a great deal of idealism and eclecticism. They were still at the perceptual stage of their political understanding. They had not yet arrived at a comprehensive understanding of the national question, or the nature and content of the national democratic revolution. At the perceptual stage of their understanding they were responding to the problem that immediately confronted them in all its horror and humiliation — that is in its psychological dimensions — for that is how they experienced it in their daily lives — rather than as historical materialism. The youth too did not inherit any Marxist tradition on which they could build and develop their own perceptions. And because of the censorship there is a poverty of revolutionary literature in the country. (The growth of the beginnings of an Azanian Marxist-Leninist movement takes place outside the country as Azanian revolutionaries come into contact with revolutionary Marxist ideas.)

Historically the youth movement has been a powerful factor in leading the peoples' struggles. We have not only the great examples of the May 4th Movement in China which led to the formation of the great Chinese Communist Party but also the more recent examples of the youth and students movements all over the world. Given correct leadership is it not possible that the present youth movement in Azania can take the same direction as that of the Chinese Communist Party.

It is quite obvious that the future generation of Azanian leaders will emerge from the present generation of youth, who have already shown sterling qualities of struggle.

But the Azanian struggle has also produced capable men and women from the other organisations. Apart from those who have been messed up by the ideology of the Congress Alliance and the multi-racialism of the South African «Communist» Party, and those who have atrophied over the years through years in exile — mainly because of internal disputes — the-

re have been others who have imbibed revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideas. This group should integrate itself with the youth and together work to form a powerful national movement, under Marxist-Leninist leadership. To stand aloof from the youth, to wear attitudes of superiority towards them is wrong. These older cadres have much to give to the struggle and the way for them to do this is to combine their political knowledge with the dynamism and enthusiasm of the youth.

LONG LIVE THE YOUTH OF AZANIA!

THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES

ETHEL KHOPUNG

This is the last part of Ethel Khopung's excellent book on the history of the oppression and liberation struggles of the Azanian peoples, called «Story of a Dispossessed People». The author has recently brought it upto date to include a section on the rise of the Black Consciousness Movement and the Soweto Uprisings.

From 1965 to 1969, the racist regime in South Africa claimed that it had crushed POQO (P.A.C.) and other subversive organisations. In 1970, for the first time the South African Government admitted that the 1963 POQO uprising led by PAC would have killed 1000 whites if the police had not used newly acquired powers. General Van der Bergh said that neither martial law nor a state of emergency could have coped with the POQO uprising.

The regime then stepped up its propaganda machinery through its Radio South Africa and other media. Kaiser Matanzima and other Bantustan leaders were projected as spokesmen for the oppressed Azanian people. These Bantustan leaders had traitorously accepted 13% of South Africa as the home of the Africans and the remaining 87% of the fatherland as the property of the white minority settlers. The Bantustan leaders promised to fight «terrorists» side by side with the whiteman. Some of these Bantustan chiefs even collected monies from the poor Africans living in their areas as contribution to the «anti-terrorist fund.»

At this time the voice of the Africans — with the Pan Africanist Congress and the African National Congress banned — was weak, at least on the surface. But students who were members of the Pan Africanist Congress continued to educate and mobilise other students on national questions. The mobilisation by the Black students was done under very extreme difficulties of police intimidation and harassment.

The liberal English NUSAS (National Union of South African Students) being a white organisation with some Black university students in it was not banned. It played some role in exposing the oppression of the Black people of South Africa.

Unfortunately NUSAS had always been sympathetic to the discredited liberal and pseudo-Communist Congress Alliance (mentioned earlier) led by the so-called «Communist» Party of South Africa. NUSAS therefore could not articulate the Azanian political situation as the Blacke themselves who lived daily in the boiling pot of Boer oppression.

In 1970, dissatisfied with the way NUSAS (a white-dominated organisation of university students) and its allies applied itself to the oppression of the Africans in the country, the black students formed their own organisation and broke from NUSAS. They called it SASO (South African Students Organisation). The Black students had observed what Mangaliso Robert Sobukwe, President of the Pan Africanist Congress had said at the time of the founding of his party in December 1959. The PAC leader had said, «We have admitted that there are Europeans who are intellectual converts to the African's cause, but because they benefit materially from the present set-up, they cannot completely identify themselves with that cause.»

LIMITATIONS OF WHITE PROGRESSIVES

Thus it is, as South Africa's history so ably illustrates, that whenever Europeans «co-operate» with African movements, they keep on demanding checks and counter-checks, guarantees and the like, with the result that they stultify and retard the movement of the Africans ...»

SASO had learnt from bitter experience the truthfulness of Sobukwe's statement. When the black students broke away from NUSAS to form SASO (South African Students' Organisation), they said among other things, «Black students owe their first allegiance to the black community with whom they share burdens and injustices of apartheid ...»

As usual when Africans in Azania find their way to freedom relying on their own efforts and recognising that they are their own liberators, they always have detractors. When therefore, SASO was founded, there were attacks on the organisation. Some called SASO racia- lists and criticised them for not co-operating with NUSAS «a multi-racial organisation.» The South African Indian Congress which had taken part in the notorious Kliptown Freedom Charter of the Congress Alliance in 1955 was also unhappy at the formation of SASO. In Natal the South African Indian Congress accused

SASO and said SASO advocated the same policies that had been pursued by the Pan Africanist Congress before it was banned after leading the positive action campaign against the Pass Laws in March 1960. This created some unpleasantness between SASO and the Natal Indian Congress.

SASO was undaunted. They embarked on the mobilisation of all sectors of the Black Community. They rejected the Bantustan tribal chiefs and described the so-called «gains» of the Bantustan policy as gimmicks calculated to buy more time for the South African Government which is being overtaken by events in neighbouring countries. SASO embarked on self-help projects such as clinics, literacy classes etc. for the Black Community.

Despite bannings of its leaders by the South African racist Government, SASO rapidly gained wide acceptance among the black people and gave new hope which had been dashed when PAC and ANC went underground after they were banned.

SASO was a student body. There was a need for students to get organised into a political party when they left school. Indeed, the whole Black Consciousness movement which had developed needed a political home. So on 24th of April 1971, a conference was held in Bloemfontein. Its main theme was the co-operation and co-ordination of the efforts of all black organisations which had an identical national outlook. At this conference the organisations that were represented were SASO (South African Students' Organisation) IDAMASA (Inter-denominational African Ministers' Association) ASSECA (Association for the Education and Cultural Advancement of African People of South Africa) and YWCA (Young Womens' Christian Association).

At this Bloemfontein Conference, an Ad Hoc Committee was elected. Its task was to invite more black people and organisations to a large conference. This bigger conference was held in Pietermaritzburg in August 1971. Over 100 representatives from education., sporting, welfare, religious and student organisations attended. This time its theme was «*Development of the African Community.*» The con-

terence was addressed by several speakers among whom was Drake Koka, Steve Biko, Mrs. E. Kuzwayo and Mrs. Mabiletsa.

The following matters were decided:

- a. That all African organisations be asked to join in the formation of a confederate organisation.
- b. That these organisations should work with other black organisations toward the realisation of the black man's aspirations.
- c. That a national political organisation be formed and operate outside the apartheid Government system and policy.
- d. That such a national organisation must devote itself to representing African opinion on a political basis and to promoting community development programmes on education, economic and cultural aspects.

On the 14th of January 1972, the Black Peoples' Convention Ad Hoc Committee announced the formation of a black peoples' political party under the banner of Black Consciousness. In its statement, the B.P.C. (Black Peoples' Convention) Ad Hoc Committee said among other things, «... It is the inalienable birthright of any community to have a political voice to articulate and realise the aspirations of its members.

In this our country, Africans, Coloureds and Indians compromise the Black Community which has been deprived of this inalienable right; and for too long there has been a political racialism in the black community.

The Ad Hoc Committee is therefore working towards the formation of a Black People's Political Movement whose primary aim is to unite and solidify black people with a view to liberating and emancipating them from both psychological and physical oppression.

Our interests therefore lie within the black community and our sole aim will be directed towards realising its needs, which needs will coincide with those of all Black people throughout the world.

It is therefore essential and imperative that all black people, individuals and organisations, should pool their resources together in order to

achieve their aspirations. Their future destiny and ultimate happening is in their hands.»

THE BLACK PEOPLES CONVENTION

Things moved fast in the Black Consciousness movement. From 8th to 10th July, 1972, the Black Peoples' Convention held its conference in Pietermaritzburg. The conference was well represented. It adopted a constitution and formally launched the organisation.

At the end of this conference the following were elected to the *interim executive* /

Mr. A. Mayatula	President
Mr. M. Shezi	Vice President
Mr. D. K. Koka	Secretary-General
Mr. S. Cooper	Public Relations Officer
Mr. A. Dlamini	National Organiser

The Black Peoples' Convention resolved in respect of planning and organisation of the new political party:

to operate openly as an overt peoples movement;

to work on membership drive towards a target of 1,000,000 in three years.

Soon after this conference there was spontaneous reaction by black people to their various situations. For instance, there were bus strikes in Johannesburg and Durban. There was also a widely publicised dock workers' strike in Durban, which caught the attention of the entire world press. *Of course, some exiled leaders of the African National Congress of South Africa attached to the long dead South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU) claimed they were behind these strikes. No, the Consciousness movement was responsible for the unrest.*

When the Durban City Council banned buses in Chatsworth as a result of the bus strike by the Black people, the B.P.C. issued a statement which read:

«It is important to remember at a time like this that these acts of racism against us are not isolated. These are part of a master plan by the whiteman to keep us in perpetual servitude and to seal the shackles that bind us in bondage. It was only a while ago that our brothers and sisters in Gelvandale, Port Elizabeth were

effected similarly by transport hurdles imposed by the white man. The people of Gelvandale preferred to walk to Port Elizabeth and back rather than sell their souls to the cut-throat price of the white man.

«... Let us remember that the government is not out to please us all. The government is out on a deliberate campaign to destroy us physically and spiritually ...»

Incidentally, it was not long after a spate of these wide-spread strikes by black workers that Mtuli Shezi, Vice President of the interim executive committee of the Black Peoples' Convention died. Before Mr. Shezi died, he related events leading to the «accident» which led to his death.

He said he had originally quarrelled with some white employers in the South African Railways. He had objected to the bad treatment these white employees had meted out to black women at a railway station some days before the «accident.» What was the accident?

Some days after his quarrel with the white Railway employees, Shezi went through Germiston. It was on the 12th of December 1972. He was apparently spotted by one of the European Railway employees with whom he had quarrelled. This white man chased Mr. Shezi, caught and overpowered him. He then pushed him onto the rails in front of an on-coming train. After being knocked down and dragged by the train, Mr. Shezi sustained a number of injuries. These injuries included a fractured pelvis, a dislocated hip and a ruptured bladder. Five days after being taken to the hospital Mr. Shezi died. The police said they suspected no foul play!»

But the Black Peoples' Convention was not intimidated. The organisation held its first conference on the 16th to 17th December, 1972. The conference elected Mrs. Winnifred Kgware a 54-year old teacher and mother of four as its elected President.

«You have opened a new chapter in the book of Black development in South Africa,» Mrs. Kgware said addressing the inaugural congress of the B.P.C. «We have embarked on something that Africa has long been waiting for,» she concluded.

Up and until now some people were still not

convinced that the Black Consciousness movement was a genuine liberation movement. But one of the highlights of the BPC Congress which silenced the doubting Thomases was the invitation to this historic congress of Ntsu Mokhehle President of the Basutoland Congress Party. Mr. Mokhehle officially opened the congress in absentia. He was a prohibited immigrant to South Africa and was banned from South African soil.

Mokhehle has been involved in the African Revolution for many years. He attended the All Africa Peoples' Conference called by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah in Accra in 1958 which set Africa ablaze. He also served on the steering committee of this organisation. When the leaders of the Black Peoples' Convention invited him, he spoke to the Congress through a taperecorded speech. The delegates to the Conference listened attentively to every word the veteran Black politician said.

Under the leadership of the Black Peoples' Convention, SASO and other organisations — guided by the ideology of Black Consciousness — the whole country moved. For ten years since Sharpeville in 1960, the African people could not organise openly. The B.P.C. now organised openly. This does not mean that it was easy. The leaders of the Black Consciousness movement were subjected to bannings, restrictions, imprisonment and passport refusal to travel abroad; like when Mr. Nyameko Berney Pityana, Secretary-General of SASO was refused a passport to tour the U.S.A. at the invitation of the Department of State's Education Travel Programme. The SASO T-shirt was also banned. The redesigning of the shirt did not help. But the Black Consciousness movement became more militant.

For instance, in a dramatic move at their Hammanskraal Conference, SASO, expelled their president Mr. Temba Sono. Sono had said that SASO had to learn to be flexible in its approach and «talk to our enemies.» Sono called for open-mindedness towards the leaders of the Bantustans, white liberals and even to the security police. SASO unanimously disowned Sono and expelled him.

Mr. Ben Khoapa, Director of Black Community Programmes summed up the mood of the

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

students in these words: «Black students are increasingly resisting efforts to get them to cooperate in their own educational genocide. No longer can they be contained by white rhetoric; nor can they be seduced into rejecting the interests of their own people. They have learnt what a large number of black people are beginning to learn from our young people that the revolution is not over and it is not just beginning, it's continually with us ...»

The militancy of the Black Consciousness movement spread also to the church. *Essays on Black Theology* edited by Mokgethi Motlhabi were published by the *Black Theology project of the University Christian Movement and Black Viewpoint published by the Black Community Programmes*. But the South African Government was not going to compromise even when the African Christians were trying to interpret their situation according to their appraisal of the Bible. *Essays on Black Theology* was banned on July 28th, 1972.

In 1972 there were still not good relations between the Black Consciousness movement and the Natal Indian Congress. The militancy of the Black organisations was said to be hindering complete co-operation between themselves and the Natal Indian Congress. But the 1973 Secretariat report of the Natal Indian Congress said, «In pursuit of its stated policy of working with organisations sharing its goals, the NIC has attempted to work with both BPC and SASO.»

In fact, Mr. G. Serwspersodh chairman of the Natal Indian Congress was one of the many speakers at the Sharpeville Commemoration Meeting in March 1973. The meeting was organised by the Black Peoples' Convention.

FRELIMO RALLY

In September 1974, the Black Consciousness movement organised a rally to express joy and solidarity with *Frelimo*. *Frelimo* had just won a guerrilla war against the Portuguese Government on 25th September 1974.

The Black Peoples' Convention and SASO jointly announced plans to organise a rally in Durban, Capetown, Port Elizabeth and Johan-

nesburg to coincide with the introduction of the Mozambique Government under *Frelimo*. The students at the University of the North near Pretoria also organised a *Frelimo* rally.

Public places such as clinics, schools and halls in the townships were painted under cover of night with slogans such as «*Viva Frelimo*», «*Viva Sobukwe*», «*Viva Azania*».

The stage was set for the *Frelimo* rallies. According to Sunday Times of September 22, a SASO representative had already approached a *Frelimo* leader in Lourenco Marques (now Maputo). Three speakers were expected to come and address the Black people in South Africa whose interest in the rally was more than keen. But the South African Government was scared. It stopped the meeting from being held, by banning it, arrested several leaders of the Black Consciousness movement and later charged them under the notorious Terrorism Act.

Reporting the events of 25th September 1974 a SASO pamphlet entitled «*The Frelimo Rally — The Facts and an Evaluation*» says:

«On Wednesday, 25th September, 1974 at about 17.30 over 2000 people gathered outside the Curries Fountain on the embankment opposite the entrance to the stadium, despite the banning of the Rally. The atmosphere was thick with expectation. The hum of excitement and genuine solidarity were indicative of the Black Community's mood.

White Police of course, were already present, having cordoned off the area around Curries Fountain and preventing anyone from entering the stadium. Reinforcements continued to arrive with all their paraphernalia — dogs, swagger-sticks, riot vans — a pathetic show of force.

By 17.40 the number of people had increased to between 4000 and 5000. Encouraged by the freewheeling atmosphere and unconcerned by the racist show of force, the crowd began to sing and dance. The National Anthem, «*Nkosi Sikelela i Afrika*», was chanted, the Black power salute was given, and many people shouted slogans including 'Viva *Frelimo*'».

The Police, however without warning unleashed the already excited Alsatian dogs into

the peaceful and unarmed crowd. Screams filled the air as women and men were bitten by dogs. One of the people bitten by these savage dogs was a pregnant women.»

Some of those later charged under the Terrorism Act for the Frelimo Rally were:

Gilbert Kaborone «Kaunda» Sedibe, President of the University of North Students' Representative Council.

Absolom Zithulele Cindi, Secretary-General of the BPC at the time of arrest.

Sodecque Variova, SASO member and leader of the Peoples' Experimental Theatre, a drama group based in Johannesburg.

Sulayman Alined «Solly» Ismael, member of both the Peoples' Experimental Theatre and SASO.

Strivivase Rajoo Moodley, former SASO Publications Director and Editor of the SASO newsletter.

Rubin Hore, Vice-President of SASO when arrested.

Sathasiven «Saths» Cooper, former Public Relations Officer of the Black Peoples' Convention.

Justice Edmund Lindane Muntu Nyeza, former President of SASO and Secretary-General of SASO at the time of detention.

Mosiusa Gerald Patric Lekota, Permanent Organiser of SASO since 1973.

Maitshwe Nchaupe Aubrey Mokoape, Founder member of BPC and SASO.

Nkwenkwe Vincent Nkomo, National Organiser of BPC when arrested.

Pondelani Jeremiah Mefolovhodwe, National President of SASO and final year B.Sc. student of the University of the University of the North at the time of his arrest.

The charge sheet numbering 104 pages said among other things the accused had during the period between 1968 and October 1974, conspired with one another to:

Transform the state by unconstitutional revolutionary and/or violent means.

Condition the African, Indian and Coloured population groups of the Republic of South Africa for violent revolution.

Create and foster feelings of racial hatred, hostility and antipathy by Blacks towards whites and/or the state. Denigrate Whites and re-

present them as inhuman oppressors of Blacks, and to induce, persuade and pressurize Blacks to totally reject the white man and his way of life, and to defy him.

Make, produce, publish or distribute subversive and antiwhite utterances, writings, poems, plays and/or drama.

Discourage, hamper, deter or prevent foreign investments in the economy of the Republic, and to call upon foreign investors to disengage themselves from the South African economy, or sections of the said economy.

BLACK REACTIONS

Reaction to the persecution and prosecution of these Azanian patriots was uncompromising. *The spokesmen for the Black Consciousness movement* said, «So long as our dignity is trodden upon so long as we are subjected to humiliation there can be no trust nor peace between us and the oppressor.»

Another spokesman of the Black people said that the main hope of the South African Government by using the Frelimo Rally as an excuse was to «crush SASO, BPC, BAWU and other Black consciousness organisations. By bleeding our organisations of effective leadership they assume the Black Movement will die a natural death.»

But the Black Consciousness movement was far from dying. On the contrary the Black people throughout the country visited the offices of BPC and SASO «to keep the fires burning» while their leaders were in detention facing charges under the Terrorism Act.

THE DEATH OF TIRO

Another event which proved the desperation of the South African Government to crush the Black Consciousness movement was the killing of Mr. Onkgopotse Ramothibi Abraham Tiro by a parcel bomb blast in Botswana where he had fled after a country-wide University students' protests.

Tiro was one of the members of the Black Consciousness movement that had left the country in 1973. Tiro was the President of the So-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

uth African Students' Movement (SASM). (Incidentally it is SASM that sparked off the «Soweto» uprising which swept throughout South Africa on June 16th, 1976. I will say more about this latter.)

Upon the death of Tiro, the Botswana Government said that the bomb was as an outcome of Tiro's speaking out against the denial of Black South Africans of their rights.

The statement went on to observe that «Onkgopotse Tiro had incurred the displeasure of certain powerful circles in South Africa. Mr. Tiro's sudden and cruel death will in no way detract from the *validity of his criticism of education in South Africa*. The Botswana Government wishes to state unequivocally that this kind of terrorism will not make it change its attitude towards those who seek refuge in Botswana from the oppression of their own countries.»

The Azanian people were deeply shocked by the brutal assassination of Tiro whose death they described as «a grave loss to the Black Community and mankind.» Tiro was buried in Botswana after a long legal battle to transfer his body from Botswana to South Africa.

THE SPIRIT OF TIRO LIVES ON

When Tiro was killed by the enemies of the Black people, a Botswana Government official had said, «Mr. Tiro's sudden and *cruel death will in no way detract from the validity of his criticism of education in South Africa.*»

This prophecy was fulfilled on June 16th, 1976. On that day the Soweto school children confronted the Boer police shouting: «We are not Boers.» «Afrikaans is the oppressors' language.» «Away with Afrikaans.» «Viva Azania.» Ignited by the Black Consciousness movement, the Azanian struggle for freedom moved from low to high intensity almost unprecedented in the history of Azania since Sharpeville. «*South Africa Explodes*» was the headline of most newspapers.

Since that bloody day over 1000 children have been killed by the South African Boers. *Thousands have been wounded. Hundreds have been thrown into jail. Thousands fled from*

South Africa, while dozens others were so tortured that in despair they either took their own lives in Vorster's prison cells or were brutally murdered in cold blood.

SOWETO UPRISING UNIQUE

The Soweto uprising was indeed unique. It was led by school children inspired by the ideas of the Black Consciousness movement.

In its opinion column one newspaper commented, «At Sharpeville 16 years ago and Carletonville in 1973, it was the anger of adults that burst out at the bestial humiliation ... in their own country. But today at Soweto it is the voice of protest from 10 000 black children against a ruthless suberviance to domination by an alien people that is setting ablaze 55 square kilometers of an apartheid settlement.

The march of events registers the escalating hatred of apartheid in South Africa not just as the concern of the adults but that of infants and the totality of the country's oppressed ... it is important for South African leaders of the revolution inside and outside the country to learn from the masses at Soweto, Sharpeville and other turning points that the salvation of the black man lies in his total refusal to cooperate with apartheid.»

Commenting on the Soweto uprising which spread throughout the country, *Azania News* (organ of the Pan Africanist Congress) said, «The black people of Azania are up in arms! The racist regime is in panic! The symbols of white alien domination are up in flames. The edifices of exploitation have been turned to ruins. The language of our colonisation has been set on the road to hell. The representatives of fascism and white racism are afraid to show their faces among the people. Three hundred and more years of sowing hatred are begetting hatred. It is not racial hatred on the part of our people.

We have but one question to ask today. How many more mass funerals? How many more damned deformed bodies? How many more murders and massacres of defenceless black men, woman and children do we want to see before we can take positive action to ena-

ble the disarmed, oppressed, exploited and degraded people of Azania to defend themselves against this genocide?

Is it enough for African and the international community to declare and denounce these crimes against humanity? How long will racist South Africa be allowed to get away with murder without retaliation on our part? ... Who will stand up for the persecuted, prosecuted and brutalised millions who refuse to be bullied or intimidated ...?»

Azania News went on to point out that the black people had rejected the tribal mini-states (Bantustans) «They said this is no uncertain terms *Away with Afrikaans! Viva Azania!* They demonstrated beyond any doubt that they were prepared and determined to die, if necessary, to make Azania a reality. *Who can oppose Azania after the people spilled their blood for it? Who can stubbornly refuse to acknowledge the peoples' love for Azania?*»

Indeed, the struggle continued. The Black Consciousness movement has refused to be intimidated. During the peak of the Soweto uprising several schools, clinics, beerhalls etc. were burned down. The damage amounted to millions of Rand. When the South African Government thought it had the «Soweto situation under control,» it raised the rents in Soweto, indirectly making the Black people pay for the damaged buildings. The people refused.

In fresh demonstrations they carried placards making their point clear: «*NO RENT PAYING!*» This huge demonstration was on 27th April, 1977. It was ten months after the June 16 Soweto uprising. The Black Consciousness movement managed to sustain their campaign against odds longer than any organisation in the past. It is clear that they have raised the struggle from a low intensity to a high intensity.

WHAT IS BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS?

This question has been answered by SASO. «BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS IS:

- a. an attitude of mind, a way of life;
- b. its basic tenet is that the Black man must reject all value systems that seek

to make him a foreigner in the country of his birth and reduce his basic human dignity;

- c. it implies awareness by the Black people of the power they wield as a group, both economically and politically and hence group cohesion and solidarity are important facts of Black Consciousness;
- d. the Black man must build up his own value systems, see himself as self-defined and not defined by others;
- e. Black Consciousness will always be enhanced by the totality of involvement of the oppressed people, hence the message of Black Consciousness has to spread to reach all sections of the Black Community.
- f. Liberation of the Blackman begins first with liberation from psychological oppression of himself through an inferiority complex and second from the physical one accruing out of living in a white racist society;
- g. Black people are those who are by law or tradition, politically, socially and economically discriminated against as a group in the South African society of their aspirations.»

BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS MOVEMENT, VERSUS PAC AND ANC

What is the attitude of the Black Consciousness movement toward the Pan Africanist Congress and the African National Congress — both recognised by the Organisation of African Unity?

It is the fundamental policy of the Black Consciousness movement to co-operate with *all* Black Consciousness-oriented organisations which work outside the policy of apartheid and Bantustans. The Black Consciousness movement, however, is independent of both PAC and ANC. It has its own leadership and programme of liberation and subscribes to an armed struggle.

But ideologically the Black Conscious-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

ness movement is closer to the PAC. For instance, the Black Consciousness movement does not subscribe to the Kliptown Freedom Charter of the Congress Alliance led by the white liberals in the Communist Party of South Africa. Basically, the notorious Kliptown Freedom Charter says Azania and its wealth belongs both to the oppressed and dispossessed Africans and the white oppressors. Azania is a bitch. She has no husband. She belongs to everybody — slave and the master.

At the fourth annual conference of SASO in Hammanskraal in July 1973, SASO's acting Permanent Organiser Mr. Abraham Tiro urged delegates to be positive and consider the country (South Africa) as a Black state which belonged only to the Black people.

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

The Black Consciousness movement has invited to its conferences PAC Leaders like Zeph Mothupeng as guest speakers. Mr. Mothupeng was among the PAC leaders who led the campaign against pass laws in 1960. He was sentenced to two years for this «offence». He had come into prominence in the 1950s when he formed part of the leadership of African school teachers which fought Bantu education. He served a prison term in Robben Island after the 1963 POQO uprising. At the time of the Soweto uprising in June 1976 he was arrested and detained. As I write he has been in detention ever since. He will probably be charged under the Terrorism Act.

The Black Consciousness movement has also declared *March 21st as Hero's Day*. As we saw in the early pages of this book, the Pan Africanist Congress has been commemorating March 21st as Sharpeville Day since 1961. The A.N.C. has been trying to have its own day as *Heroes Day*, but the people of Azania have completely ignored it.

In fact, in 1977, nine months after Soweto, the Black Consciousness movement observed March 21st as *Heroes Day*. They called for a week of prayer in memory of the protesters of

Sharpeville — hence a Johannesburg newspaper reported «*Soweto mourns Sharpeville victims.*»

There has also been a big argument about the name *Azania* for South Africa. The ANC has vigorously opposed the name Azania yet they speak of Zimbabwe and Namibia with a feverish zeal. The ANC prefers the colonial and racist name «South Africa». The Black Consciousness movement has settled that with their militant slogan «*Viva Azania!*»

In September 1977, Steve Biko, the honorary President of the Black Peoples' Convention died in police detention. Over 20 000 Azanians attended his funeral. At this funeral they ignored the colonial name «South Africa» and used AZANIA instead.

The coffin of the Azanian hero bore a wooded carving of the Black leader's face and a pair of broken chains on the lid with the words: «*Biko — One Azania, One Nation, One People.*»

As we saw earlier a number of Black Consciousness movement members have fled from racist South Africa. Many have opted for military training. Students who could have food and shelter have always chosen to be trained with PAC cadres, but those in desperate need of food, shelter and scholarships and who had no choice at all were forced to opt for the ANC. The ANC has all the money from the Soviet Union. They literally bribe some members of the Black Consciousness movement by promising clothing and scholarships.

But it seems that the ANC has not been able to get all it wants with its money from the BCM members. They have therefore occasionally mounted their propaganda machinery to discredit the Black Consciousness movement. The 1977 Second Quarter of Sechaba is one classic example to illustrate this point. In this issue they used one Nkosazana Dlamini to discredit SASO. Nkosazana was caught up by the Soweto uprising while writing her examinations at Wentworth, University of Natal where she was a medical student. She fled the country. Abroad she met the ANC leaders who promised her a scholarship. She has been asked to say the most fantastic fairy tales against the Black Consciousness movement to

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

get the ANC scholarship to complete her medical course.

Members of the Black Consciousness movement have denounced her as «opportunist reactionary» and «murderer of your parents.»

Nkosazana has claimed that SASO and Black Peoples' convention were «trying to find a way of creating a kind of *third force*» to project the Black Consciousness movement as an alternative to ANC — and Western countries are backing them. They (SASO and BPC) tend to project the African black image, with slogans like 'Africa for the Africans ...' They tend to be racial in their politics ... Beyond criticising they have no message themselves to give to the people.»

One might ask: if they have no message what are the people fighting for? Why do the people respond to the Black Consciousness movement and not to the ANC? To suggest that the Black Consciousness movement is backed by Western countries is an exercise in imbecility. It is tantamount to the worn-out accusation that anybody who does not agree with the ANC is «a CIA agent.»

One Black Consciousness movement supporter remarking about this attack said, «Why are the Boers killing us if we are backed by Western countries and CIA? Can Boss kill itself or its agents?» He continued, «It is strange that the ANC which has been misleading the international community, forming committees and collecting large sums of monies in the name of «Soweto» should now turn around and say we are 'racialist' — splittists' — what have you?»

One Tebello Motapanyane who styled himself Secretary-General of the South African Students Movement (SASM) was also used by the ANC *Sechaba* to cast an aspersion on the integrity of the Black Consciousness movement. A young leader of the Black Consciousness movement reacting to the Motapanyane's account of *How June 16 Demo was planned* said, «he is in the payroll of ANC and is homeless in exile. Your parents at home are dying! Come home!»

Indeed, the ANC attacks have caused great anger in the ranks of the Black Consciousness movement. For instance, when *Sechaba* said, «the oppressor will be met bullet for bullet,»

the contemptuous reply was «When? You have been saying that for 17 years in exile.»

THE «LEFT» LIBERALS AND BCM

The so-called «Communist» Party of South Africa (CPSA) refused to be outdone by *Sechaba*. Some people call the liberal white «Communist» Party of South Africa a «parasite». It lives on other organisations and consider itself the «brain» of the African Revolution in South Africa. It has turned itself into a spokesman for the ANC it bullies and directs.

Although, the «Communist» Party of South Africa is not banned outside South Africa, it has never called a political rally in its own name. It has always called meetings in places like *Trafalgar Square in London* in the name of the ANC. But the majority of speakers have always been the minority white liberal leaders of the «Communist» of South Africa and not those of the ANC.

Worried and embarrassed by political events in Azania leading to «Soweto», the liberals in the so-called Communist Party of South Africa tried to discredit the Black Consciousness movement.

«Reactionary and counter-revolutionary persons,» *The African Communist (No. 68 First Quarter 1977) organ of the C.P.S.A. cried hysterically, «and the Press attempt to bring about disunity among the people by talking of BPC as 'the organisation' leading the struggle for liberation. The Government puts all the blame on what it calls 'Black Power'. Without wishing in any way to diminish the significance of the Black Consciousness movement, it must be pointed out that BPC and SASO represent an intellectual elite ... To suggest that the BPC is 'the Organisation' at the head of the liberation movement is to bring confusion ...»*

The white liberals in the «Communist» Party of South Africa then claimed somewhat stupidly that the ANC — its external mission, and the «Communist» Party of South Africa — have over the years been mobilising the people by deed, word of mouth, radio broadcasts, underground leaflets and newspapers.

The London-based African Communist edi-

ted by white South African liberals went on to unashamedly tell the world whose intelligence it constantly undermines «The BPC, SASO, BPA and other similar organisations must be regarded as important tributaries to the Great River of the liberation movement headed by ANC ...

It is, however, elementary knowledge that ANC exist more on its bulletins and those of social imperialism than it does on the Azanian soil — hence the hysterical and hostile attitude of both the ANC and CPSA toward the Black Consciousness movement whose noble work has been climaxed by the **Soweto uprising**.

The brave patriotic activities of the Black Consciousness movement are an embarrassment to the untruths which this now discredited «Congress Alliance» has been spreading for many years outside Azania. The activities of the Black Consciousness movement and others like the Pan Africanist Congress are a challenge to the «authenticity» which social imperialism has conferred on its client organisations, namely the ANC and the liberal «Communist» Party of South Africa.

THE TWO A.N.C.'s AND WHITE-DENOMINATED CPSA

In 1975 when the Black Consciousness movement was preparing for a show-down with the Boers inside South Africa, the African National Congress split into two wings — the Oliver Tambo group and what is popularly known as the Makiwane group. This split in the ANC occurred when the ANC (Tambo group) purported to expel eight of its leading men among whom were Pascal Ngakane, son-in-law of the late Chief Albert Luthuli the last elected President-General of the ANC.

The Makiwane group ignored the «expulsion» and claimed they were the genuine ANC and referred to the Tambo group as having been hijacked by the white liberals in the «Communist» Party of South Africa.

Condemning both the CPSA and Tambo's ANC, the Makiwane group said, «The A.N.C. of Tambo is now simply a front or cover organisation used as a tool to achieve the objectives of the S.A.C.P. Those objectives of the

S.A.C.P. reside in the domination of the Black by whites in the name of Marxism-Leninism ... the Party (CPSA), not the A.N.C. is in the vanguard role of directing the struggle for the national liberation of the African people. This accounts for the arrogance of such whites as Slovo and Carneson in giving instructions to African on what Africans have to do to liberate themselves. They have reduced the Tambo group of the ANC to mere puppets dancing to the music of His Master's Voice.»

The Makiwane group then asked a painful question: «For how long will White South Africans continue to dominate them (Blacks) politically and humiliate them socially? We say this practice must be stopped immediately. The Slovos and Carnesons have no right even to attend meetings of Africans where plans to overthrow White domination are discussed.» (See *In Defence of the African Image and Heritage*, Box 25044, Dar-Es-Salaam).

The Makiwane group also drew attention to an event which had angered many Black people. Joe Matthews a leading member of the Central Committee of the «Communist» Party of South Africa and Secretary to the Revolutionary Council of the A.N.C. made a disgusting press statement. The unexpected statement from the representative of both the ANC and CPSA was made in the *Johannesburg Sunday Times* of 18th April 1976. That was just two months before the Black Consciousness movement ignited apartheid South Africa with *the fire of Soweto*.

Joe Matthew told the white-controlled *Sunday Times*:

That the independence of the Transkei should be accepted as a reality and recognised.

That Black political leaders must be released so that they could enter into a dialogue with the Boers who wield power and not with powerless English liberals.

The Makiwane group of the ANC reacting to Joe Matthews said,

«Too many members of the Central Committee of the S.A.C.P. have betrayed the Black peoples' struggle and yet S.A.C.P. has never issued a single statement denouncing them. We have already mentioned the Central Com-

mittee member, **Arthur Goldreich** as the enemy of the oppressed ... He now lives in Israel. He fought on Israel's side (against the Arabs in the 1967 Arab-Israel War). The «Communist» Party of South Africa has not denounced him. We now have added Joe Matthew to this list of traitors ... He was not denounced by the S.A.C.P. He now denounces the Oliver Tambo leadership of the A.N.C. in exile as 'buffoonery'».

The Makiwane group then pointed out that the African people in Soweto, in Zululand, in the Orange Free State in the Eastern Cape have given their complete rejection of this bogus white leadership of Blacks ... The time for white Baaskap is over, **even in Tambo's A.N.C. O.R.** Tambo must show a little more courage by removing the white liberals from all ANC organs. African unity is more important than making the A.N.C. an appendage of the Sino-Soviet dispute used by the Moscow-supported White liberals such as the Slovos. We stand for African unity. We fight for African unity.»

It should by now be clear why **Sechaba** and The **African Communist** belittle the work of the Black Consciousness movement. They are victims of social imperialism and are simply singing their mater's tune. The blood with which the Sharpeville and Soweto martyrs wrote the history of Azania means nothing to the ANC and CPSA. They themselves have no history to show. They have played no role in the battles of Sharpeville and Soweto. They fight more on papers and are experts at stunts such as distributing diversionary leaflets with «bombs». But in the actual battle field they are paper tigers. They are hoping that someday foreign troops will impose them on the people of Azania. But those foreign soldiers whether Cubans or Russians will have their certain defeat. Azanians are not out to exchange masters.

PAC'S ATTITUDE TOWARD BCM

The Pan Africanist Congress has hailed the historic role the Black Consciousness movement is playing in the liberation of Azania. PAC has not only given publicity to the activities of the BCM, but has accepted BCM as a

comrade-in-arms on the complete basis of equality. PAC has not only considered a united front with BCM, but has in fact given military training to some members of the BCM.

SUPER-POWER INTERFERENCE IN AZANIA STRUGGLE

The Pan Africanist Congress has condemned the Soviet Union for using the ANC to divide the liberation movement in South Africa. The Soviet Union has dubbed ANC as «authentic» movement. They have never said what yardstick they are using to confer this «honour» on the ANC. The ANC has thus become a client organisation that is manipulated by social imperialism to work against the national unity of the Black people of Azania.

It was Mfanasekhaya Qqobose of PAC when addressing a rally organised by left-wing groups in West Berlin in June 1976 who said:

«We are not counting our struggle in months or years. We are just continuing what our forefathers did centuries ago. The people of Azania are their own liberators.»

Qqobose then pointed out to his audience that PAC had been advocating a **united front** with the ANC and other Azanian liberation movements on the basis of the armed struggle and peoples' war, but the ANC had so far not responded because ANC was controlled by the Soviet leaning white «Communist» Party of South Africa. He said PAC considered the Soviet Union as a superpower with hegemonistic ambitions in Africa.

Qqobose said that his organisations was opposed to any foreign intervention and would not accept foreign troops coming to their aid as is in the case of Angola.

AZANIA SHALL BE FREE

There is no doubt that Azania shall be free. But many black people are concerned that when they have defeated their oppressors in Azania, new colonialists in a new form may come to impose their puppets on the Azanian pe-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

ople by force of arms using mercenaries in the pay of social imperialism.

It was not idle talk therefore when in Peking, Hsinhua of 12th May, 1977 reported David Sibeko of the Pan Africanist Congress as having said, «The struggle in Azania is going to intensify, no matter what these super-powers do. We are looking forward to an escalation of the armed struggle in the very near future — **super-powers out of Africa!**»

Sibeko then said, «We have on one hand, U.S. imperialism accelerating its support for the Vorster regime. On the other hand, the other super-power (Russia) is escalating its moves to divide the Azanian national liberation movement and works frantically to deny us the unity that our people demand.»

BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS MOVEMENT AND THE FUTURE

How does the Black Consciousness movement see the future state of a free Azania?

During its Fourth National Congress held in King Williamstown, the Black Peoples' Convention adopted a Comprehensive Commission's Report on the future state of Azania.

The report read:

We Black people of Azania, under the guidance and leadership of the Black Peoples' Convention, recognised the need to radically change the Azanian society to be in keeping with the wishes, aspirations, hopes, interest, ideas and ideals of the majority of the people of our country.

We therefore are striving and working towards the establishment of a society in which:

1. All sane adult persons who are citizens of our country are accorded the Franchise irrespective of colour, race, religion, status in life or any other consideration.
2. All sane adult persons shall participate in the making of the laws under which they live through our peoples' National Assembly which shall be a body constituted of duly elected representatives of our people.

3. All people shall be equal in the eyes of the law irrespective of colour, religion, status in life or any other such consideration.
4. All citizens of our country form a united nation irrespective of ethnic, origin, language differences, skin colour or any such consideration.
5. All citizens shall be protected each from exploitation by the other.

LAND

6. Ownership of the land, sea and air space shall be vested in the state.
7. All citizens with reasonable need for land on which to have a home shall be allocated proportionate land for this purpose.
8. Distribution of land to organised groups be it for sporting, religion, farming, industrial trading, commercial or any other such purposes shall be done in accordance with a central National plan.

EDUCATION

9. Education is an instrument of national unity.
10. Education is geared towards raising the cultural, social, economic and intellectual level of all citizens.
11. General content of education is geared towards the promotion of self-reliance, a high level of critical awareness, understanding the community and its problems, a sense of positive self-identity.
12. Education is geared towards the destruction of imperialist, racist, tribalist, sectionalist, colonialist, neo-colonialist notions.
13. Emphasis in general education shall be in the following areas:
 - (a) With respect to languages, there should be one national vernacular language which shall be selected by the peoples' political structure.

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

- (b) Environment studies touching on Geography, History, Economic, Political and Constitutional structures mainly of our country, but also as compared with states of Africa and others throughout the world.
 - (b) Humanities shall include social anthropology, sociology and elementary community development.
 - (c) Basic science shall include arithmetic, mathematics, elementary physics and chemistry and comparative economic systems.
14. A programme of rapid elimination of illiteracy shall be designed and implemented.
 15. Elementary education shall be free and compulsory for all citizens.
 16. Specialisation in education is introduced at the minimum effective level.
 17. All teachers in all standards be specially trained to specialise in the various fields specified above.

RELIGION

18. There shall be religious freedom, but control shall have to be exercised over the proliferation of different churches, for this purpose a credential council shall be set up. All ministers of religion shall be civil servants, paid by the state directly.

HUMAN RIGHTS

19. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations shall be observed and respected.
20. Our country is aligned neither to the *West nor the East but shall see itself* as part of the Third World.

HEALTH

21. Health services are the primary responsibility of the state.

22. Professional medical Councils shall be recognised and the standards set by these Councils upheld in the rendering and medical services, all medical and para-medical personnel shall be civil servants.

DEFENCE

23. Every sane and healthy adult person shall form part of an effective national defence force.
24. There shall be no use of national territory by foreign forces.
25. Peaceful collaboration with all nations of the world on the basis of principles of mutual respect, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-aggression and non-interference in domestic affairs, equality and reciprocity of advantages, peaceful co-existence.
26. Development of economic and cultural relations with all nations whose government respect the principles mentioned in 25 above.

SOCIAL WELFARE

27. The welfare of the handicapped shall be the primary responsibility of the state.
28. National social welfare shall cover care for the following categories for which these shall be state-aided societies and institutions, crippled, deaf, dumb, mentally retarded, blind, aged, orphans, people with certain specific diseases and any other deserving categories.
29. Special emphasis shall be laid on the development of whole communities *especially in cases of disasters like floods, fires, drought, famine, earthquakes and epidemics.*
30. People under conditions of social aberration like alcoholism, drug addiction and habitual prostitution shall be taken care of and be rehabilitated

through the state machinery.

31. All economically active citizens shall contribute to the welfare of the handicapped.
32. A social welfare council sets out standards for the rendering of social welfare services and help in shaping of welfare policy.

FARMING

33. Farming shall be practised in a collective communal way rather than an individual way.
34. For purpose of 33 above, rural Communities are re-organised such that the total land available for farming is distributed equally and evenly among them.

Farming shall be aimed at raising and maintaining a high level of produce for purpose of self-sufficiency.

INDUSTRY, TRADE, COMMERCE

36. Monopoly in industry, trade, and commerce shall not be allowed to play a major role in our economy.
37. The principles of communalism are institutionalised into industry, trade and commerce.

LAW

38. All citizens shall have the right to fair trial and access to legal defence and to this end the state shall:

- (a) set up legal advice bureaux with qualified lawyers who will interpret all legal matters to every citizen requesting this.
- (a) lawyers shall be employed as civil servants to afford all citizens equal opportunity of good legal representation.

In a nutshell this is the liberation struggle of the Black people of Azania. The struggle continues. Aluta continua! Viva Azania!

And how is the Azanian struggle to continue in the face of the South African racist regime's determination to answer the legitimate demands of the Black people with machine guns, imprisonment, bannings and murder? The Black Consciousness movement has answered that question. In an advertisement published in 1975, the Black Consciousness movement defined the form the Azanian struggle must take.

The advertisement read:

Government of Azania:

Department of Defence: Vacancies:

**Generals, Majors, Lieutenants, Captains
Wanted to Train and Lead 15 Million
Blacks.**

**Apply Before we Reach the 4th Century
of oppression.**

THE AZANIAN STRUGGLE — RACIALISM OR NATIONAL OPPRESSION

This abridged chapter from «Negro Liberation» — a book dealing with Afro-American oppression — by Harry Haywood, the great Afro-American Marxist-Leninist, sees the problem of white racialism against the Afro-American minority in an entirely different light from the usual liberal and pseudo-Marxist approach. Haywood sees it from the viewpoint of national oppression. Thus he makes a distinction between racialism and national oppression which is its roots. While white racialism is the characteristic feature of national oppression, against Blacks both in the United States and Azania, it is the root source of the latter that we have to correctly understand if we are to attain genuine liberation, and not be deceived by anti-racist reforms (as advocated in the notorious Freedom Charter of the ANC-CP) which leaves the roots of national oppression untouched.

As Haywood correctly points out, to see the struggle as merely against racialism is to

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

trap oneself into «defensive reactions» and to be engaged in fighting a symbol of something deeper. — «They (the Negroes) have perforce rallied under the slogans of racial equality, racial solidarity, slogans which, though militant, do not hit the center of the target — their oppression as a nation in the Black Belt.»

In Azania white racialism regulates the class relationships between black and white which is based on imperialist super-exploitation and white settler colonialism necessitating the most inhuman form of national oppression. For us to see the enemy solely as racialism or apartheid is to overlook the vicious class relationships that that racialism regulates — which is based on our double exploitation, both as people and as workers — and which hides the nature of the exploitative relations of production between exploiter and exploited.

Racialism belongs to the superstructure of society, to the realm of ideas and concepts, and is part of bourgeois ideology. But it has its roots in the relations of production.

In seeing the struggle as being primarily against national oppression, we are not trapped by concepts like «anti-apartheid», «multi-racialism», etc. which lead us down the blind alley of fighting for equal rights, non-racial democracy, etc. The struggle against national oppression goes deeper than the struggle for equality and democratic rights. It is for the national salvation of the African people from centuries of colonial oppression. Obviously the struggle for equality and democratic rights accrues from our struggle against national oppression, and is a natural concomitant of it.

It is thus against the specificity of national oppression that the main thrust of our revolutionary struggle must be directed. And this opens up enormous revolutionary potential. For the struggle for national independence and self-determination of the African people can only be realised by expropriating the wealth of society from the exploiters, settler colonialism and imperialism. For in no other way can the African people achieve equality. We have no independent Black bourgeoisie which can set up the new nation. Only the working class — in alliance with all the other exploited sections in the community — in fully dispossessing the exploiters, can build the new nation, but it can only do so by going full steam ahead with the socialist revolution. It must set itself up as the new ruling class and exercise its class dictatorship over the bourgeois forces ... Only in this way can the dispossessed nation of Africans come into birth — under the leadership of the working class, drawing around it all the other working class and exploited elements, like the Indian and Coloured people and workers. The new African nation that will be born will do so on the basis of freedom and liberation. It cannot liberate itself by oppressing others. The African people, led by the working class, is in the overwhelming majority in the country;¹ it has nothing to lose but its chains. It has firm allies among the national minorities at both stages of the struggle since they undergo similar oppression.

Haywood, of course, writes from the viewpoint of the Afro-American minority in the U.S., where, he states, they constitute a nation within the «white American nation». In Azania, of course, the nation struggling to be born is the African nation, who are the originally dispossessed inhabitants of the country, and upon whom lay the main burden of the struggle against national oppression and class exploitation. The Indian and Coloured minorities, who are also oppressed and also deprived of all political rights, find their destinies linked up with that of the Africans.

It is from this viewpoint of understanding the specificity of national oppression that Haywood calls race a myth. It is not that he says that it does not exist. He understands it for what it really is, hiding the nature of national oppression upon which the whole edifice of imperialist and capitalist exploitation is built.

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

As we Azanians now enter the final stages of our struggle it is important to understand this distinction between racialism and national oppression. Racist colonialism developed at a certain stage in the history of imperialist exploitation of our country, serving its need for superprofits. But modern imperialism no longer finds this form of exploitation suitable to safeguard its interests and is quite prepared to abandon it. The signboards of racialism can be pulled down, as imperialism is urging the settler colonial state to do, but national oppression and class exploitation can still remain in new forms.

Edwin Makoti, member of the Central Committee of the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania put it this way: «The national liberation struggle of the people came to the conclusion that the struggle must be based on the main contradiction in society and not merely upon its local peculiarity, that is, it must be based upon eliminating the general features of colonialism rather than the specific feature of White domination alone which deceives the people into thinking that the only enemy of freedom in the country is racist colonialism and that therefore they have a friend and ally in liberal colonialism. The strategy of liberation is that we must deal with the conflict as a whole and not with one factional aspect of it only, for in doing that, we are actually binding the liberation movement to the shirt tail of the other faction and that cannot but be the highest form of opportunism on our part.» (*Edwin Makoti, The Native versus the National Question, IKWESI, August 1977, No. 6*).

1. Amongst the African peoples the working class together with the landless agricultural workers in the countryside (semi-proletarians and firm allies of the African worker) are in the overwhelming majority — well over 99% of the African population, the middle classes comprising of teachers, clerks, lawyers, doctors, are a very small but growing minority and there is a smaller handful of African businessmen, who are bureaucratic capitalists. A similar type of class stratification occurs amongst the Indian and Coloured national minorities.

THE MYTH OF RACE

The «white supremacists» insist on presenting the Negro question as one of race. This makes it possible for them to «justify» the notorious color-caste system in the name of spurious race dogmas which depict the Negro's servile status in American life, not as the result of man-imposed prescription, but as a condition fixed by nature. Negro inequality is supposedly due to natural inherent differences. In this credo, Negroes presumably are a lower form of organism, mentally primitive and emotionally undeveloped. «Keeping the Negro in his place» is thus allegedly prescribed by nature and fixed by Holy Writ. Color of skin is made an index to social position. Race, a strictly limited biological concept, becomes a social factor and is used as an instrument for perpetuating and intensifying Negro subjugation. The Negro problem is explained in terms of natural conflict between races, the result of inborn peculiarities.

In reality, the so-called racial persecution of the Negro in the United States is a particular form and device of national

oppression. The use by an oppressor nation's ruling class of such social differences as language and religion to preserve the isolation (and thus the economic and social inequality) of a subject people is common knowledge.

Everywhere in the world, a study of the national question reveals the use of these differences by the ruling bourgeoisie as the foundation for its strategy of «divide and rule,» of fomenting strife and friction between the toilers of various nationalities. In Hitler's Germany with its slogan of «one race, one culture, one nation,» racism reached a high peak making the cult of race the cornerstone of state and world policy.

Among American Negroes, physical difference becomes almost the sole characteristic whereby the subject race can be distinguished from the oppressor nation. In the absence of such sociocultural distinctions between white and Negro as language and religion, the «racial visibility» of the Negro enables the Anglo-Saxon ruling clique to set him apart from all others among the population as a permanent object of scorn and oppression.

This deliberately cultivated emphasis on the racial factor, particularly on the aspect of color differences, has not been without its adverse effect upon the Negro. It has indeed acted as a retardation on the growth of political self-assertion. The fog of racist obscurantism, thrown up by his oppressors, has made difficult clear political orientation, *i.e.*, the job of locating and thus confronting the real enemy — the forces of monopoly capitalism. It is therefore not surprising that until quite recently Negro protest has been shunted off into the blind alley of a defensive «racism.» **What is in reality an aspiration for identity as a nation has sought expression through false symbols of «race» foisted on him by white rulers.** He has perforce defined his fight for freedom as a fight for «racial equality», «racial opportunity.»

Manifestly, the Negro problem cannot be defined by any racial formulae. Ideologically, they obscure the economic and political conditions for the achievement of Negro equality, and impede the full and necessary clarity as to the nature of the issue. They are tank-traps to block the road to the understanding of the profound revolutionary implications of the struggle of the Negro people for liberation.

The maintenance of the pariah status of Negro Americans, their lack of equality, is an integral part of the policy of American finance capital. That policy has for its objective the achievement of the following:

1. The artificial and forcible stifling of the free economic and cultural development of the Negro through racist persecution as a basic condition for maintaining his super-exploitation and for maintaining the degradation of the great mass of southern white folks;

2. The infection of the organism of American democracy with the virus of race hatred as a deterrent to the formation of a common front of labor and democratic people against the common enemy — monopoly capitalism.

REAL NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The secret to unraveling the tangled skein of America's Negro question lies in

its consideration as the issue of an oppressed nation. Within the borders of the United States, and under the jurisdiction of a single central government, there exist not one, but two nations: a dominant white immigrant minorities, the Negro, wearing his badge of color, which sets the seal of permanency on his inferior status, cannot, under contemporary economic and social conditions, be absorbed into the American community as a fullfledged citizen, limited as this absorption is in practice even for large sections of the white minorities. He cannot hope to escape as long as the status quo remains unchanged in the South. True, there are colored minorities, such as the colored Latin Americans — Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and others; there are Orientals, and remnants of the American Indians. But these also are tarred with the brush of color — and are in the main relegated to the category of «unassimilables», outside the limits of majority democratic tradition.

The policy of Jim-Crow proscription of America's black folk has resulted over the years in the shaping of the Negro as a distinct economic, historical, cultural, and, in the South, geographical entity in American life. The Negro is American. He is the product of every social and economic struggle that has made America. But the Negro is a special kind of American, to the extent that his oppression has set him apart from the dominant white nation. Under the pressure of these circumstances, he has generated all the objective attributes of nationhood.

The history of the Negro people in the United States is unquestionably intertwined with the history of the rest of the American people. But to say no more than this would be to falsify both the special story of the Negro people and to befog the history of American capitalism. For, on the one hand there were the dominant whites, and among them existed from the beginning the division into economic classes. The Negroes, on the other hand, were forced into the stream of American history in a special manner — as oppressed slaves whose present position as a whole people still bears the marks of the slave lash.

But a qualitative change had taken place in his status. Freed from chattel slavery by the uncompleted revolution, he was now ready for *the appearance of economic classes within his group*, which under the conditions of segregation and imperialist oppression, necessarily served as driving forces for a movement of national liberation. The process of class stratification among Negroes was of necessity a slow and tortuous one, taking place as it did against the overwhelming odds of post-Reconstruction reaction. But proceed it did, so that the Negroes, who at the time of their release from chattel bondage comprised an almost undifferentiated peasant mass, had by the beginning of the twentieth century become transformed into a people manifesting among themselves the class groupings peculiar to modern capitalist society. Along with an increasing mass of wage laborers, there began to appear a class of small business people, with more or less well-defined capitalist aspirations. This class was to find its spokesmen among the educated middle class. The rise of a Negro bourgeoisie marked the appearance of a class which, striving to defend its own interests under American conditions, was destined to initiate an historical movement which could only develop in the direction of national freedom. The process of class differentiation developing against the background of Jim-Crow oppression, and in conditions of continued majority concentration of Negroes in the Black Belt, thus formed the main objective conditions for their emergence as an oppressed nation.

The advent of imperialism, the epoch of the trusts and monopolies, at the turn of the century, riveted the yoke of white ruling class *tyranny still tighter, with the result that the Negro* was thrust still further out of the pale of American democracy into deeper isolation within his own group. The rise of a finance capitalist oligarchy to dominant position in American economic and political life precluded the possibility of peaceful democratic fusion of the Negro into a single American nation along with whites. Thenceforth the issue of Negro equality could be solved only via the path of the Negro's full development as a nation. **The Negro**

question had now definitely become the problem of an oppressed nation striving for national freedom against the main enemy, imperialism.*

OBJECTIVE CONDITIONS FOR NATIONHOOD

Geographically, the Negroes are scattered throughout the United States, but almost one-third of their number (five million) are still massed in the Black Belt area, including its peripheral counties. Despite the migrations of the last eighty years, they exist as a stable community and form a majority of the population over a broad area.

We defined the Black Belt in Chapter I as an area girding the heart of the South, encompassing its central cotton-growing states and 180 counties in which the Negroes constitute more than half (50 to 85,5 per cent) of the population.

This Black Belt region is the heartland of the American Negro. Here he has lived from generation to generation. It was upon its Atlantic Seaboard that his forefathers landed in Jamestown, Virginia, over 300 years ago. As a chattel slave, the black man followed the trek of King Cotton and the plantation across the face of the South. He planted and raised the South's chief cash crops, tobacco and cotton. His unrequited labor as a slave formed an essential part of the primary accumulation of wealth upon which the towering edifice of American industrial civilization was founded.

* The uniqueness of the Negro problem in the United States lies in the fact that the Negro was left out of the country's general democratic transformation. Quite the reverse was the development in France. Pre-revolutionary France was what Mirabeau aptly called a «formless heap of disunited peoples.» These peoples were welded into one united French nation as a result of the revolution. For example, in France all ethnic groups, without exception, Bretons, Normans, Basques, Alsatians, etc., shared equally in the «liberty, equality, and fraternity» achieved by the great French Revolution. They were therefore all welded into one French nation on the basis of this democratic transition. Had any one of these ethnic groups been excluded from the benefits of that revolution, as were the Negroes from the American revolution, a national problem similar to that of the present-day Negroes would have survived in France. Similarly in Britain, although the democratic transition followed its own peculiar pattern, the Welch, the Scottish, the English all shared its benefits. The Irish, who were excluded from this process of democratic transformation, remained an oppressed nation within the geographic configuration of the British Isles.

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

Any serious examination will show that the Negro population of the Black Belt is tied together by myriad internal bonds, by all facets and agencies of modern capitalism, has all the prerequisites for existence as a nation. In the Black Belt, there is a division of labor between city and country typical of our capitalist era. Though it is primarily an agricultural community, this area has its cities, serving as commercial and industrial outlets for the agrarian hinterland, cities such as New Orleans, Savannah, Mobile, Memphis, Charleston, Atlanta, Norfolk, Winston-Salem, all lying within the Black Belt or at its periphery. These cities are economically and historically part of that region. This is so notwithstanding the fact that Negroes comprise roughly only thirty to forty per cent of the populations of these centers.

As elsewhere in the modern world, town and country are linked by a unified system of transportation and communication, by monetary unity, by a common banking and credit structure, by all media essential to modern capitalist market relationships.

Among the Negro people of the area, there exist all class groupings peculiar to capitalism, which historically provided the basis for the emergence of modern nations. Not only do Negroes work as laborers in the cotton and tobacco field; they work also in the coal mines, steel mills, saw and planing mills, ginning and cotton seed oil mills, in furniture, turpentine refining, in processing of tobacco, in chemical industries and in pulp and paper, in longshore and logging, on railroads, etc.

There is a Negro upper class or bourgeoisie, living in both urban and rural communities, striving as do all bourgeois classes for the extension of its markets. Its most influential segment resides in the cities, functioning mainly in the fields of insurance, small-scale banking, real estate, undertaking and other services for the Negro community. There is also a sprinkling of well-to-do Negro farm owners in the rural areas. This Negro bourgeoisie has its ideologists in the educated middle classes, striving for the modern development of their people. There is the thin stratum of professional people, including doctors, lawyers, teachers, ministers (the largest group), and social workers.

The development of all these classes is artificially retarded by American monopoly capitalism and its Bourbon cohorts. All classes suffer from the ferocious national oppression. The people as a whole find their interests running counter to this stifling Jim Crow. The Negro workers want modern conditions of labor; the sharecroppers, poor farmers, and plantation hands want land and freedom from the yoke of peonage; the town middle classes and intellectuals want equal opportunities in businesses and professions.

Although the Negro community in this area has all these economic and social elements of capitalism welding it together, we must not lose sight of the decisive fact, that the region's economy remains backward, mainly agrarian in character. The full development of modern capitalism has been arbitrarily arrested. In this respect the region's economy is typical of that of colonial and other retarded nations. One can say that the Black Belt is a kind of «internal colony» of American imperialism, made to function mainly as the raw material appendage of the latter. The character of the oppression of the Negro people in no sense differs from that of colonial peoples. The economy of the region is not controlled by the Negro capitalists. Its immediate direction is in the hands of white local capitalists and landlords, who act as the outpost command for the real rulers, the financial dynasty of Wall Street.

This only emphasizes the fact that the economy of the Black Belt is typical of that of an oppressed nation, whose full development is artificially and forcibly retarded by imperialism.

NEGRO CULTURE

A common tradition and culture, native to Negro America, has been in the making since the first Negroes were landed at Jamestown. The special history of the Negro people in the United States is the history of oppression and the struggle against it. It is the history of the misery of the chattel slave sold from the holds of the slaveships into bondage where an unknown tongue prevailed. It is the history of more than two hundred heroic slave revolts and insurrectionary plots, all of them foredo-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

med and ruthlessly suppressed. The history of the Negro people has infused the Negro with hopes, ideals, customs, and traits which are blended in a psychology whose activities and aims move in a thousand ways toward freedom and equality. This psychology has been evidenced in slave revolts, in participation in the democratic wars of this country and in its political life, especially during Reconstruction, and in the various organizations which developed the liberation movement of modern times.

The entire development of Negro music, literature, poetry, and painting, of churches, fraternal groups, and social societies, bears the imprint of this struggle for liberation. The psychological as well as the economic need for continuous struggle to gain equal democratic status, to throw off the oppressive chains and assume the upright posture of a free people — this is and has been the dynamic of Negro culture.

The Negro people are a separate folk, a people with distinct interests, feelings and attitudes built upon their common history of suffering and oppression.

Notwithstanding its many points of contact with the culture of the dominant white nation, this Negro culture has its own distinctive features.

National Negro culture finds expression in a rich folk lore, in music, in the dance, in an expanding and virile theatre movement and in a highly developed literature. It is voiced in a rapidly growing press. (In 1946 the combined circulation for 137 Negro newspapers was almost two millions.⁶) But, through whatever medium it manifests itself, this culture is built around themes of distinctly Negro life and Negro problems.

The myth of the Negro's past as only a «drummer of water and a hewer of wood» is now exploded. And in the shattering of this myth, the Negro has seen himself emerge as the inheritor of a rich historical tradition with antecedents reaching back into the dawn of civilization itself. This literature has brought to the consciousness of Negro America and to an ever growing segment of whites the missing pages of American and African history, the great contribution made by the Negro to civilization and

democracy.

The New Negro is here and in much greater numbers than he was in the 'twenties. The stereotypes are giving way to a Negro with a new sense of his own dignity and worth and a newly awakened pride in himself as a contributor in no mean sense to the progress of our society. He is a Negro determined to fight for his just rights.

And behind this new Negro is the emerging dynamic force of the Negro industrial working class, which is playing an increasingly important role in the councils of Negro leadership.

Joseph Stalin, who was chiefly responsible for formulating the successful program for solving the problem of Russia's many nations, has defined a nation as an «historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture.» The validity of this definition has been attested by the fact that it has served as the theoretical cornerstone for the building of that unique fraternity of free and equal nations known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Negroes in the United States manifest all these attributes of nationhood listed in the concise and classic definition of Stalin. They are «a nation within a nation.»

THE STATUS OF NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

True, the actual movement for national liberation among the Negro people in the U.S. has been comparatively weak. It has even been argued that the Negro himself rejects the concept of separate nationality as a classification of his status in the contemporary American social scene. For, the argument runs, if the Negroes were a nation, would not the asseveration of their nationality find definite expression in the demands, slogans, and programs of their organizations? Since, allegedly, the capitalistic upper classes are the bearers of the «national idea», is not the fact that this class among Negroes has never, in a clear cut and consistent manner, raised the demands of nationhood, conclusive proof that the Negroes are not a nation?

The fact is that the Negroes are a young na-

tion whose advance to political consciousness and strength is retarded by imperialistic oppression. Yet, this very oppression is creating the basis for the rise of a fully conscious national movement among them.

The road to national consciousness of the American Negro is more arduous and tortuous than that of most peoples. It is beset by formidable obstacles both of an ideological and a physical environmental nature.

First, there is the overwhelming and stifling factor of race — the chief weapon in the ideological arsenal of the ruling classes of the oppressor nation. The spurious dogma of Negro racial inferiority is sunk deep in the thinking of white America. **It has left its indelible stamp on the nascent Negro nation, befogging the basic concept of the Negroes' status as that of an oppressed nation. The charge levelled against the Negro people, that they are less than human, has forced them into an untenable defensive position, in which much of their energy has been consumed in the assertion of their basic humanity, their right to be considered human beings. To meet this invidious attack they have perforce rallied under the slogans of racial equality, racial solidarity, slogans which, though militant, do not hit the center of the target — their oppression as a nation in the Black Belt.**

Secondly, an additional deterrent to the Negroes' quest for freedom, via nationhood, is that the concept of Negro nationality is a totally new one, and thus outside the bounds of the traditional thinking of American democrats. Thus the idea of Negro nationhood, on American soil, when first projected by the Communist Party, met with attack not only by reactionaries, but also by well-meaning liberals, including many Negro leaders, who felt it to be a retreat before Jim Crow, an acquiescence to segregation.

Finally, perhaps the most formidable retarding factor in the development of the Negro's consciousness of nationhood is the fact that the new Negro nation of the Black Belt finds itself set down in the midst of the strongest capitalist nation in the world, totally engulfed by

what the Negro playwright, Theodore Ward, called «The Big White Fog.»

Furthermore, as Stalin has pointed out, the national question nowadays is «virtually a peasant question». However, in this struggle against financial exploitation, political enslavement, and cultural effacement of the Negro people by the imperialist bourgeoisie, the mass of the Negro peasantry have lacked the leadership from those classes on which the development of the national movement has historically depended. The Negro bourgeoisie and industrial proletariat are comparatively recent social formations.

For the Negro to claim the rights of nationhood in these conditions would be an act of the highest political consciousness. And yet the fact is that, while eager to combat every manifestation of Jim Crow within American life, the Negro people see the solution of their problems neither in a process of ethnological absorption into the white community, nor in the abandonment of their American homeland for some illusory refuge in Africa or a «48th State,» nor in any escapist scheme of mass exodus from the South.

This growing sense of nationhood has been most dramatically expressed in the appeals of the National Negro Congress and of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to the United Nations. DuBois, in his introduction to the N.A.A.C.P. appeal, writes:

«The United Nations surely will not forget that the population of this group (the Negroes) makes it in size one of the considerable nations of the world. We number as many as the inhabitants of the Argentine or Czechoslovakia, or the whole of Scandinavia including Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. We are very nearly the size of Egypt, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. We are larger than Canada, Saudi Arabia, Ethiopia, Hungary, or the Netherlands. We have twice as many persons as Australia or Switzerland, and more than the whole of Union of South Africa. We have more people than Portugal or Peru; twice as many as Greece and nearly as many as Turkey. We have more people by far than Belgium and half as many as Spain. In

sheer numbers then we are a group which has a right to be heard; and while we rejoice that other smaller nations can stand and make their wants known in the United Nations, we maintain equally that our voice should not be suppressed or ignored.»

Even if the Negro people had chosen to integrate themselves with the nation as a whole, the forces of reaction, spurred on by the program of monopoly capital, put up new barriers to such integration and left no doubt that freedom for the Negro people could only be won by even greater struggles against national oppression, and first of all for land and political power in the Black Belt.

RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION

The question of self-government for the Negroes in the South, however, is inseparable from their character as a nation.

In the last analysis the fight for self-government in the Black Belt is the fight for the right of self-determination by the Negro nation.

What, concretely, is the meaning of the right of self-determination of nations? What should be understood by it? Is it to be identified with separation? As regards the Negroes, is it to be equated to the demand for a separate Negro state in the Black Belt — a Negro republic? Does it run counter to the principle of Negro and white unity, so essential to the struggle for Negro rights and democracy? Is it not a capitulation to Jim Crow or segregation, as many of the critics of this principle contend?

These are some of the questions raised, not only by reactionaries who have donned the false cloak of friendship for the Negro's cause in order better to sabotage it, but by many honest and sincere proponents of Negro freedom.

The right of self-determination means none of these things. Quite the contrary. It implies the application of consistent democracy in the sphere of relations between nations, the elimination of the forcibly imposed distinction between oppressed and oppressing nations; it means the abolition of all and sundry privileges

of one nation over the other. Specifically it means simply the right of the people of a nation to determine their own fate, or destiny, free from forcible intervention from without by the people of another nation. A nation has the right to organize its own life in the manner or form it chooses, independent of the dictates of any other nation — to be master in its own house. Finally, self-determination means the recognition of the sovereignty of a people in all matters affecting their internal life as well as in matters involving their relationships with other peoples or nations. This, then, is the content and principle of the right of self-determination.

Quite definitely, this right includes the right of separation, that is, the right to free political secession from the oppressing nation. But self-determination must not be construed as identical with secession and the establishment of an independent state. The right of nations to secede is an inviolable democratic right, but it is not an obligation, or a duty.

«A nation», says Stalin, «has the right to arrange its life on autonomous lines. It even has the right to secede. But this does not mean that it should do so under all circumstances, that autonomy, or separation, will everywhere and always be advantageous for a nation, for the majority of its population, for the toiling strata.»

An illustrative parallel which might serve to bring out the distinction between *right* and *obligation* is afforded in the field of women's rights. The right of divorce is universally recognized in all advanced nations as basic to the emancipation of womanhood. Every democrat worthy of the name is duty-bound to support this right. But the right of divorce by no means signifies an obligation on the part of women to divorce their husbands. And so it is with nations. Any attempt to reduce the right of self-determination to the demand for secession is in fact to deny this right. It would be equivalent to dictating the form in which the nation should apply its rights.

A study of the national question reveals that the choice of settlement of the problem may be exercised in any one of the following forms, depending on the decision of the nation itself:

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

International experience in the solution of the nationality problem has shown clearly that any program for its solution must include two points. First, it must confirm the unconditional right of the nation to democratic self-determination up to the point of secession and the organization of a separate state. Secondly, it must include a point on territorial autonomy in the event that the nation should decide on this alternative and consider it to be the most advantageous for its people.

«We demand the freedom of self-determination, ...» Lenin said, «not because we dream of an economically atomized world, nor because we cherish the ideal of small states, but on the contrary, because we are for large states and for a coming closer, even a fusion of nations, but on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is *unthinkable* without the freedom of separation.»

The recognition of the principle of self-determination implies an uncompromising fight for the conditions for its realization; that means, the fight for equality in all fields, and against all forms of national or racial oppression, in short, complete democracy in the country. The exercise of the right of self-determination is the crowning point of this struggle and symbolizes that the equality of the given nation has been fully achieved.

Self-determination is, therefore, «merely the logical expression of the struggle against national oppression in every form.» It is an irrefutable demand of consistent democracy in the sphere of the national problem.

Self-determination as the ultimate solution of the Negro national question is no communist dogma, as the spokesmen of imperialism both open and covert strive so desperately to prove.* Neither is it a mere theory. Quite the opposite. It is a living reality attested by the struggles of the oppressed nations everywhere, and confirmed beyond all dispute in the epic example of the Soviet Union, a country embracing one-sixth of the earth's land surface, in which the national question has been solved. Upon the ruins of the «prison of nations» that had been the Russia of the tsars,

where the most rapacious and wildest forms of national and racial oppression prevailed, has now been built that great commonwealth of free and equal nations known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Here 189 peoples speaking 150 languages, different in tradition, race and color, enjoy the same rights and are forged together in an extraordinary unity of effort and enthusiasm for a common ideal — a multicolored, multi-national fraternity of peoples, a commonwealth of nations based on the free association of races and nations living in peace and friendly collaboration. This democratic solution of the national question, grounded in a socialist economy, is the reason for the unshakable unity displayed by the Soviet peoples in the recent war against fascism. Undeniably the Soviet achievement is a crowning victory for the policy which recognizes the unqualified right of nations to self-determination.

The principle of self-determination applies fully to the situation of the Negro nation of the Black Belt. Once the Negro community there is conceded to be a nation, the recognition of its right to self-determination logically and inalterably follows.

It would be scraping the very bottom of the foul pit of distortion and calumny to label this democratic need of the Negro people of the Black Belt a concession to Jim Crow, or to assert that it plays into the hands of the Bilbos and Talmadges. Jim Crow means separation of Negro and white, a separation arbitrarily and violently imposed by the Negro's oppressors. It is the instrument of imperialist national oppression. But the right of self-determination for the Black Belt Negro, on the contrary, commits its proponents to the most consistent and unremitting fight for every democratic need of the Negro people; it means the obligation to assist in the organization of and to give practical support to their fight against all forms of Jim-Crow oppression and violence to the point of the establishment of their full equality; that is, the realization of the concrete conditions in which the right of self-determination of the Negro nation can be exercised.

In America the imperialist policy of Jim-Crow national oppression of the Negro creates

the conditions for the rise of a movement for Negro national liberation. At the same time, imperialist oppression clears the ground for the emergence of the most dynamic force of that movement, the Negro working class, drawing it into the orbit of industry and into direct contact and fraternal relationships with white la-

bor.

This is a glaring paradox in the world of imperialism; but for advanced labor whose perspective is socialism these trends are but part of a single process leading to world unity on a free and voluntary basis.

THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN AZANIA

This excerpt from a long, erudite but revolutionary account examining the national question in Azania is by a well known Azanian revolutionary whose name for obvious reasons of security we cannot divulge. This excerpt is his own conclusions on the national question, after he examines the different concepts and theories of the nation – going through Stalin’s definition, current Soviet concepts, Western theories, etc.

His main conclusion is that in the current epoch the concept of the nation cannot be separated from the class antagonisms of society. Each class forges the nation in its own interests, and the Black working class has a concept of nation which is not that of the white colonial bourgeoisie. It is a revolutionary concept which will find its fulfillment with the working class dictatorship over the white bourgeoisie, for the aims of the national struggle can only be realised in the social revolution.

IKWEZI, which is based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tsetung-Thought does not agree with everything in the article, certainly not with some of the sources of its citation – like Trotsky – we have no truck with Trotsky and Trotskyites – and the negative references to Stalin, and even those made with regard to nationalism. But nevertheless we rate it as a serious attempt in contributing towards an understanding of the national question in Azania. It should certainly provoke Azanians to think more deeply on this question.

Our own approach stemming from the colonial dispossession of the African people of their land and their country is more Africanist and for us the nation is the African (Azanian) nation which the other oppressed national minorities, the Coloureds and the Indians should accept and identify with, without in anyway having to give up their identities and rights as national minorities. Hence one of the tasks of the struggle against national oppression is not only to win democratic rights but to return the country and the land to the indigenous inhabitants – for the setting up of the Peoples Republic of Azania. Where national oppression and class oppression are identical it is obvious that the class must first set itself up as the nation (the struggle for self-determination and national independence) and the consolidate its national and democratic rights by exercising its class dictatorship. This is only realisable if the working class leads the struggle for national democracy through its vanguard Marxist-Leninist Party, and not be integrated into a structure where effective power lay with imperialism and its agents in the country and where the colonial nature of the country would not really have been effaced.

ON DEFINITIONS

Few writers on the subject of nationality or nationalism have evaded the temptation to add to the growing list of definitions their own particular idea of what a **nation** is. Indeed, it was only after a long detour involving the thorough study of national and nationalist movements that I myself reached my present position which is — stated simply — that it is impossible to give a definition of what a **nation** is and that all that the theorist is called upon to do is to define what **the nation** is in any given historical context. Such «definition» does not involve the enumeration of «indispensable» or «essential» features of «a nation» but rather the explanation of the social content which characterises the particular national movement. Yet the heritage of the past cannot be brushed aside in this perfunctory manner without some theoretical justification for the procedure adopted.

One of the main problems that has dogged those who have attempted to discuss the national question in South Africa is the deserved reputation of Stalin's definition of the question.¹ Though Stalin pointed out some years after writing his pamphlet on «Marxism and the National Question» that his definition referred only to the period of the «bourgeois democratic world revolution»,² i.e., to the period of capitalism up to 1917, it is none the less obvious that the form in which his definition is couched, i.e., the «stipulative» character of his definition,³ is a trap for the unwary. Because of the undoubted value which his pamphlet had in exposing *inter alia*, the mysticism of the Austro-German Social Democrats such as Otto Bauer and Karl Renner, who insisted that a nation is «a community of fate» bearing a particular «national character», it assumed for most Leftists and Marxists the *ex cathedra* validity of a papal decree.⁴ The fact is that armed with this magic formula one is inclined to go about looking for groups that fit or tend to fit the arbitrary limits set by the definition. Indeed, as I have already suggested above, the National Party's own theory of nationality, though it bears more affinity to the Austro-

German theory of «national-cultural autonomy»,⁵ is logically comparable with the Stalinist position, an assertion which my discussion of Potekhin's work has shown. The «national question», in this approach, becomes a verbal game, a question of which «attributes» are, from a historical point of view, more essential than others. This verbal game clearly has and is related to political strategies and problems. It is unnecessary for my purposes to demonstrate this in detail. Suffice it to refer to the ambivalence which even Stalin evinced on the question of whether or not the Jews are a «nationality».⁶

The anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles conducted especially since the end of World War II in Asia, Africa and Latin America have thrown the originally Europe-centric theory of nationality into a crisis. Theorists in the socialist countries as well as in the capitalist world have been compelled to re-examine the whole question and to face the problem of definition anew. The developments in science itself, for instance, the paramountcy attained in the West by the concept of «operational definitions», have made it necessary to examine first principles such as the object of the science of society. The fall from grace of Stalin since 1956, with the subsequent «de-Stalinisation» campaign waged in Eastern Europe, made it necessary for those academics concerned with questions of nationality to bring their thought into line with the official attitudes. Moreover, the partition of Germany and the projected permanence of the two German states also imperatively demanded a theoretical examination of whether or not there were two German «nations». This has, incidentally, been resolved by the postulation of a difference between «bourgeois» nations and «socialist» nations, a rather esoteric sphere which can be avoided with profit.

In the socialist countries, the academics concerned do not seem to have reached any finality on the subject. A controversy on the concept of the nation conducted in various Soviet and other Eastern European journals during the period 1961–1965 serves to demonstrate the range of disagreement.⁷ What is

most important arising from the controversy is the fact that while all are agreed that Stalin's original definition served the polemical purpose of exposing the reactionary and strategically inept character of the approach of Bauer, Renner, and others, it is stressed that his examination of the subject was based exclusively on historical material relating to European experience.⁸ It is further stressed that one has to bear in mind «the conditional character and relativity of scientific definitions ... As perfect and flexible as the definitions may be they can «never ... embrace all the relevant relationships that determine the development of a phenomenon» (Lenin)⁹ From the point of view of the present study an important contribution to the discussion derives from the pen of one M.O. Mnacakanjan, who cuts through the terminological and conceptual jungle by proclaiming boldly that:

The limited scientific value of a general definition is evident not only in the fact that it is incapable of revealing the essence of nations and the laws of their development but also in the fact that it cannot characterise fully and in a rigorous scientific manner the multiplicity of forms and the peculiarities of the origins and evolution of nations in all their phases of development, and finally it cannot include all types of nations with their peculiarities *under a general concept. In order to achieve this, differentiated definitions of the concept «nation» are necessary.*¹⁰

In Western Europe and in the United States the same problem has been raised again because of the phenomenon of the «emergent nations» in the Third World.¹¹ A. Smith, argues that despite Popper's logical objections to the possibility of definition (because definitions do not capture the «essences» of phenomena) and despite Coleman's methodological objections (because of the qualitative nature of the social sciences) definitions of a kind remain a necessity. These have to be «ostensive, substantive» definitions, «which would demonstrate the limits of the field. Only an ostensive

definition would help us to designate «nationalist» phenomena, and give the term jurisdictional limits».¹² He finally decides for a working definition, «stripped off essentialist notions and uses a combination of what he calls a «stipulative definition» and an «empirical definition».¹³ Finally, he warns that «... there is no once-for-all unique definition of «nationalism» or the «nation». We are simply singling out clusters of recurrent features only, and «nationalism» refers to these.»¹⁴ ...this brief reference to Smith's presentation of the problem shows that the Western theorist has got no further than his Soviet counterparts.

The reason is, of course, that the problem is not one of definitions.¹⁵ The concept «nation» refers to a category of phenomena that encompass both delimitable quantitative elements as well as elements of consciousness. Since both sets of elements can vary without any **apparent** symmetry, definition, i.e., setting limits to the content (meaning), of such a category becomes an insoluble **theoretical** problem. The decision, whether or not one is confronted with a nation or an emergent nation cannot be made merely on **general** grounds. It is eminently a **historical** question, i.e., a question that requires an examination of the **specific** set of **circumstances**. Unlike a concept such as «mode of production», which defines at a highly abstract level, the relations of classes of people to one another on the basis of their relationship to the ownership of the means of producing their subsistence (and which is, therefore, a supra-historical category not admitting any element of consciousness), a concept such as «nation» can only be related to **changing** forms of state formation, i.e., to a historical category. An analogy that suggests itself is that between «class-in-itself» and a «class-for-itself». Whereas the former is definable in general terms, the latter is «definable» only in specific historical terms. Since historical interpretation always proceeds from the class standpoint of the historian¹⁶ it is clear, therefore, that the answer to all such questions as: what is the nation? requires the answer to a prior question, viz., what is the class position of the person who answers the question. My exposition has indicated that even thought

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

most writers in South Africa have not explicitly defined their class position when examining the national question, their position is implicit in the answer they have given.

On general grounds all that one can say about nations in the modern world is that they will consist of antagonistic or potentially antagonistic classes. This, of course, is not saying *very much, since exactly the same could be said of the state.* Although it can be further asserted on empirical grounds that **oppressed** nations tend to create their own states unless there are insuperable obstacles to such state formation and that consciousness of nationality arises in the course of the struggle for national liberation, it is clear that these features are *class-determined.* The content of the term «national» is dependent on the level of political consciousness attained by the representatives of, as well as the classes of people concerned. In the course of class struggles each class aims to become the leading class in the state and its articulate representatives will, therefore, define the nation in terms of the interests of their class. *I have demonstrated that for the purposes of the ruling class in South Africa the National Party has propagated its theory of nationality while, on the other hand, the liberal bourgeoisie has put forward variants of a pluralist doctrine of nationality.* What is happening today, and what this study has demonstrated, is that the working people in their drive to hegemony are compelled to spell out explicitly what has been mainly implicit hitherto, namely, their theory of the nation of South Africa.

Yet it is not possible to leave Stalin's definition, and by implication that of the National Party, without referring to its inadequacy on theoretical grounds, and because it is so firmly entrenched in the political thought of South Africans as has become obvious above. What I have said about nations consisting of antagonistic or potentially antagonistic classes does obviously imply in some sense a «community of economic life» in the same way as the tendency to create separate states implies some «community of territory». However, a careful historical examination of both these alleged features of nationality shows that they are highly problematical concepts themselves. I need

not, however, enter into a general analysis of what they can and do signify. In regard to the concept of self-determination, which in the Soviet theory of nationality, hinges on some sort of «community of territory». I shall refer to the matter again briefly.

The other features of Stalin's definition, viz., community of language and community of culture (or national character or psychological make-up) are not only problematical but indeed irrelevant. In effect, Stalin, like most writers on the subject, understands «language in a purely morphological sense (itself a vexed problem for the linguist). Although it is axiomatic that a group of people cannot constitute a nation unless the individuals understand one another, i.e., can speak to one another, it does not follow at all that they have to be able to do so in a specific language, in some «mother tongue». The real problem here is one of ability to communicate and this is never a mere morphological question. In a multilingual nation the ability of the majority of people to speak more than one language or at least one major language solves the question of communications unless other questions arising from antagonistic contradictions in the social whole obstruct such communication. «Culture» or «national character» are indefinable and completely amorphous umbrella terms with merely emotive significance. At most it can be said that culture is the product of classes, that, therefore, that which is conducive to the humanisation of men and women — international culture — is the product of the classes that are necessarily committed to liberation and emancipation. In the modern world these classes are the working classes. It follows, therefore that a nation cannot be «a community of culture» since it is necessarily composed of antagonistic classes.

IMPERIALISM AND THE NATION

In the genesis of nations the State has played the most important role. Lest this unqualified statement be misunderstood in the usual way, i.e., as meaning that the decisions and interactions of «politicians» of the ruling class have been the decisive factor, I hasten to say

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

that states are themselves the products of the pursuit of definite economic objectives by dominating classes who exploit other classes in order to attain these objectives.

The history of Western Europe shows that as a general rule the bourgeoisie took as its point of departure the language group to which they belonged and on this demographic basis created a market. In some instances this entailed the breaking up, in others the unification, of the pre-existing feudal structures. (Compare Germany and Austira-Hungary, for instance.)¹⁷ In the imperialist epoch, however, more particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, the state was imposed on classless societies. In other words, the intrusion of capitalism, and thereby of private property in the means of production, into tribal and pre-tribal societies gave rise to states which paid scant attention to questions of language affinity, «culture», and historical association of peoples. The historic role of the bourgeoisie had changed in the interim. From having been a progressive force that spearheaded the people's movement for democratic rights against the old feudal order it had itself become the dominant class, rapaciously attaching to itself as much capital as it could, irrespective of who the previous «owners» had been. The carving up of the world proceeded according to the rules laid down by the modalities of imperialist expansion so that in the short term many state boundaries were, from the point of view of the typical bourgeois nation state, «artificial».

The coalescence of peoples that had taken place in Europe in the course of many centuries during which first commodity exchange and later industrial capital had knit these peoples together with enduring economic bonds, did not occur in sub-Saharan Africa. The capitalist market was an alien imposition accompanied by a foreign bourgeoisie that had every interest in either preventing or if necessary stultifying the development of a potentially competitive native bourgeoisie.

Ultimately we have to answer two fundamental questions that are closely related to each other. Firstly we have to ask which classes are contending against each other, i.e., what is the content of self-determination? And

secondly, it has to be established which is the leading class in this struggle, i.e., which class represents the interests of the majority of the people. From the vantage point of the answer to this second question the genuine or alternatively the bogus, character of the demands of a «national» character put forward by different groups involved in the struggle can be judged. In regard to the first question it is necessary to stress that the content of self-determination is decided during the course of the struggle itself and depends upon the changing interests and strategies of the classes concerned. With both these questions I shall deal presently in the specific context of South Africa. But it is necessary to situate the South African question in the context of the historical development of the idea of the nation.

What happens to the social structure in the conquered areas? In certain respects there takes place a repetition of the processes which took place in Europe as a result of the rise of capitalism. Now, too, industry and war break up the pre-capitalist structures; now, too, large sections of the agrarian masses are dispossessed, becoming a class of landless wage-labourers, tied to the machine and subject to the tender mercies of the capitalist entrepreneur. Macadamised roads and railways replace jungle footpaths, towns and cities are conjured out of the wilderness, the ocean, which was formerly a source of superstitious dread and an obstruction to communication, becomes an international highway; tribes and peoples, who had formerly never heard of one another, became nextdoor neighbours. In short, the new mode of production revolutionises the whole mode of life.

But there are fundamental differences between the process of change as it manifested itself in Europe and the social revolution in the countries conquered by imperialism. Whereas in Europe the development of capitalism — in spite of economic and political revolutions — was a relatively gradual and «organic» process, in the conquered territories the process assumes the character of a cataclysm. Whole peoples disappear in the space of a few decades, cultural treasures and patterns are obliterated suddenly, and a painful process of adaptation

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

to the new conditions begins. Imperialist rivalry changes the whole pre-existent territorial configuration. Tribes are split in half, lines are drawn on maps in London, Paris, Berlin and Brussels through desert, mountains and lakes in Africa. And these "accidental" political entities congeal into fixed proto-national units. Alien tribes are thrown together into the cauldron of the imperialist state and are compelled to coalesce. Some elements, mostly from the former ruling chiefly families, collaborate with the foreigners; they receive education, and *proceed to the metropolitan centres for study*, imbibe the capitalist ethos and return to unite and to lead their peoples, most of whom for a long time "live suspended in a disoriented way between two cultures".¹⁸ This new leadership, depending on whether it is tied to a feudal land-owning aristocracy or not, finds itself willy-nilly thrown into opposition to its imperialist masters.

In Africa there were few instances of such an aristocracy, which found it in its interests to collaborate loyally with the foreigner. More usually, the native bourgeoisie, which is born and bred by imperialism, albeit in hot-house conditions, or the radical intelligentsia, which responds to the pressures from below, begins to question the manner in which imperialism exploits the country without doing anything to develop it for its own people. The native bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie are especially concerned with their own subordinate position. Imperialism, of course, is interested in the colonies only in so far as they secure for it ready markets for raw materials and goods and serve as fields for investment of capital. Such investment is usually confined to the development of the essential infrastructure of roads, railways, harbours, water-power, etc.

Only in exceptional cases does it invest in productive heavy and secondary industry (or even in the agricultural sector *per se*) for the development of the metropolis it knows well, is predicated upon the underdevelopment of the colonies. Whereas in Europe the capitalist class had stormed heaven in order to free the development of the capitalist mode of production from the fetters of feudalism, in the imperialist epoch the same capitalist class strangles

the development of a native industry in the colonies at birth. The world capitalist system itself becomes the main obstacle to the further development of the productive forces in the colonies. In the consciousness of the exploited and oppressed people capitalism itself becomes the enemy.

The colonial bourgeoisie and the radical petty-bourgeois intelligentsia are concerned with their own advancement (and that of the emerging nation on which their possibilities of advancement rest), not with the profits of the financiers in the metropolises. To a certain extent, therefore, there is a coincidence of interests between them and the labouring people. Consequently, they place themselves at the head of their people, who still recall the recent loss of their lands, and take up the cudgels against the foreigners. For the European capitalists and their skilled white workers, supervisors, clerks and managers, as well as their civil service, police chiefs and garrison commanders, remain an alien element in the colonial country. These people regard the metropolitan, not the colonial, country as their home. Taking in most cases the given imperialist boundaries of the state, and not the old, useless tribal and semi-feudal traditions, as their point of departure, the colonial bourgeoisie and, more especially, the petty bourgeois intelligentsia create movements for national liberation the goal of which is the creation of an independent state. It is, therefore, not the language group but the imperialist economic territorial boundaries that have delimited, in most African countries, the confines of the emergent nation irrespective of the homogeneity of «culture» or the consciousness of a «calling», divinely or otherwise inspired.

The colonial bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie take up the national struggle against the imperialist system of domination but they cannot be consistently anti-imperialist for they are tied hand and foot to the system itself. As far as they are concerned the «mother countries» are the main sources of investment capital needed for the development of industry. Under their leadership, therefore, the new nati-

ons cannot become economically independent and a system of neo-colonialism replaces the crude imperialism of the recent past. By playing off the socialist countries against the imperialist West some of these regimes can for a while adopt postures of «non-alignment» and strut large on the stage of contemporary history. In reality, they are merely protecting the long-term interests of private capital accumulation under the guise of a state capitalist economy. In spite, therefore, of ostentatious Xenophobia, into which all bourgeois nationalism degenerates, the colonial bourgeoisie cannot liberate the nation. The urban petty bourgeoisie is not an independent force and the landowning aristocracy, where it exists, together with tribal chiefs, usually side with the enemy. The peasants wait for a lead from the cities and are incapable of organising themselves nationally because of their compelled parochialism and petty-bourgeois ethos, so that only the colonial working class is sufficiently committed to total liberation in order to lead the struggle further. A struggle rages in all these countries between these various classes to give a class content to the nations that are emerging. In Africa, the working class is, generally speaking still much too small and without a tradition of independent organisation to have taken the lead decisively. Hence the bureaucratic, usually Western-educated military and civilian elites can still continue with their thermidorian consolidation of the system of private (capitalist) enterprise dressed up sometimes as "African Socialism".

THE SOUTH AFRICAN CASE

In South Africa, however, the case is different. As I have shown, imperialism found here a native (mainly agrarian) bourgeoisie of European origin which by the end of the 19th Century, had become indigenous to the country. This bourgeoisie had emerged in the course of two centuries of merchant-capitalist exchange and petty commodity production amidst congeries of people living in pre-capitalist societies, who were gradually being dispossessed.

As a result of this process the basis of traditional production was being undermined and increasingly the direct producers were being transformed into a rural working class. Because of the colour-caste/class relations that had emerged prior to the establishment of the dominance of the capitalist mode of production in South Africa, this agrarian bourgeoisie was the perfect instrument (akin to the rajahs of India) for the purposes of imperialist exploitation of South Africa. The intense struggle against the backward-looking Krugerist elements representing the small white farmer outside the Western Cape Province and Natal was decided finally by the outcome of the Anglo-Boer War (1902) and led to the compact between imperialism and the native bourgeoisie known as the Union of South Africa. But the struggle of the Afrikaans-speaking petty bourgeoisie and aspiring bourgeoisie, which I have traced in Chapter Two of this study, was more than a mere confrontation between an outdated Calvinist past and a modernised capitalist future. **It marks the beginning of the struggle in South Africa for national liberation.** The idea of a united South Africa was an idea that emerged logically and necessarily from the struggle of the Afrikaners against British imperialism.

From what has been said previously about the development of the system of capitalist domination in South Africa it is clear why the native bourgeoisie compromised with British imperialism. It was in its immediate economic interests to perpetuate the colour-caste system and thus effectively to exclude the vast majority of the labouring people from the economic, political and social fruits of nationhood. In other words the national struggle was aborted, the bourgeois democratic revolution remained incomplete and became the system of racial domination that has made South Africa a by-word among the nations.

The national liberation movement today is, therefore, returning to the source of the anti-imperialist struggle. Its purpose is to make this struggle into a **national** struggle as opposed to the **nationalist** struggle into which the bourgeoisie had by force of its historic supine-

ness transformed it. National liberation in the present South African context, therefore, can mean three different and antagonistic things. The term denotes three options that are open to the oppressed people of South Africa, options the realisation of which depends crucially on the class leadership of the movement. Each of these options, representing as they do, three different contents or meanings of the term «nation», needs to be looked at from the point of view of the interests of the oppressed people, i.e., specifically of the workers, urban and rural, and the peasants.

In the first place, "national liberation" can mean the complete territorial separation of the black people from the white people of South Africa whether in two or more states. As this work has shown this is the option which the government is advocating and justifying by means of a neo-Fichtean theory of nationality that postulates the existence of supra-historical "nations" each with its own "culture" and "calling". That this option is clearly in the interests of the bourgeoisie has been demonstrated above through an examination of the economic and class-determined functions of this theory and strategy. What needs to be asked still is whether it is an option that is at all considered by the oppressed people themselves. Since self-determination literally means that the people themselves have to decide what form of state they want (a question I shall refer to again below), it is necessary to ask whether any considerable group of black people has ever or does now make the demand for a separate black state or separate black states. If so, who are these people? The second question is easily answered. It is common cause that at least some so called homelands leaders — Matanzima and Mangope — unequivocally demand separate states for their "nations". They express these demands on behalf of and through the political parties they have created. But any analysis of the facts reveals¹⁹ that they have neither majority support even of the people domiciled in the reserves nor has any of them been prepared to submit to the test of a referendum even under political and security conditions that put them in an undeniably advantageous position. Moreover, they repre-

sent, as I have shown, the most grasping aspiring bourgeois stratum among the people, which is prepared to thrive on the offal of the capitalist class while the rest of "their" nation continues in wretched poverty and underdevelopment. There can be no shadow of a doubt that they represent neither the interests of the oppressed workers and peasants nor even the opinion of any but the tiniest minority of black people.

In the 1920's, as I have shown, the Communist Party put forward the slogan of an 'independent native republic' as the prelude to a workers and peasant government but this slogan was doomed to oblivion from the start since it in fact advocated what the oppressed people had never yet demanded. Trotsky conceded that one should not close the option, as we have seen, that the blacks **after victory** might wish to establish their own state and would then have to be supported by the Workers' Party but — in the context of a similar discussion on the "Negroes" of the Southern States in the U.S.A. — he made it clear that the workers' party can never foist a decision regarding the content of self-determination on the people against their wishes. "So far as I am informed, it seems to me that the C.P.'s attitude of making an imperative slogan of it (self-determination = secession) was false." It was a case of whites saying to the Negroes, "You must create a ghetto for yourselves. It is tactless and false and can only serve to repulse the Negroes. Their only interpretation can be that the whites want to be separated from them. Our Negro comrades of course have the right to participate more intimately in such developments. Our Negro comrades can say, The Fourth International says that if it is our wish to be independent, it will help us in every way possible, but that the choice is ours. However, I, as a Negro member of the Fourth, hold a view that we must remain in the same state as the whites, and so on. **He can participate in the formation of the political and racial ideology of the Negroes**"²⁰

If one accepts — and one must accept — that the liberation movements that have been born out of the political organisations of the people represent the views of the oppressed

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

people, it is demonstrably clear that this matter has already been decided, that the oppressed people are exercising their right to self-determination in the struggle itself. The oppressed people in South Africa are unalterably opposed to a separate black state or to separate states. They are opposed to it because they are fully aware that such separation would effectively perpetuate the exploitative system under which they have lived for centuries and because they stake their claim to a share in the wealth they have produced in South Africa as a whole. The "whites", i.e., the National Party and Harry Schwarz, among others, have made the very mistake against which Trotsky warned the Marxist in America, i.e., they have «determined» for the blacks that they shall live in their own states and that they shall have «national liberation». Such gifts from the oppressor, more than anything else, have turned the oppressed workers and peasants against the idea. They have chosen to follow the ancient injunction: Beware of the Greeks when they come with gifts! It is significant that as far as the position of black people in the U.S.A. is concerned, the Soviet theorists have come to the same conclusion. P. I. Semenov maintains without qualification that black Americans' struggle is not one for their own fatherland but for effective legal equality with other members of the social organism. "It is true," he says, "that at the time when the majority of blacks lived in the South of the U.S.A. there may have been a possibility of them constituting a separate nation distinct from the American nation. Today, however, when they are dispersed over the whole country, this possibility no longer exists. The American Negroes have no other fatherland than the U.S.A. and in this sense one has to speak of them as part of the American nation."²¹ "As long as they are discriminated against," he continues, "they will have their own movement with its own interests which differ from those of the rest of the American nation." None the less, Semenov ends off his comments on the Negro question in the U.S.A. with the remarkable assertion that the Negroes are fighting solely for legal equality and final inclusion in the American nation and that they do not have any desire to form in fu-

ture a special political power centre, i.e., a special ethnic group.²²

However, if my exposition has revealed nothing else, it has shown that nations are **not** inevitable, god-given entities that will manifest themselves in some specific form at any given time. The nation, its physical limits and its social content, is determined in political struggle. The history of Palestine and of India proves, as does the history of Germany, that the rations of what constitutes the nation cherished in the most passionate manner by dedicated revolutionaries can — for decades, possibly for centuries — be negated by the failure to win the allegiance of the revolutionary people for the realisation of such notions. "To talk of a 'Muslim nation' ... means that there is no nation at all but a religious bond; it means that no nation in the modern sense must be allowed to grow; it means that modern civilisation should be discarded and we should go back to the medieval ways; it means either autocratic government or foreign government; it means, finally, just nothing at all except an emotional state of mind and a conscious or unconscious desire not to face realities, especially economic realities. Emotions have a way of upsetting logic, and we may not ignore them simply because they seem so unreasonable. But this idea of a Muslim nation is the figment of a few imaginations only, and, but for the publicity given to it by the press, few people would have heard of it. And even if many people believed in it, it would still vanish at the touch of reality."²³ Of course, imperialist machinations and colonial bourgeois leadership of the national movement in India have made of Pakistan a reality that will not simply vanish. And Nehru was as clear as is the liberation movement in South Africa of the strategic purposes behind the propagation of a bogus Pakistani nationality. "Stress has been laid on the 'Muslim nation' in India, on 'Muslim culture', on the utter incompatibility of Hindu and Muslim 'cultures'. The inevitable deduction from this is (although it is not put boldly) that the British must remain in India for ever and ever to hold the scales and mediate between the two 'cultures'."²⁴ Similarly Marx and Engels in the 1840's advocated, *inter alia*, the idea of a Greater Germany as

being in the interests of both the German workers and the progressive bourgeoisie. Historical developments, in particular the defeat of the national revolutions of 1848 in Central Europe, led to the (now) permanent separation of Austria from Germany. These historical examples show no more than that the development of the national idea is inextricably linked with the class leadership of the national struggle and that, therefore, the effective mobilisation of the oppressed people under working-class leadership is an imperative both of political practice and of political theory.

The second meaning that can be (and is) attached to the term 'national liberation' in South Africa is the democratisation of the polity within the existing capitalist framework. This means simply that the black people should be **integrated** in the existing system by being given formal political equality. This bourgeois democratic programme was, until 1960, the official platform of all the political organisations of the people in one form or another, of course, there were important differences. Whereas, in general, the largest section of the movement believed literally in this liberal ideal and trusted to the numerical superiority of "Africans" to bring about some more equitable sharing of wealth eventually, i.e., wanted to follow the example of the Afrikaner sectionalists, there were some, such as Marxists in the Unity Movement and in the South African Communist Party, who believed that no power on earth would be able to contain the people's struggle within the confines of bourgeois democracy, that the revolution would assume a permanent character as a matter of necessity. Hence they were not only willing to preach a 'mere' democratic programme but realised also that at this stage the demands of the democratic programme reflected the real (revolutionary) consciousness of the majority of the oppressed people. Thus, for instance, the demand, as made in the Ten Point Programme of the Unity Movement, for "new division of the land" was potentially the pivot on which the revolutionary movement would turn from a movement for bourgeois democracy into one for the realisation of socialism in South Africa. It was realised that not even the pinkest of bo-

urgois liberals could genuinely advocate a change in existing property relations without becoming a sorcerer's apprentice who would unleash "uncontrollable" forces.

None the less, the old guard of the Congress movement in particular as well as strong factions of the leadership of the Unity Movement, did not conceive of the struggle as a permanent, uninterrupted revolution. A good illustration of the validity of this interpretation comes from the record of the Treason Trial. Having due regard to the nature of political trials and the constraints under which witnesses for the defence have to speak it is none the less true that what Nelson Mandela said on the occasion quoted here reflects generally the views at the time of many of the old guard (but, ironically, not necessarily those of Mandela himself, despite his explicit statement to that effect!). In answer to a question from the prosecution whether he thought that the demands of the Freedom Charter could be achieved by means of a process of gradual reforms, Mandela replied as follows:

Well, this is how I approach the question. I must explain at the outset that the Congress, as far as I know, has never sat down to discuss the question ... We demand universal adult franchise and we are prepared to exert economic pressure to attain our demands, and we will launch defiance campaigns, stay at homes, either singly or together (referring to the various components of the "Congress Alliance"), while the Government should say, "Gentlemen, we cannot have this state of affairs, laws being defied, and this whole situation created by stay at homes. Let's talk. In my own view I would say Yes, let us talk and the Government would say, "We think that the Europeans at present are not ready for a type of government where there might be domination by non-Europeans. We think we should give you 60 seats. The African population to elect 60 Africans to represent them in Parliament. We will leave the matter over for five years and we will review it at the end of five years". In my view, that would be a victory, my lords; we would have taken a

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

significant step towards the attainment of universal adult suffrage for Africans, and we would then for the five years say, we will suspend civil disobedience; we won't have any stay at homes, and we will then devote the intervening period for the purpose of educating the country, the Europeans, to see that these changes can be brought about and that it would bring about better racial understanding, better racial harmony in the country ... Then at the end of the five year period we will have discussions and the Government says, "We will give you again 40 more seats," I might say that that is quite sufficient, let's accept it, and still demand that the franchise should be extended, but for the agreed period we should suspend civil disobedience, no stay at homes. In that way we would eventually be able to get everything that we want; we shall have our People's Democracy, my lords. That is the view I hold — whether that is Congress' view I don't know but that is my view".²⁵

The adoption of armed struggle, the influence of Communist Party members in the Congress movement, the developments in Southern Africa and basically the rapid growth of working-class consciousness because of the Bantustan policy, have in the interim shifted the whole organisation to the Left in spite of numerous split-offs by anti-Communist elements. There is now a tendency to see the revolutionary struggle as a continuous process towards the establishment of a socialist order.²⁶ However, it is clear that in the testimony cited above, Mandela was voicing the typical liberal bourgeois point of view which was held by most of the official leadership of the Congress Movement at the time and which is still held by many "leaders" who now operate in the "opposition" parties in Bantustan legislative assemblies and even in the Black Consciousness Movement.²⁷ It should also be clear from what I have said previously that in this view the "nation" consists of "majority" and "minority" nationalities and that democratic rights would be guaranteed for those groups that would require such guarantees. On the other hand, it must be obvious that the actual

course of history — *inter alia*, the intransigent resistance of the National Party to negotiations with the bourgeois liberal, i.e., aspirant bourgeois, leadership of the national movement — has weakened this tendency. I have already shown that the previous ruling-class strategy of aborting the growth of an indigenous black bourgeoisie is coming home to roost by way of the fact that there is no strong bourgeois leadership among the people, that the social base of the movement for national liberation is unquestionably a proletarian-peasant one and that the armed struggle itself is throwing up a working-class leadership steeled by failures, disappointments and betrayals.

It is to the third option, therefore, that we have to turn. In this interpretation the racial oppression of the black people is understood as a function of the capitalist system itself. It is not an aberration or a disease that can be healed by applying political therapy to the white electorate. What is necessary is the liquidation of those institutions and practices which have given rise to national oppression, i.e., to the exclusion of the majority of the people from the body politic and from the enjoyment of equal rights in all spheres. This means noting else than the abolition of capitalism itself. Because of the colour-caste framework of the social relations engendered by the capitalist system in the specific historical conditions of South Africa, i.e., because of the privileged position which whites enjoy by virtue of their "colour", the struggle assumes a national form. But its content is necessarily a social one. It cannot be halted at the mere «integration» of the black people into the existing economic relationships on a basis of "equality". Today, any attempt at such "integration" must infallibly bring about the more or less rapid disintegration of the capitalist system itself. To believe, as some liberals still do — even after the Cuban and Vietnamese experience — that the mere concession of political rights without an accompanying redistribution of wealth can buy off an oppressed population which consists in the mass of exploited workers, is an idle dream. On this the extreme right and the left wings of South African politics are in agreement. For the ruling class, the time has passed

where such a strategy could have worked and it is literally faced with the National Party alternative of fascist rule for decades, during which the balkanisation and class polarisation of the oppressed can be pursued without fear of Armageddon.

The nation, in this third conception, consists of all the people who are prepared to throw off the yoke of capitalist exploitation and racist oppression. It involves a **determined and uncompromising struggle against all attempts to divide the population on the basis of language, religion, tribe, or caste. It is based on the realisation that the colour-caste consciousness of the oppressed is a vanishing thing which is replaced pari passu** by a growth in workers' consciousness and working-class unity. It proposes the solution of the national question by means of the application of consistent democracy in every sphere, by the legal enforcement of equality of all languages. This tendency believes, together with people such as Cabral and Machel that "Ten years ago, we were Fula, Mandjak, Mandinka, Balante, Pepel, and others. Now we are a nation of Guineans. Tribal divisions were one reason the Portuguese thought it would not be possible for us to fight. During these ten years we were making more and more changes, so that today we can see that there is a new man and a new woman, born with our new nation, and because of our fight. This is because of our ability to fight as a nation" ... This is not the first fight in our country, and it is not Cabral who invented the struggle. We are following the example given by our grandfathers who fought against Portuguese domination 50 years ago. Today's fight is a continuation of the fight to defend our dignity, our right to have an identity — our own identity".²⁸ Or, in Machel's words:

No one can claim that they are representatives of a race, ethnic group, region or religious belief. They represent the working People, their sacrifices and aspirations, the whole People, from the Rovuma to the Maputo, without distinction as to race, ethnic group or religion. No one fought for a region, race, tribe, or religion.

We all fought and are still fighting for the same nation, for the single ideal of liberating our land and our people".²⁹

Today the forces of production in South Africa have developed to the extent that in the teeth of legal sanctions against joint political and economic action by black workers, there is hardly an extra-parliamentary action that does not involve all sectors of the oppressed. Every organisation of the people rejects distinctions made on the basis of caste and even the Church is compelled more and more to *speak with the tongue of the people*. The rulers attempt the impossible by, for instance, hounding "Africans" out of the Western Cape, which they have proclaimed a "Coloured Preferential Area" for labour purposes. Yet the people continue to stream back and "Africans" and "Coloureds" jointly dare the bulldozers and the bullets of the ruling class. Students and School pupils throughout the country are refusing to serve as willing tools for the perpetuation of the oppressive and exploitative system by boycotting schools and closing down the segregated political and quasi-political institutions which are working the system on behalf of the ruling class. They appeal to their parents **as workers** to come out in support of the struggle. **And all this is taking place on the basis that it is a struggle for full and equal nationhood. Based on the erasure of the status quo as a whole.**³⁰

More and more people are becoming aware of the need to forge a new type of organisation that will represent and articulate these aspirations of the labouring people. Strategy and theory are converging in front of our eyes. The nation of South Africa is struggling to be born. The working people are exercising their right to self-determination in the only way that it is possible for them to do. They are resolved to bring to an end the archaic divisions that have debilitated the nation and kept it in subjugation for more than a century.

From their perspective on the national question it is not only possible but necessary to denounce as bogus the reactionary "nationalism" of the homelands leaders such as Matanzima. **A fortiori** the "nations" they claim to re-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

present, be they "Xhosa", "Zulu", "Tswana", "Coloured", "Indian" or anything else, are non-existent entities which no recourse to "theory" can create. The only way in which these so-called "nations" can gain even a Pakistan-Israeli kind of legitimacy is by serving the same functions politically as those two states do, i.e., as centres of counter-revolution and division of the colonised peoples of the world. Only through the physical defeat of a revolutionary struggle can the Transkei and those that may follow it become temporarily consolidated, for the benefit of imperialism/capitalism in South Africa. For the same reason that bourgeois nationalism that passes as "African nationalism", which aims at no more than the "integration" of the oppressed black people into the existing capitalist structures has been weighed and rejected. However, precisely because bourgeois-democratic demands are revolutionary in their implications in the specific historical conditions obtaining in South Africa, this nationalist tendency not only continues to have a resonance among the people but, because of the singularly difficult military problems faced by the South African revolutionary movement, it will continue to be the greatest danger to it since it is assured of the full support of all the imperialist states. The greatest task facing the national liberation movement in its hour of crisis is, therefore, the need to propagate with all the means at its disposal the fundamental distinction between **national** liberation and the **nationalist** "liberation" proffered by bourgeois liberalism in whatever guise.

The working people have resolved in action to create a new South Africa in which the barriers of caste can no longer rise up to tower above the nation and to imprison its members in separate cells by which strategy the capitalist gaolers of the country can the more easily control them. The working class, in short, has become the leading class in the nation and is about to constitute itself as the nation of South Africa. The people themselves are disproving the validity of the National Party's theories as well as that of all other divisive, multi-national and multi-ethnic theories and the strategies that imply them. They have been able to

formulate clearly that the so-called "ethnic groups" are specifically either language groups, colour-castes, religious groups or administrative groups and no more. The grand attempt to make out of these groups of people socio-political entities comparable to the colour-castes of the recent past is not only doomed to the same fate as the strategy on which the perpetuation of the colour-caste system was based but is in any case too late. Ever since the emergence and acceptance by the oppressed of the African National Congress and the strategy of "non-European" unity, all such attempts, short of massive and virtually permanent fascist repression were doomed.

The sanguine optimism of this conclusion need not obscure the realistic expectation that the heritage of a divided past will continue to be a mortgage in the future. The ideological dimension of a social formation always lags behind its political and economic dimensions. Prejudice ingrained over centuries will not evaporate overnight. But, to the extent that the property relations are radically restructured the question of the nation is resolved in principle. This is the infallible conclusion to which my investigation of the national question leads me. However steep the ascent from that new point of departure, however deeply entrenched caste prejudice other forms of ideological conditioning may be among the social groups inhabiting South Africa, with the success of a revolutionary strategy based on the kind of analysis presented in this study such vestiges of the past will no longer have a soil in which they can thrive. The revolutionary nation will have conquered for itself the historic opportunity to create a new South Africa along a road of its own choosing.

FOOTNOTES

1. A nation is a historically evolved stable community of people based on community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of cul-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

ture. "Moreover, "The nation is not simply a historical category but a historical category belonging to a specific epoch, the epoch of rising capitalism". (Translated from J. W. Stalin, "Der Marxismus und die nationale Frage", in *zur nationalen und zur Colonialen Frage. Ausgewählte Artikel*), p. 7 and p. 12.

2. See his polemic against the Yugoslav epigones, *ibid.*

3. See Anthony Smith, *Theories of Nationalism* pp. 165–166.

4. We have already seen what problems this gave rise to in the early period of the C.P.S.A. See p. 57ff above.

5. See Otto Bauer, *Die Sozialdemokratie und die Nationalitätenfrage*. Also Stalin, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

6. See E. H. Carr, *History of the Bolshevik Revolution*, vol. 1., pp. 281–282.

7. The Soviet material was, unfortunately, accessible to me only in German translation, mainly from publications in the German Federal Republic.

8. See, for instance, P. M. Rogacev and M. A. Sverdlin, "Concerning the Concept 'Nation'" (printed in *Ostprobleme*, vol. 19, 1967, No. 2), p. 45.

9. M. S. Dzunusov, "The Nation as a Socio-Ethnic Community of People" (printed *ibid.*), p. 53.

10. M. O. Mncakanjan, "Nation and Nation State" (printed *ibid.*), p. 63 (my emphasis).

11. See especially the work of Emerson, *op. cit.* Also Anthony D. Smith, *op. cit.* An informative work on the problems posed by the phenomenon of nationalism to Marxian theory is H. B. Davis, *Nationalism and Socialism. Marxist and Labor Theories of Nationalism to 1917*.

12. *op. cit.*, p. 165.

13. *ibid.*, pp. 165–166.

14. *ibid.*, pp. 166–167.

15. Martin Legassick, though he does not discuss the methodological problem, adopts this attitude. "Neither black South Africans nor black Americans, I would argue, form a nation in Stalin's sense. Neither "historical" rights of territory nor historic culture, though they may form an important part of forging identity or claiming resources, are an adequate basis for a national movement in these cases" (M. Legassick, "Class and Nationalism in South African Protest"), pp. 52–53.

16. See Introduction, p. 9f.

17. Trotsky writes on this point that: "Whereas in nationally homogeneous states the bourgeois revolutions developed powerful centripetal tendencies, rallying to the idea of overcoming particularism, as in France, or overcoming national disunion, as in Italy and Germany — in nationally heterogeneous states on the contrary, such as Turkey, Russia, Austria-Hungary, the belated bourgeois revolution released centrifugal forces. In spite of the apparent contrariness of these processes when expressed in mechanical terms, their historic function was the same. In both cases it was a question of using the national unity as a fundamental industrial reservoir. Germany had for this purpose to be united, Austria—Hungary to be divided" (*History of the Russian Revolution*, vol. 3, p. 37).

18. *The Economist*, 26th August, 1967, p. 728.

19. See for instance Innes & O'Meara, *op. cit.*

20. "Self-Determination for the American Negroes", (April 4, 1939), Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination (my emphasis).

21. Quoted in Erwin Oberländer, "Der sowjetische Nationsbegriff. Zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion", *Politik und Zeitgesche-*

hen. Beilage zum "Parlement", vol 18, no. 12, 1968, p. 19 (my translation).

22. *ibid.* (my translation). Compare this statement with Stalin's *obiter dicta* from the year 1925 when he criticise the U.S. Communist Party's policies towards black workers in the U.S.A. "The whole approach of the American party to the Negro question is wrong. You are a national minority with some characteristics of a nation". (Quoted in M. Legassick, "Class and Nationalism in South African Protest", p. 45).

23. J. N. Nehru, *Autobiography*, p. 469.

24. *ibid.*

25. Carter & Karis, vol. 3, p. 593. "Does the A.N.C. Advocate Violence? Treason Trial Testimony March—October 1960".

26. See, for instance, Slovo, *op. cit.*, pp. 144–149.

27. In the same court hearing, Dr. Wilson Z. Conco, in answer to a question from the Prosecutor whether he regarded "... the Liberal Party as a party which agrees and supports the methods adopted by the Congress movement to achieve their objects", replied: "Yes, the Liberal Party ... agrees with us to this extent that it also recognises the universal franchise ... they agree with them there; that racial discrimination must go, we agree with them there; that South Africa must have a Government who should represent all the people, there we more or less agree. And so are the Progressives and all other groups which agree with our main object I would regard as the 'forces of freedom' with us ... We believe in ... attaining our objectives through extra-parliamentary methods ... The Liberal Party believes in fighting in Parliament ... but we have no vote, my lord, and we could never influence parliament, I mean direct influence through the electorate ... We still want a change through Parliament, my lord, but indirectly by drawing the attention of the voters to our sufferings ... and ... in our Defiance Campaign a lot of white people came to our support, not only here but in the world over ..." In answer to the question whether they would retain the present constitution after attaining "equal rights", Dr. Conco affirmed. (Karis and Carter, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 580). It is interesting to note that a variant of this bourgeois liberal viewpoint has been put forward by Martin Legassick, whose views on the question seem to me formally to be indistinguishable from those of the BCM. He apparently assumes, on the basis of this correct analysis that "In South Africa there is no contradiction between the national and the class struggle", that certain reformist actions of an economic character would necessarily lead to a rapid development and deepening of working-class consciousness. It is not clear, however, how his "foci for 'self-determination' and defended liberation will lead to the destruction of South African capitalism". South Africa's forced labour system was predicated on the progressive "under-development" of African rural areas and the inhibition of any African economic power. It would then have been more valuable for the (Communist) Party, instead of engaging in endless debates over whether or not an African bourgeoisie existed and if so whether it was progressive or reactionary, to support and to democratize these programs. Such economic action while a challenge to the system as a whole, would not have been a direct threat to the power of the State: by institutionalizing popular power in local areas, it would have given the people an immediate interest in the revolutionary defense of the gains they had made. And by focusing on present competition in agricultural production rather than earlier white "conquest", it would have given a sounder basis for a demand for the return of expropriated land to

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

the African peasantry. Similarly in urban areas, as Party member Mofutsanyana correctly pointed out in 1937, "radicals had blundered ... by allowing the urban advisory boards to become the agents of white municipalities. The proper course was to secure the election of militants who would conduct a struggle against high rents, lodgers' permits, beer brewing and other vexatious regulations" (quoted from Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 498). Local struggle could again have begun to institutionalize democratized self-determination ... (M. Legassick, "Class and Nationalism in South African Protest: The South African Communist Party and the Native Republic" 1928-1934" (Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University: n. d.

28. A. Cabral, "Connecting the Struggles: An Informal Talk with Black Americans", in A. Cabral, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79.

29. Samora Machel, "Message from Samora Machel",

(Africa Frontline)

30. 1976-1977 was a period of unprecedented mass struggles involving oppressed people against the State machine over economic, educational and political matters. At the time of writing, thousands of children are boycotting schools and thousands of "illegal squatters" are being hounded from one locality to another. In all these actions the police are confronted directly by urban workers and their children, who demand an end to the system of oppression, division and exploitation. In the rural areas a massive resettlement of people is taking place amid growing signs of principled resistance. And all these struggles are being linked up with the vocal and articulate student population both in town and country. More and more the struggle is being directed not against "whites" but against the state as such in both its white and its black visages.

ZANU AND THE ADVANCE OF THE ZIMBABWEAN REVOLUTION

IKWEZI gives unconditional support to the armed struggle conducted by ZANU and condemns the traitorous clique of Bishop Muzorewa and Sithole and their internal settlement. The writer states here that ZANU has a M-L leadership. But can there be effective Marxist-Leninist leaderships without an independent Marxist-Leninist Party. Readers views on this question are welcome.

The African people of Zimbabwe are nearing complete liberation, after almost a century of resistance against white European settler colonialism and imperialism. In the course of the Zimbabwean liberation struggle, the African masses and their leaders have successfully resolved contradictions that would have wrecked other struggles. A correct course for the Zimbabwean Revolution has now been charted by a hard core of revolutionary Marxist-Leninists within the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU). President Robert Mugabe and the leadership of ZANU have provided the proper orientation for the Zimbabwean people's war, led by the Zimbabwean African National Liberation Army (ZANLA), against the fascist, settler colonial regime of Ian Smith and his African collaborators. The forces of imperialism and reaction have employed every device at their disposal in their attempts to destroy ZANU and stem the revolutionary tide in Zimbabwe. ZANU has encountered sabotage and treachery from several directions and has prevailed. ZANU President Robert Mugabe lucidly analysed the key feature that has maintained

ZANU on the revolutionary path at the historic Chinoio Central Committee Meeting, held from the 31st of August to the 8th of September 1977:

Throughout the fourteen years of ZANU's existence the one unmistakable feature that emerges in the *unity* that has bound together those of us with a greater commitment to the principles and objectives of the Party. I define Party unity as a harmony that draws us together under the given leadership of the Party towards the achievements of its goals. Unity is in fact more than mere harmony. It is an active bond of aspirants who share in common given political beliefs. Unity is integrative of constructive or progressive or revolutionary forces in the direction of set goals.»

The unity of the Zimbabwean revolutionaries within ZANU has preserved the national liberation struggle against all attacks and adversity, and has facilitated the development of ZANU towards the adoption of Marxism-Leninism — Mao-Tse-Tung. Thought and towards more

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

progressive forms of party organisation. In the course of the Zimbabwean people's war, ZANU has succeeded in merging the political and military aspects of the struggle in order to mobilize the African masses for greater control of their revolution. The level of the struggle has been progressively raised by ZANU in several areas — mass work and organisation, ideology, party-building, military affairs, socio-economic planning, etc. With the collaboration of African feudalists and bourgeois nationalists with the fascist settler colonial regime, ZANU has effectively demonstrated to its cadres and the Zimbabwean masses that the national democratic revolution is a class struggle as well as an anti-colonial struggle. ZANU has taken concrete steps to make sure that the new Zimbabwe will be a worker and peasants' state. The revolutionary scope of ZANU is not confined to the liberation and reconstruction of Zimbabwe, but is also dedicated to the liberation of the last citadel of colonialism — AZANIA — and to the achievement of Pan Africanist unity. The revolutionary successes scored by ZANU should assist immensely in the elimination of imperialism and reaction from the African continent and in the achievement of a unified, socialist Africa.

DEVELOPMENT OF ZANU

ZANU has prevailed in the struggle because of the development of the Party and the masses in revolutionary theory and practice. The founding of ZANU on 8 August 1963 represented a break from bourgeois, reformist nationalism and opened the way for revolutionary Pan Africanist development in the waging of people's war. The formative period of ZANU strikingly resembles the foundation of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) on 5 April 1959 and its subsequent development. Both PAC and ZANU immediately undertook revolutionary mobilization of the African masses and, soon afterwards, people's war (Poqo and the Crocodile Group). Both PAC and ZANU have developed ideologically and organisationally, with ZANU showing the way for the PAC and the Azanian liberation struggle in terms of re-

volutionary practice. Of course, the PAC and the Azanian people must contend with an even more repressive settler colonial regime than that which is being defeated by ZANU and the Zimbabwean masses. It is likely that, once Southern Africa is fully liberated, Zimbabwe and Azania will become beacons of socialism and Pan Africanist unity on the African continent.

The foundation of the Zimbabwean national liberation struggle is composed of the outstanding African masses of the country. The Zimbabwean people created a long, glorious history and culture and were renowned for their prowess in agricultural production and in other fields of endeavour. The Zimbabwean masses conducted a remarkable and valiant war of resistance — Chimurenga — led by Muchemwa Mungati in 1896 — 1897 against the forces of British imperialism and colonialism. The spirit of Zimbabwean resistance persisted throughout the colonial period, as the African masses protested against massive thievery and super-exploitation. The African working class movement emerged and was organised by the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union (ICU) — founded by Masotsha Ndlovu in 1924 — and other unions which were the predecessors of the African Trade Union Council (ATUC) — founded by ZANU.

As the Zimbabwean movement progressed in their resistance against British imperialism and white European settler colonialism, the spread of Pan Africanism throughout the African continent contributed to the rise of political activity in Zimbabwe after the Second World War. In the late 1940's, two of the towering figures of the Zimbabwean revolution — Robert G. Mugabe and Herbert W.J. Chitepo — were participants in the revolutionary Pan Africanist ferment at the focal point in Southern Africa — Fort Hare University. Robert Mugabe and Herbert Chitepo attended Fort Hare at a time which the Youth League of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC — SA) — led by Anton M. Lembede, Mangaliso Robert Sobukwe, Nelson Mandela, and others — was revolutionizing the nationalist movement in Azania. Mugabe and Chitepo proceeded from their education in Azania to

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

play central roles in the Zimbabwean independence movement before the formation of ZANU. From 1957 — 1960, Robert Mugabe served as a teacher in Nkrumah's Ghana — the centre of Pan Africanism on the continent. The Pan Africanist experience of the leadership of ZANU was an important element in the initiation of the Zimbabwean liberation struggle after 1963.

The period from 1957 to 1963 witnessed the commencement of mass African nationalist activity in Zimbabwe, which was retarded by reformist leadership. The sacrifices of the Zimbabwean masses in all forms of protest against colonialism and imperialism were not matched by the willingness of some of the African nationalist leadership to confront and smash the settler colonialist state. The revolutionary Pan Africanists who broke away to found ZANU in August 1963 immediately set about organising the people of Zimbabwe for a national liberation struggle. The recruitment of Zimbabweans for ZANU, especially youth, surpassed previous levels of support for African nationalism in Zimbabwe. In May 1964, the ZANU Congress at Gwelo formally established ZANU as a Pan Africanist and socialist liberation movement and also set forth a *Programme of Action* to move Zimbabwe towards genuine liberation and socialism. The Gwelo Congress laid the foundations for mass organisations, adopted the ZANU Constitution, and elected the Central Committee and National Executive of ZANU. Robert Mugabe was confirmed as Secretary General and immediately continued as a leading force in the Zimbabwean liberation movement, despite periodic arrests and harassment. Herbert Chitepo was elected as the National Chairman and was delegated with the running of the affairs of ZANU from beyond the borders of Zimbabwe. Leopold Takawira was named as Vice-President and was eventually the victim of a foul murder by the fascist, settler colonial regime after six years of detention on 15 June 1970. The Reverend Ndabini-gi Sithole was elected as President and proceeded to betray ZANU and the liberation struggle while under detention

ZANU INITIATES ARMED STRUGGLE

From its inception, ZANU mobilized the African masses to employ all means at their disposal against white European settler colonialism. A wave of actions — including sabotage and assaults on white European settlers — inspired the Zimbabwean people and struck fear into the hearts of the settler regime. The most prominent action was the campaign of the Crocodile Group in July 1964 which attracted international attention. Soon afterwards, in August 1964, ZANU was banned and the leadership of ZANU and large numbers of militants were detained. Although Robert Mugabe was to be detained for ten years, the liberation struggle was continued and intensified. Zimbabwe militants were recruited and trained for the people's army — ZANLA — and the armed liberation struggle commenced in April 1966 in several different areas of Zimbabwe. The most spectacular action was carried out near Sinoia on 28 — 29 April 1966, with ZANLA routing the settler colonial forces. ZANU firmly placed itself among the African liberation movements committed to overthrowing colonialism through armed struggle. ZANLA superseded the Poqo of the PAC in terms of a well organised chain of command, and the FPLM of FRELIMO in terms of intense interaction with the African masses. In August 1967, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the ANC — SA attempted to exceed the successes of ZANLA by sending a substantial guerilla force through the Wankie Game Reserve in Zimbabwe. Unfortunately, the force was in no way attached to the African masses and was badly mauled. ZANU took account of this experience, avoiding any form of adventurism as ZANLA built up the people's war in stages. In November 1973, ZANU National Chairman Herbert Chitepo outlined ZANLA's strategy for people's war:

«The strategical aim ... is to attenuate the enemy forces by causing their deployment over the entire country. The subsequent mobilization of a large number of civilians from industry, business and agriculture would cause serious economic problems. This would have a psychologically devastating effect on the morale of the whites, most of whom had come to Zimbabwe, lured by the prospect of the easy, privi-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

leged life promised by the regime.» (Herbert Chitepo, National Chairman of ZANU, *Third World*, March 1974, pp. 6–7.)

From 1964 to 1974, ZANU progressed organisationally and ideologically under the leadership of National Chairman Herbert Chitepo. *Dare ne Chimurenga* (the Supreme Council) was founded to direct the development of ZANLA and the people's war, the multiplication of ZANU cells inside of Zimbabwe, and the progress of ZANU towards the adoption of Marxism-Leninism as the liberating ideology. As ZANU and ZANLA developed, it became evident that the liberation forces needed to be politicized in order to integrate with and mobilize the African masses and to maintain their attachment with the leadership of the Party.

ZANU ACCEPTS IDEOLOGY OF MARXISM—LENINISM

Even before the banning of ZANU, the liberation movement was exposed to various forms of socialist ideology. Eventually, ZANU cadres accepted Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought as an essential element of the Party's ideology. The guerrilla training of ZANLA forces in China or by Chinese instructors familiarized ZANU with the mass-line ideology of the Chinese Revolution. DARE was careful to gradually include those elements of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought that would be helpful to ZANU and to adapt those elements to Zimbabwean conditions. ZANU's President Robert Mugabe has captured the essence of ZANU's perspective on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought:

«Yes, we are Marxist-Leninists. The main principles of socialism do not vary but the application varies. In our particular circumstances you have about five million people in the rural areas. They constitute the peasantry and about one million in other areas, and you have got to take into account their own customs, the economic situation which has been established by the settlers, and you can't overnight, you see, bring an overhand (a set formula) to the situation» (*Zimbabwe News*, January–February 1976, p. 24).

The development of ZANU as a revolutionary party guided by Marxism-Leninism — Mao Tse Tung Thought produced a core of hardened cadres, dedicated to people's war. From such a basis, ZANU has been able to proceed in the mobilization of the Zimbabwean masses for the revolutionary overthrow of white settler colonialism and for the creation of a new socialist Zimbabwe. In 1970, when FRELIMO went over to the offensive in Tete province of Mozambique, ZANU was able to step up preparations for a concerted people's war — led by ZANLA — in North East Zimbabwe. By December 1972, ZANLA operations were fully initiated, as the liberation army began the consolidation of the first liberated and semi-liberated areas. The campaign of people's war coincided with organisational advances inside ZANU. Much fresh and militant blood was flowing into ZANU, facilitating the progress of the party towards becoming the vanguard of the Zimbabwean proletariat and poor peasantry. The ZANU Chief of Defence (COD) Josiah Tongagara was one such representative of the heightened revolutionary character of ZANU in the 1970's. Tongagara and ZANLA discarded any notion of compromise with the colonial fascist regime and vowed to fight until complete victory. The 1973 ZANU elections confirmed the ascendancy of the youthful revolutionary wave in the party. However, the very progress of ZANU was also to produce disaffected, counter-revolutionary, petit-bourgeois elements who would endeavour to sabotage the Zimbabwean revolution and seize control of the party apparatus from the revolutionary vanguard. The would-be wreckers of ZANU sought assistance from every imperialist quarter in their quest to become the new ruling chiefs over the people of Zimbabwe.

The victory of FRELIMO over Portuguese colonialism in 1974 and the steady progress of ZANU in making the Zimbabwean Revolution alarmed the reactionary forces of imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism. A concerted campaign was launched to shore up the position of imperialism and colonialism in Southern Africa. Bourgeois African politicians, such as Bishop Muzorewa of the African National Council, were sought out and persuaded to com-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

promise with the colonial fascist regime of Ian Smith. Imperialist forces induced the South African colonial regime of B.J. Vorster to initiate a policy of «detente» with African neo-colonial forces. African leaders were offered economic benefits as part of a deal in which the revolution in Southern Africa would be sabotaged. The release of Zimbabwean detainees and the initiation of the talks in October 1974 represented a cornerstone of the detente exercise. ZANU was the major force standing in the way of counter-revolution in Southern Africa. Upon his release from detention, ZANU Secretary-General Robert Mugabe joined DARE and ZANLA in denouncing detente and the devious manoeuvres that were designed to destroy revolution in Zimbabwe. Because of the principled stand of ZANU, the reactionary alliance was determined to undermine and emasculate the vanguard organisation of the Zimbabwean people.

REACTIONARIES ATTEMPT TO SABOTAGE ZANU

The ZANU document entitled *The Prince of Detente* contains a comprehensive account of the criminal assault on ZANU by renegade gangs in the pay of imperialism. The execution of the plot against ZANU was greeted with approval by the imperialist powers — including the Russian superpower — and by every element which was terrified by the prospect of a revolutionary Zimbabwe. This conspiracy against ZANU was concocted well in advance, as multinational corporations, particularly LONRHO corporation, foreign secret services, and other reactionary elements recruited saboteurs from various quarters to carry out the operation. A bourgeois clique, which claimed to be part of ZANU, wormed their way into ZANLA and launched an attack against the guerrilla fighters and Chief of Defence Josiah Tongogara in October 1974. Fifty-nine revolutionaries were killed before the dastardly assault was put down. Still, the conspiracy against ZANLA escalated, especially against the headquarters of DARE and ZANLA in Zambia. Inside Zimbabwe, the Rhodesian fascist colonial regime continued to persecute those patriots

who were against a sell-out and for revolution. Meanwhile, all bourgeois, reformist African politicians were being gathered together to support the detente exercise and to oppose ZANU and complete liberation. The Lusaka agreement of 7 December 1974 grouped all the counterrevolutionary cronies under the multi-racial, reformist banner of the African National Council (ANC). Among those jumping into the ANC abyss were the Reverend N. Sithole and the same group of renegades who viciously attacked ZANU. However, claims that ZANU was being dissolved and ZANLA delivered by Chairman Herbert Chitepo of DARE, Chief of Defence Josiah Tongogara of ZANLA, and other Zimbabwean revolutionaries. Inside Zimbabwe, Secretary General Robert Mugabe was leading the mounting criticism of detente and counterrevolutionary intrigues against the Zimbabwean liberation struggle.

The reactionary forces of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism launched their most ferocious attack on ZANU in early 1975. Instead of releasing all detainees, the Smith regime intensified the campaign of incarcerating political prisoners. Bourgeois African politicians joined forces with the Smith regime in attempting to suppress the armed liberation struggle of ZANLA. In Zambia, traitors to the Zimbabwean Revolution stepped up their assault on ZANU, with the full support of the reactionary forces. On 17 March 1975, the valiant patriot, Chairman Herbert Chitepo, was brutally assassinated. Instead of arresting true culprits in the murder, more than 1,350 ZANU militants were detained. The Chief of Defence Josiah Tongogara and other revolutionary ZANU cadres managed to escape arrest and initiated a programme in Mozambique to regenerate the people's war inside Zimbabwe. In April 1975, ZANU revolutionaries were joined in Mozambique by General Secretary Robert Mugabe who assumed the leading role in reconstructing a more revolutionary ZANU and launching the final struggle to eliminate Rhodesian settler fascist colonialism. By August 1976, more than 20,000 militant Zimbabweans had swelled the ranks of the revolution, making it possible to proclaim that ZANU was, once again, the only genuine liberator of the

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

hters to accept the political guidance of ZANU. In addition to the process of fusion of political and military aspects of the struggle, ZANU required inspired leadership in order to conduct the diplomatic struggle against the reactionary forces and to construct a united front of all genuine anti-colonial forces. Therefore, in April 1976, revolutionary political leaders and military commanders requested ZANU Secretary General Robert Mugabe to become the helmsman of the Zimbabwean Revolution.

White European settler colonialism in Southern Africa was badly shaken; the intensification of the people's war in Zimbabwe coincided with the massive uprising of the Azanian people after the Soweto massacre of 16 June 1976. The Black African masses fully committed themselves to revolutionary action in spite of the murderous repression of the fascist colonial regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia. Azanian youth led massive strikes and insurrections against the apartheid colonial regime, losing hundreds of comrades in the process. ZANLA-ZIPA forces received overwhelming support from the poor peasantry and rural proletariat of Zimbabwe as the people's army built up its potential to contest the Rhodesian colonial forces. The revolutionary youth of Zimbabwe matched the fervour of their Azanian comrades, as a constant flow of young volunteers into ZANU's ranks attested. The South African colonial fascists responded to the Azanian uprising by murdering and detaining thousands of African militants while increasing restrictions on the African population. The Zimbabwean masses were made subject to even more draconian measures which authorised the Rhodesian bandit forces to carry out arbitrary murder and torture. So-called «protected villages» or concentration camps that had been used by the US imperialists against the Vietnamese people were constructed to keep the Zimbabwean people away from their liberators. Chemical warfare and other forms of terrorism were introduced in an attempt to eliminate guerilla fighters and peasant supporters. After March 1976, Rhodesia virtually declared war on Mozambique, attacking villages and refugee camps and killing innocent non-combatants. However, such measures and ot-

hers failed to stem the tide, as ZANLA-ZIPA forces reached parity with the colonial army in 1977. In fact, the Rhodesian war effort against the Zimbabwean masses was seriously straining the colonial economy and the morale of the white European settler population. The war criminals in charge of the Rhodesian army had to rely on African elements and mercenaries to prevent a military collapse. Depending on rank, Africans were either enticed or impressed into the Rhodesian army. Criminally-skilled Africans usually ended up in the Selous Scouts terrorist units which were used to massacre African peasants and missionaries. The mercenaries were recruited by various imperialist quarters from South Africa, Europe, and America. The same bourgeois circles that helped to sustain the Rhodesian war economy made certain that the Rhodesian army received a steady stream of hired killers. However, nothing could stop the decline of the Rhodesian colonial fascist regime towards destruction.

IMPERIALISM'S NEW TACTIC: REACTIONARY ANC REVIVED

The victorious upturn in the Zimbabwean liberation struggle and other upheavals in Southern Africa brought the diplomatic intervention of US imperialism to assist British imperialism in preventing revolution and excluding the Russian superpower from intervening in the region. The initiative of Henry Kissinger revived the hopes of the neo-colonial elements under the ANC-banner who were becoming even more isolated. A broad grouping of reactionary forces were determined that the Kissinger initiative succeed. No heed was paid to the massacre of 800 non-combatants at Nyadzona refugee camp in Mozambique; the Zimbabwean people did not figure in this new scramble for power in Salisbury. ZANU Secretary-General Robert Mugabe acted to counter the new imperialist manoeuvres against the Zimbabwean Revolution. In August 1976, Comrade Mugabe led a ZANU delegation to Dar-es-Salaam to present the case of the reconstructed party against attempts to impose a neo-colonial settlement on the Zimbabwean people. The deve-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

lopment of ZANU as the revolutionary vanguard party in the Zimbabwean people's war made it increasingly difficult to neglect it as a political force. No matter how the reactionary forces endeavoured to circumvent or sabotage ZANU, the mass support engendered for the revolutionary people's war had become impossible to erase.

The Geneva Conference in the last three months of 1976 demonstrated the power and the skill of ZANU in negotiations designed to approve neo-colonialism in Zimbabwe. Before the Geneva Conference began, Secretary-General Robert Mugabe of ZANU led the way towards a united, patriotic front with the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), headed by Joshua Nkomo. Although occasional friction had developed between ZANU and ZAPU fighters in ZIPA, the Patriotic Front was established in an urgent attempt to bring together all those committed to an armed liberation struggle in Zimbabwe. It was recognised that if the Patriotic Front and ZIPA were not made to work, the only benefactors would be imperialism and the neo-colonial opportunists in the ANC. The initial act of the Patriotic Front was to formulate a common position for the Geneva Conference; the Kissinger proposals were criticised and alternative proposals that guaranteed genuine independence were presented. Once the Patriotic Front had prevented the conclusion of a neo-colonial settlement, ZANU and ZAPU proceeded to formalize the united front and explore the possibility of intensified co-operation. However, the Patriotic Front had been voluntarily formed by Zimbabwean revolutionaries, and any possibility of unification could not be artificially attained. The position of ZANU was opposed to any sacrifice of its principle of self-reliance, the application of Marxism-Leninism and uninterrupted revolution.

ZANU achieved a major victory with the formation of the Patriotic Front and the failure of neo-colonialism at the Geneva Conference. The Front-line Presidents were confronted with the obvious choice of recognising the Patriotic Front as the sole legitimate representative of the Zimbabwean people. In February 1977, the OAU Council of Ministers followed

suit, paving the way for full African recognition of the Patriotic Front at the OAU Summit in Gabon in July 1977. The reactionary forces of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism were confronted by Pan-African support for the total liberation of Zimbabwe. The counter-revolutionaries who were riding high in 1975 were forced to expose themselves as willing collaborators with Rhodesian colonial fascism. ZANU leaders and militants were no longer treated with disdain; evidenced by the release of Chief of Defence Josiah Tongogara and other ZANU cadres from detention and the nullification of all spurious charges against ZANU in October 1976. Subsequently, the way was clear for ZANLA-ZIPA to come under the leadership of ZANU. In December 1976, the ZANU Central Committee met to plan for the escalation of the revolutionary struggle, to formalize the leadership, and to prepare for further organizational advance.

Inside Zimbabwe, the great progress made ZANU was reflected in both political and military aspects. The People's had been formed as the political wing of ZANU, organising the anti-colonial struggle in the cities, towns, and other occupied zones. In November 1976, twelve prominent ANC members, including the Reverend Canaan Bana and Nolan Makombe, joined forces with the People's Movement, after denouncing the political bankruptcy of Muzorewa, Chikerema, and other ANC traitors. Subsequently, as the People's Movement threatened to strip the puppets of the Smith regime of any pretence popular support, the Zimbabwean militants who were responsible for the People's Movement experienced torture, detention, and murder. Still, the struggle continued.

The year 1977 began with significant developments in the advance of revolution in Southern Africa. In Mozambique, the Third Congress of FRELIMO was convened to confirm the adoption of Marxism-Leninism as the revolutionary ideology and the advance towards socialism, led by the vanguard party. The establishment of FRELIMO as the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party and Mozambique as the socialist beacon in Africa provided tremendous inspiration to revolutionaries throughout the

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

continent. Comrade Robert Mugabe and ZANU were especially ecstatic about the direction in which FRELIMO was prepared to lead Mozambique and committed African revolutionaries. In parallel with the Third Congress of FRELIMO, ZANU stepped up revolutionary measures. The Department of Political Organisations was changed to a Political Commissariat, with the tasks of politicizing ZANLA forces and further implanting ZANU among the Zimbabwean masses. The Chitepo College of ideological training was established to instill Zimbabwean revolutionaries with the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung Thought. Mass organisations of women and youth were strengthened. Despite the assassination of Comrade Jason Moyo of ZAPU, the Patriotic Front was formalized in the Maputo Accords of January 1977. In March 1977, a joint meeting of the ZANU Central Committee and the ZANU High Command decided upon fusion of the political and the military with newly-proclaimed ZANU President Robert Mugabe at the head. At about the same time, ZANLA forces demonstrated the progress of the Zimbabwean Revolution with the victorious raid on the strategic Nyampanda base of the Rhodesian colonial army. In May 1977, President Mugabe and ZANU were prominent at the United Nations Conference in Support of the People of Zimbabwe and Namibia. In his address, President Mugabe denounced Rhodesian and South African colonialism and its imperialist supporters; he presented the case of the Zimbabwean people in their struggle for national liberation and appealed for international solidarity and support. From June 20 to 29, 1977, President Mugabe led a ZANU delegation to the People's Republic of China and met with Chairman Hua Kuo Feng of the Chinese Communist Party. The fact that ZANU was honoured as a fraternal party by the Chinese demonstrated the advance that ZANU has made in the course of the Zimbabwean Revolution.

HISTORIC CHIMOIO MEETING

The historic Chimoio Central Committee meeting of ZANU from 31 August to 8 September 1977 clearly exhibited the revitalized leadership

of the Zimbabwean masses. Comrade Robert Mugabe was officially proclaimed as President and delivered one of his sharp analytical speeches, laying out the problems and tasks confronting ZANU. Chief of Defence Josiah Tongogara and his deputy Rex Nhongo represented the ZANLA High Command, once again merged under the political direction of ZANU. The Central Committee and Political Departments had been expanded in line with the increased responsibilities shouldered by ZANU. At the meeting, the future direction of ZANU, as the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party, was planned, as were the political, economic, and military strategies for the future. All in all, the Chimoio Central Committee Meeting was a landmark in the history of ZANU, Zimbabwe and Africa.

As President Mugabe said: «This Central Committee Meeting occurs at a very important stage of our struggle, a stage when the war has gained significantly in momentum and its effects have begun to be felt by the enemy ... and this meeting also comes at a time when imperialist manouvres aimed at the neutralization of our war effort and the negation of our successes are being advanced through the instrumentality of a home-based stooge and reactionary leadership ...»

In the wake of the Chimoio Central Committee Meeting, ZANLA forces intensified the liberation war to new levels. Thousands of ZANU guerilla fighters established liberated zones among the rural population of the eastern third of the country. In these zones, ZANLA forces were no longer on the strategic defensive, but were beginning to mount pitched battles with the Rhodesian colonial army. The ZANLA attack on the major colonial military base of Grand Reef in December 1977 was a prime example of the development of strategy in the Zimbabwean people's war. In the vital core of Zimbabwe, ZANLA forces established semi-liberated zones in preparation for the final stages of the liberation struggle. Since September 1977, ZANU had trained more than 10 000 guerilla fighters at Nachingwea Camp in Tanzania to deliver the finishing blows against Rhodesian colonial fascism. In the liberated zones of Zimbabwe, ZANU cadres established re-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

volutionary administration amongst the masses, thereby smashing the Rhodesian colonial state and carrying forward the national democratic revolution. Along with ZANU village chairmen and secretaries came decent administration, health care, and other social services, as well as democratic rights for the Zimbabwean people. The end of colonial repression and capitalist exploitation in the liberated zone has released the energies of the Zimbabwean masses for the revolutionary struggle to come.

For the Rhodesian colonial regime, the Zimbabwean liberation struggle was placing an unbearable strain upon the entire system. Confronted with a definite losing situation, the Rhodesian colonial fascists increasingly resorted to counter-revolutionary dual tactics to avoid defeat. On the one hand, the Rhodesian colonial forces stepped up terrorist atrocities against the people of Zimbabwe and Mozambique; the most appalling was the massacre of more than a thousand non-combatants in the vicinity of Chimoio in November 1977. On the other hand, the Smith regime, in collusion with various reactionary forces, set in motion plans to broaden the coterie of African opportunists who were willing to support colonial fascism in exchange for wealth and power. At first, it seemed that the Muzorewa and Sithole cliques had abandoned all principles in order to latch on to the colonial fascist state. Muzorewa and Sithole not only accepted continuing colonial repression, but pledged to do their part in intensifying it. Because of the fine work of the Patriotic Front, the international community emulated the Zimbabwean people and the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in rejecting the so-called «internal settlement». Consequently, ZANU could press on towards the complete liberation of Zimbabwe.

With the approach of victory in the liberation war, the People's Republic of Zimbabwe is beginning to take shape. In the course of the people's war, ZANU has created a revolutionary state apparatus, built the vanguard party, and commenced socio-economic reconstruction. As the revolution progresses, the oppressive colonial administration will be completely replaced by the power of the proletariat and poor peasantry under the direction of ZANU. The

colonial judiciary will give way to people's courts and justice for the masses. The colonial army will be destroyed by ZANLA forces. Programmes of re-education will be necessary to transform servants of Rhodesian colonialism into part of the new Zimbabwe. In order to carry through the national democratic revolution, ZANU will extend political education to the entire population. The mass line will ensure genuine progress in the Zimbabwean Revolution.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN ZANU

In the course of the liberation struggle, ZANU has paid particular attention to mass organisation. The Zimbabwean peasantry has been mobilized in support of the people's war through the elimination of Rhodesian colonial domination, the promotion of production and social services, and the spread of political education. As for the proletariat, ZANU has developed the ideology — Marxism-Leninism — that stresses working class power and outlook. Through the People's Movement, ZANU has mobilized the urban proletariat to support the people's war and to contribute the death blows against Rhodesian colonialism and capitalist exploitation. The building of revolutionary African trade unions will continue to be a principal task of the Zimbabwean working class.

Zimbabwean youth and women have played a central role in the liberation struggle and have been the objects of particularly vigorous mass organisations by ZANU. The youth and women have traditionally been especially oppressed, particularly since the onset of Rhodesian settler colonialism. Zimbabwean youth and women have remained on the periphery of colonial society, concentrated in the destitute reserves. With the commencement of the people's war by ZANU, the youth and women of Zimbabwe are well-situated to either assist or participate in the liberation struggle. Young people have provided the bulk of ZANLA guerrilla forces and have been organised into a youth league. The Department of women's Affairs, led by Teurai Ropa, have been successful in harnessing the enormous potential of Zimbabwean women and in eliminating discrimina-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

tion. A special ZANLA woman detachment is now in the field, fighting a people's war for the liberation of all Zimbabweans. ZANU organisations of youth, women and trade unionists have sent representatives abroad — to China, for instance — as part of ZANU's internationalist duty.

ZANU has already embarked on a campaign to build the Marxist-Leninist vanguard party. The Political Commissariat has undertaken the vital tasks of selecting cadres from the mobilized masses, conducting rigorous political education courses, and building the party organisation from the grass roots. A special ZANU Committee has been established to refine the ideological line of the party and to provide long-term direction that will be required in the course of the Zimbabwean socialist revolution. The Committee has issued internal party documents — known as *Mwenji* — to stimulate efforts to further develop ZANU as a party based upon Marxism-Leninism and scientific socialism. The hard core of Zimbabwean revolutionaries who have led ZANU through ferocious counter-revolutionary storms will certainly keep the party on the correct course in the battles to come. *A luta continua!*

ZANU has made certain that socio-economic reconstruction began during the liberation war. The camps of Zimbabweans in Mozambique have promoted agriculture and small crafts, as well as manpower development. In the liberated zones, ZANU has encouraged co-operatives in agriculture, as the Zimbabwean peasantry re-claim their land for agricultural production from white European settlers. Grain production is of paramount importance, and Zimbabwe has the potential — in the African peasantry and their land — to become the breadbasket, instead of the tobacco farm, of Southern Africa. The sophisticated irrigation and cultivation techniques that were employed so successfully before the European invasion can be successfully combined with modern methods. A massive campaign of agricultural reconstruction can solve the immense socio-economic dislocation problem of the Zimbabwean people. Providing all the arable land of Zimbabwe for the tiller, particularly in co-operatives, is the starting point.

ZANU'S PROGRAMME

Regarding industry, the imperialist corporations who supported the Rhodesian colonial economy in its super-exploitation of the Zimbabwean proletariat will find no place in the new Zimbabwe. ZANU appears determined to make Zimbabwe the most self-reliant country in Africa, with tough restrictions on foreign aid and investment. In the manufacturing sector, a considerable import-substitution industry was established to avoid sanctions against Rhodesian colonialism. For those industries that will remain necessary, ZANU will have to promote the development of skilled workers by intensifying manpower training programmes. The manufacture of vital necessities, such as clothing, will have to take priority in light industry. As for heavy industry, Zimbabwe can become the industrial hub of Central and Southern Africa, unless a liberated Azania can expand and accelerate the construction of the hub. Zimbabwe possesses the high-grade coal and iron ore to forge a substantial steel industry. The production of alloys, etc. and machine tools will follow.

The step-by-step construction of Zimbabwean industry will require a binding series of plans and the participation of the Zimbabwean working class. Energy for Zimbabwe's mounting needs can be provided by coal and hydro-electricity. The harnessing of Zimbabwe's many rivers can be expanded into a multi-country authority. Mozambique will especially benefit from the reduction of floods. Regional Pan-African cooperation can be very productive especially in transportation. Zimbabwe will be the centre of a transportation network, leading to and from the ports of Mozambique. All African countries, except for Lesotho, will be able to greatly lessen dependence on imperialist exploitation and South African colonialism.

With the liberation of Zimbabwe, Azania will be next on the list for African revolutionaries. ZANU has pledged to support the people's war in Azania in just the same way as FRELIMO has assisted ZANU. Certainly, the sacrifices involved in the liberation of Azania will be immense, with Zimbabwe acting as the principal rear area of the liberation struggle. Neverthe-

less, President Robert Mugabe of ZANU has been an ardent Pan Africanist for more than thirty years, and, in that time, has never wavered in his support for the oppressed people of Azania. ZANU remains based firmly upon Pan Africanist principles as well as Marxism-Leninism, and will see the liberation of Azania through to the end. The maintenance of the alliance between ANC—SA and ZAPU, and the close relationships between ZANU and PAC is

a matter that will be determined in the struggles to come. And after the People's Republic of Azania is founded? Genuine Pan Africanists and Marxist-Leninists will continue the struggle against the reactionary forces of imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism throughout Africa; the same forces which attempted to wreck ZANU. It is not unlikely that the comrades of ZANU will be in the forefront of the struggle for a united, socialist AFRIKA!

AFRICAN REVOLUTIONARY INTELLECTUALS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL TRANS- FORMATION IN AFRICA

Kazu Wamba-Dia-Wamba on the Agony of the Colonised African Intellectual

Who are revolutionary intellectuals in Africa and how do they relate to and respond to the 'call to return to the classics'? Which specific forms does that call take in the concrete struggles waged by African people? How do the friends of the African people deal with those forms? Without a revolutionary theory, there is no revolutionary movement; how do African intellectuals help develop, or retard the development of, such a revolutionary theory? Where do they stand in relation to the complete liberation of Africa? What are the most advanced experiences of the African mastery of the contradiction between African dominated nations and imperialist domination? What are the most advanced experiences of the African working class revolutionary movement? What are the most advanced African practices of the mass based class dictatorship? What have been the most successful African struggles against colonialism and colonial restoration. What are their basic teachings and how do these relate to the classics of Dialectical and Historical Materialism? How were those teachings ela-

borated and how are they, or should they be, spread? Which concrete forms does modern revisionism take in the African revolutionary movement? What has concretely been the impact of the Sino-Soviet split in Africa? Why have 'educated Africans' tended to act as organic intellectuals of the ruling classes more than as those serving the masses of African people? Who are today in Africa the masses of people and who are serving as their organic intellectuals? How are people's organic intellectuals formed? This second part of the essay will deal with some of these questions.

NATURE OF THE COLONIZED AFRICAN INTELLECTUAL

The nature of modern African intellectuals, Europeanized Africans who engage predominantly in intellectual activities, reflects the character of their historical formation as a social stratum. Under colonialism, among the major goals of educating Africans, were to make them ignorant of

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

the people's languages, traditions, cultures, and above all the history of mass cultural resistance struggles. They were trained to see mass culture as primitivism, and were required to move away from it. Getting 'educated', 'civilized' or 'cultivated' in fact meant becoming intensively *Europeanized* and *de-africanized*. What was presented as history of the colonized people, or rather of colonization was nothing but an enumeration of their defeats and the colonizers' victories. Wars of invasion were presented as humanitarian, civilizational or wars of pacification of primitives inflicting permanently violence upon themselves. Colonizers were presented as the saviors of these unfortunate primitives. This process of mis-education disorganized the social psychology of colonized people. Mentally, it became much easier and better for them to ignore the 'savage and primitive ancestors' and identify themselves with French «ancestors» (Gauls), Belgian 'ancestors', British or Portuguese 'ancestors', etc. The colonial state ideological apparatuses heavily attached and disoriented the cultural integrity and identify of the colonized people.

DESTRUCTION OF INDIGENOUS CULTURE

Under colonialism, African intellectual workers were trained to be auxiliaries in the colonial administration, the church, the police, the army, etc.; they were formed as organic intellectuals of the colonized state dispatched in the ranks of the colonized African masses. Obviously their major social function was not to help develop the mass resistance struggle but rather to deal with the ideological/theoretical requirements posed by the necessity and imperatives of containing, breaking off and disorienting mass resistance struggles through ideological soothing. These few assimilated who appeared to be close to the colonizers reinforced the illusion of upward mobility in the colonial system on the condition only that one

works hard, i.e. give oneself into the intensive brain washing process. In the struggle for independence, they often tried to persuade the masses of people that they were not ready for independence and that colonialism as a process of civilizing was capable of preparing colonized people for genuine independence. They presented themselves as the genuine interpreters («interlocuteurs valables») of the colonized masses to the colonizers and vice versa. Since the civilizational claims made by the colonial state were mostly audible to them, they were more interpreters of the colonizers to the colonized masses than the other way around. They usually stood for the continuation of colonialism, at the same time used the threat of mass uprising for the benefit of getting some reformist petty gains for themselves. From the village deacon, bible reader, modernized chief, elementary school teacher, clerical worker ... to the assembly line supervisor: they were all trained predominantly as intellectuals working for the ideological reproduction of the pre-capitalist lineage rule. They were in charge of making the masses of the colonized people *accept mentally* their own miseries. Schooling functioned in fact as a process of transformation of class stand: the de-africanization process was also a change of class stand and/or class determination. The main objective of colonial schooling was to win whoever went through it over to the colonial rule perspective. Only secondarily that skills (reading, writing, calculating, etc.) were spread. The colonial state had the responsibility of controlling the use of those skills: 'inappropriate' — from the colonial state point of view — written materials were, for example, kept out of the colonies or just out of reach of the colonized people and 'safe' materials such as the bible were spread to the most remote corners of the colonies. Often, semi-literate colonized masses had only the bible available in their native languages to read. Stories written by missionaries, for example, ten-

ded to pacify and make the colonized masses accept conditions. Cultural materials — produced by colonised people — helping colonized people to resist colonial cultural penetration were destroyed — under the pretext that they were incarnations of primitivism and sins. Cultural creations of African people were removed from the African communities and stocked in European museums. In a colony, only colonial monuments hailing the bravery and heroism of European conquerors — and sometimes of the African traitors — were allowed to stand up on the pedestal. The mastering of technical skills was discouraged by myths such as the famous 'mathematical incompetency of Blacks' and by repressive measures. In Zaire, for example, a number of colonized people who made certain technical discoveries were arrested.

THE ROLE OF MISSIONARIES IN COLONIZING AFRICANS

An important theoretical work of translation into African languages of Christian materials was done by missionaries, those organic intellectuals of European ideological penetration and domination of Africa. With the practice of concept displacement, basic notions of African cosmogonies were transformed into Christian imagery. Colonial psychologists were busy proving that the colonized natives were, in fact, expecting colonizers to help them resolve their psychological tension or that due to 'traditional ways of child raising' they were fundamentally childish. Linguists and anthropologists were proving that native languages («dialects», as they were called) were incapable of expressing abstract ideas. *African revolutionary intellectuals have done, so far, nothing comparable to that extensive work of shaping mentalities.* Revolutionary theory, distorted and mystified to combat it by missionaries and colonial officers, has been spread negatively in the ranks of the colonized officers, has been spread negatively

in the ranks of the colonized masses as 'a target of attack and enemy number one of God loving people'. Without exaggeration, the missionary work has profoundly affected the minds and personalities of the masses of the African people. Unless they are correctly de-briefed, revolutionary intellectuals will be preaching in the desert. I remember, after 13 years of missionary schooling, how difficult *mentally* it was for me to read, at first, revolutionary literature. The colonial sediments in my consciousness would react violently against such a literature, distorting it and preventing me from understanding it correctly. Only through my involvement in political, ideological and organizational struggles that such a literature became increasingly meaningful.

«THE WAY OF THE ANCESTORS» AS ANTI-COLONIAL RESISTANCE

Before colonialism, in areas where feudalism or tribute¹ paying modes of production were not dominant, i.e., in communities based on lineage mode of production, intellectuals (wise men: medicine men, spiritualists or sorcerers, prophets, etc.) were in fact organic intellectuals of the masses of people. Chiefs, who were elected, were in fact mass based chiefs. Their organic intellectuals were also those of the masses of people. Their theoretical work was given orientation through the so-called 'ways of the ancestors' or the ancestral political line. They were in charge of the ideological development and reproduction of the ancestral line. To the extent that this line was in fact a mass line, the intellectuals guided by that line were serving the people. They were positively conservative as they were defending and serving communalism. Under colonialism, communalism became an ideology and practice of resistance and those intellectuals serving communalism were helping to develop the mass resistance movement often taking the form of politico-religious organizations or

movements sometime putting forward the slogan, 'return to the ways of the ancestors'². In this capacity, those intellectuals were reactionary if they were agitating for mere and strict 'return to the ways of the ancestors' — they were progressive if the recourse to the ways of the ancestors was used as a mass criticism of colonialism culminating into the independence movement. Agitation for strict re-establishment of the ancestral line led, in some cases, to the creation of 'communalistic' secret societies accomodating quite well — or at least in pacific coexistence — with colonialism. Often these secret societies terrorized native communities almost in agreement with colonialist terrorism. The recourse to the 'ways of the ancestors' as a mass criticism of colonialism led to mass agitation against colonialism and for independence. «Ways of the ancestors» stood for complete independence before colonialist penetration and after the colonialists — thanks to the intervention of ancestors — will be kicked out. Politicization process under colonialism, often starts with a recourse til communalism as a cultural support and prespective for the resistance against colonialism. The structure of the colonial state prevents from realizing politically and organizationally the ideological directives of the mass movements.

In the pre-colonial hierarchical societies, two different opposite forms of intellectuals could be identified: those serving aristocratic nobilities (e.g. the members of the king's court, the marabouts, etc.) and those serving the masses of people, especially during moments of intense class struggles (leading to peasant upri-

sings for example). Reference to the ancestral line is often here the ideological expression of the class dictatorship of the aristocratic mobilities. The king-founder is usually transformed into a mythical figure or a god. Only when the colonizers threaten their «traditional» power that these nobilities call for the 'return to the ancestral line' i.e., for a reinforcement of the leading aspect of their class hegemony³ required by the weakening of the dominant aspect of their class hegemony. The split of those two aspects do indeed provoke an ideological conjuncture of crisis apprehended through the call to 'return to the ancestors'. Intellectuals serving the exploited masses of people had thus to fight against such an ancestral line and were treated by the 'feudal state' as criminals. Their main role was to make it difficult for the organization — by the ruling class and its organic intellectuals — of the mass consensus to the stability of the current social relations of production to have pertinent hold. They helped to break up the class mechanism organized to break up mass resistance with the active service of these intellectuals forced the colonizers and aristocratic nobilities to enter into class alliance against the peasant masses of people. The theoretical work — and the resulting teachings — related to pre-colonial and colonial peasant uprisings need to be studied in this perspective. Some uprisings were organized by the nobilities in their competition with colonizers for the control of the colonized native masses; but, most often they were organized against land expropriation realized by both colonizers and nobilities or by colonizers through nobilities.

FORTHCOMING: Programme of the Pan-Africanist Movement of Azanian Workers and Peasants (Marxist-Leninist). This programme is based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung-Thought and analyses the current situation in Azania and the tasks and policies that Azanian Marxist-Leninists must pursue.

THE REAL NATURE OF THE SOVIET-CUBAN OCCUPATION OF ANGOLA

BY J.K. CHITUNDA (UNITA INFORMATION OFFICER)

The Soviet imperialist and neo-colonialist oppression in Angola has been a nightmarish continuation of the evils we have experienced under Western colonial domination. But this time the danger of Soviet domination looms ahead for entire Africa and even Europe, unless the Cubans are militarily defeated in Africa. This is possible.

The Soviet—Cuban occupation of Angola has been profoundly destructive in our country. It has thwarted the triumph of democracy; it has imposed on Angola a regime of a lonely, unpopular pro-Soviet clique; it has paralyzed the productive forces and destroyed the economy of the country; it is perpetrating war, violence and bloodshed; it has demanded of the Angolan people a price that is extraordinarily high for their liberty, dignity and national independence; it has been promoting disunity among the people. The Soviet social-imperialists have been orchestrating a vicious, intensive propaganda campaign throughout the world to justify their expansionist imperialist adventures and to mystify our resistance to their aggression. And the wounds of bitterness and disharmony inflicted in all walks of life by this Soviet—Cuban occupation in Angola will bleed and pain still long after these forces of occupation are gone, thus rendering extremely difficult Angola's task of national reconstruction. But a historical precedent has now been established in Angola: For the first time in history, a well-structured, highly effective, revolutionary guerilla army is challenging the Soviet—Cuban expeditionary forces; a truly people's armed resistance movement is destroying the myth of the invincibility of these Soviet—Cuban expeditionary armies; the mask is falling and the real imperialist-fascist nature of USSR and Cuba is being exposed.

The process of the cubanization of Angola is being carried out at an accelerated pace by the Luanda regime. More than 8 000 Cuban families have been settled in

various settlement areas — colonies — throughout the country. During the past two years, more than 15 000 children were born of forced unions of Cuban men and Angolan women. Hundreds of Angolans have been killed so that wives could be taken by Cubans.

Cuban instructors dominate at all school levels.

Militarily, there are 25 000 Cuban troops today in Angola; this represents one fifth of Cuba's national army. (During Angola's 1975 civil war there were only 15 000.) But the Cuban military presence in Angola continues to escalate. Fresh Cuban troops have been disembarking in Luanda almost every week, eluding all western «intelligence estimates». Last March, for example, 900 Cubans of the so-called CHE GUEVARA INTERNATIONALIST BRIGADE, under the cover of «instructors», arrived in Luanda and were immediately assigned to duties in combat zones in the provinces of Cwanza-Sul, Benguela, Huambo and Cuando-Cubango. We believe that before the end of this year, Cuban troops in Angola will exceed 30 000.

Cuban engagement in the Horn did not cause a reduction of Cuban forces in Angola. At one time, there appeared to be the need to transfer some combat-experienced units from Angola, but such gaps were immediately filled by fresh contingents from Cuba to Angola.

MPLA EXISTS ONLY BECAUSE OF CUBAN SUPPORT

In terms of manpower, the war in Angola is being supported almost exclusively by Cubans. In fact, one of the errors we made until some six months ago, was to judge the conflict almost strictly in terms of MPLA and UNITA. The MPLA forces were demoralized, disorganized, weak; entire battalions, companies and platoons have surrendered to the UNITA forces

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

on many occasions. This led to a relaxation of our vigilance on our part; and when the enemy — the Cuban — launched his most ruthless offensives against our forces it was not easy to push him back to his bases. The terms of this equation are therefore UNITA and the people on the one side and the CUBANS on the other. **The regime of Agostinho Neto is controlled and propped by the Cubans. Without them, there can be no MPLA Luanda regime; MPLA officials themselves make no mystery of it when they declare: «So long as the MPLA is in power, no Cuban will leave Angola; and as long as the Cubans remain in Angola, MPLA may rule.»**

In terms of the size of Cuba's economy and population, the Cuban effectives in Angola are equivalent to the United States combat effectives in Vietnam at the peak of the American involvement in Indochina. But Cuban involvement in Angola entails no economic sacrifices to Havana. In fact the availability of Cuban troops at the service of Moscow in Africa represents a valuable source of income for Cuba. The Soviet Union spends nearly 2,5 million US dollars per day to sustain its war efforts in Angola — to finance the Cuban troops and war material. Part of the loot goes directly to the Havana government. The Cuban troops in Africa are mercenaries in the true meaning of the word: they fight at a monetary price for a foreign power in a foreign country, deceitfully utilizing the cover of proletarian internationalism. As a bonus Cuba receives also the economic assistance from the Soviet bloc in all domains. Cuban sugar, for example, is imported preferentially by the Soviet bloc countries at a price four times that of the world market.

It is true that in its war expenditures in Angola, especially in the maintenance of the Luanda government apparatus, the Soviet Union benefits enormously from the financial contribution of the United States' Gulf Oil Corporation which pours in some 500 million US dollars annually. This covers 70% of the Luanda government's budget. The country's economy is in ruins. Angola is a very fertile country which used to export corn, beans, wheat, fruit; but today these basic food items are being impor-

ted. In the Autumn of last year, the Luanda regime had to purchase some 1 500 tons of corn from Zaire. The markets are empty. The factories are shut down, some of them damaged beyond repair.

Coffee production is 65% below the pre-war production. Angola was Africa's second largest producer of coffee and was among the world's top ten. Diamond production fell by 85%. In 1974 Angola was the world's 5th producer of gem quality diamonds, with an annual production of about 2,5 million carats%: today Angola barely produces 350 000 carats.

The Benguela Railroad, a vital communication route for Angola and the neighbouring countries of Zambia and Zaire, is completely paralyzed.

The Soviet Union pursues vigorously in all Third World countries activities aimed at imposing its hegemony. Politico-economic domination is the Soviet goal. The method chosen for the attainment of such politico-economic objectives is military intervention, blackmail — violence. The ultimate goal, however, is world hegemony, world domination — imperialism in its most aggressive and most ambitious manifestation.

In this process of Soviet imperialist expansion the role played by Angola stands out as unique in significance and importance. There are several reasons that explain the singularly profound Soviet involvement in Angola:

1. MPLA provides for the ideal ideological base to Soviet revisionism and social imperialist expansionism. No other political organization in Africa has maintained such a long historical record of faithful and militant solidarity with the Soviet Union as the MPLA. No other political organization in Africa has maintained such longtime ideological dependence upon the Soviet Union.

Agostinho Neto is an internationalist of the Cuban persuasion rather than an African nationalist. He eschews Pan-Africanism. In fact the entire MPLA leadership elite is made up of people of Portuguese ethnic and cultural background. Many of them were officers of the oppressive Portuguese colonial administration at the end of which they sim-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

ply put on a new hat — that of pseudo-Marxist «rulers of independent» Angola. They cannot identify with the vast masses of the oppressed Africans in the country.

CLASS NATURE OF MPLA

Once understood the class origin and the class nature of the Luanda government elite, one may readily comprehend Luanda's demanding acts of shipping young men and women to Cuba to far-away Cuba to harvest Fidel Castro's sugar cane under physically and spiritually degrading conditions; this is reminiscent of the forced labour of the colonial days. No leader worthy of the respect and love of his people would tolerate such affront. During the first four months of this year, several thousands of young Angolans were sent to Cuba's provinces of Camagüey and Oriente to work on sugar cane fields. In March alone, 1 600 youngsters have disembarked at the port of Cienfuegos to serve their «tour of duty». If the price of proletarian internationalism is this dehumanizing servility to the Soviet Union and Cuba, then only Agostinho Neto's MPLA can afford to pay it.

2. Angola is very rich in raw materials and other natural resources: diamonds, gold, copper, iron, phosphates, petroleum, uranium etc. The territorial waters are plentiful in fish. And the soil is very fertile. Raw materials are necessary for the survival of the economies of industrialized countries. By controlling the sources of raw materials — by dominating the raw material producing countries — the Soviet Union can choke all other developed nations to death or at least bring them to their knees.

Several Spanish fishing vessels were recently expelled from Angola territorial waters, while the Soviet Union has already become the gendarme of the Angolan coast.

A large quantity of Angolan diamonds are today ending up in Havana through black market. The Soviet Union produces diamonds, but not in sufficient quantities to warrant the establishment of its own marketing system; for this and other reasons, the Soviet Union thus far has been marketing its diamonds

through the Central Selling Organization of London, a South Africa's De Beers Corporation controlled organization which distributes about 85% of the world's diamonds. The Control of Angolan diamonds could already make it feasible for the Soviet Union to end its partnership with De Beers Corp.

The importance of the uranium ore in the manufacture of nuclear weapons is obvious.

3. Angola is the first African country in which the Soviet Union has carried out an open military intervention to install a government of its operations in Southern Africa. The Soviet Union would like to consider Angola a «liberated zone» from which it can carry out acts of subversion and hit-and-run actions against the neighbouring countries. The success of all Soviet plans in Southern Africa depends almost entirely on the Soviet ability to maintain the MPLA in power and on the consolidation of its hegemony in Angola.

In view of our armed popular resistance, the Soviet and Cubans, in their vain attempts at defending their «liberated zone» are sinking deeper and deeper in the quagmire, bringing in more and more troops but getting nowhere.

No other country in the world is waging an armed revolutionary struggle against Soviet social imperialism (the case of Erythrea being quite recent). The case of Angola, therefore, has no precedent.

Our struggle is against oppression, foreign domination, colonialism and neocolonialism; our struggle is for freedom, liberty and the dignity of the Black man; it is for progress in peace, democracy and socialism. Unfortunately many people refuse cowardly to recognize and to proclaim the Soviet Union as an imperialist, neo-colonialist superpower.

The Soviet Union has imposed upon us the pursuit of a military solution, and we shall pursue it to our full satisfaction. The military defeat of the Soviet-Cuban forces in Angola is inevitable. This will herald a new era for the Third World countries. The image of the Soviet Union and Cuba will be tarnished and their pseudo progressive-socialist mask will fall. The Soviet Union will no longer be the most powerful ally of the socialist bloc. All co-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

ountries that wish progress and social justice in peace and dignity will have to realize that Soviet imperialism is real.

For the time being, it is therefore futile to entertain the illusion of persuading the Soviet Union to participate in the search of political solutions to Southern Africa's problems. Following its brief military victory in the 1975 Angola's civil war which led to the installation of its puppet MPLA Luanda government, the Soviet Union has become the new boss, it tasted the glory of power, and the invincibility of its Cuban expeditionary forces became a myth overnight. The Soviet Union feels strong, so it opts for the use of force and violence to achieve its world domination objectives.

In Angola the Soviet-Cuban forces are confronting the well-organized, disciplined, popular guerilla army of UNITA. For each soldier of the UNITA army, there are 100 civilian men and women equally well organized and equipped to provide him with all necessary support. The Cubans may see the soldier, but there is very little they can do about the one hundred inconspicuous but omnipresent peasants and urban activists. They would have to exterminate a large part of the population of Angola in order to destroy UNITA's army.

ANGOLAN POPULATION HATES CUBANS

In general, the Angolan population hates the Cuban soldiers. That is why the Cubans can only operate in units of battalion (450-600 men) size. The Cubans resent and distrust even the MPLA soldiers. The civilian population has on various occasions taken the initiative to kill Cuban soldiers by whatever popular methods. One full battalion of Cuban and MPLA troops was decimated in the Autumn of last year at Cuma (Huambo Province) by poisoning.

The effectiveness of the UNITA armed forces and the competence of our military commanders in operations have led many people to wonder whether there were some foreign military advisors working with us. Of course there are no foreign elements whatsoever within our armed forces. Our performance is the product

of twelve years of guerilla warfare experience on the terrain, a continuous process of self-improvement, self-discipline and the correct leadership by the most competent, most brilliant sons of Angola.

We must not underestimate the fighting capacity and determination of our people. Colonialist Portugal had solidly established its authority in Angola. It controlled all socio-economic forces. The Portuguese cultured became assimilated, etc. It possessed the formidable PIDE - the State Secret Police. The Portuguese authorities knew Angola like the back of their hand. They had assembled a standing army of 120 000 men to repress and suppress African nationalism. 10% of the country's population were Portuguese (by 1974 there were nearly half a million Portuguese out of a total population of 5,5 million). But despite all these innumerable advantages, the Portuguese colonial rule collapsed by the persistent action of the Angolan nationalists.

The Soviet-Cuban colonial rule in Angola has not as yet consolidated its infrastructures. But this internal socio-politico-military disadvantage is compensated for by an important external factor: while the Portuguese colonial regime was condemned and denounced almost universally - especially by the progressive countries - the Soviet-Cuban colonial rule enjoys support of the socialist countries, with the exception of the courageous position of the People's Republic of China and Albania. The Soviet-Cuban colonial rule in Angola benefits also from the helpless weakness of many Third World countries, as well as from the passivity of the Western powers.

We shall combat foreign domination and foreign oppression, at any stage, and no matter under what colours or ideology it comes. Just as the Western colonialists fooled the world saying that they were in Angola «to civilize and christianize the African» thereby implying that the Africans should not have fought against them, so are the Soviets and their agents attempting to make the world believe that they are in Angola «to repel the South African racist aggressors and to help establish socialism in the country ...» thereby implying that it is reactionary to fight against the Cuban

expeditionary forces. To us there is no «least evil» between Southern Africa's white minority oppressive regimes and the Soviet–Cuban neocolonialist oppression. Both perpetrate humiliation, misery and death for the African.

Both trample upon human rights and human dignity. Both represent a threat to world peace. There is no other realistic appreciation of the problem, in our view, other than what we have just stated.

MAO-TSE-TUNG ON DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

The question of building up the Pan-Africanist Congress as the mass organisation of the Azanian people also involves the question of democracy with the organisation, and relations of mutual trust and confidence between leadership and the rank and file members. In this talk Mao-Tset-Tung, the greatest Marxist of our era, outlines how a Party should practise democracy, correctly handle contradictions amongst its members, and respond to the needs and wishes of the masses. In our own organisations difficulties often arise because of the lack of democracy, of incorrectly handling contradictions amongst ourselves, of the lack of a spirit of criticism and self-criticism. The lack of these revolutionary qualities often turns non-antagonistic contradictions into antagonistic ones.

Of course correct relationships among members and between leadership and rank and file depends to a large extent on

the nature of the leadership: whether it is a leadership of opportunists and careerists out to build their own fortunes or dedicated to the struggle and the cause of our oppressed people. Such a leadership of course is not afraid of the masses and constantly mobilises the masses on the basis of correct policies. As Mao-Tse-Tung once said: those who wish to rule and control others wish to keep them ignorant but those who wish to free the masses wish to keep them enlightened.

Of course correct democratic relationships between leadership and rank and file means little if the organisation is not united around a correct political programme that unites the many to defeat the few and which correctly defines the revolutionary tasks to be undertaken. This political programme too we must update so that the masses of our people understand it and unite around it. Ideological unity is the real basis of all unity.

Comrades! I'm now going to put forward a few ideas. (*warm applause*) Altogether I'll deal with six points, focusing on the question of democratic centralism while also touching on other questions.

This is a question of how to hold meetings. Distribute the draft, invite comments from those present and make amendments accordingly before giving a report. When making a report, one shouldn't just read it out, but should offer some supplementary ideas and explanations. By following this method we can promote de-

mocracy more fully, pool wisdom from all quarters and compare different points of view, and our meetings will become more lively. It has been advisable to use this method for the present conference which is being held to sum up the working experience of 12 years, and particularly that of the past four years, for there are many questions and consequently many opinions. But can all conferences adopt this method? No, not all. To use this method we must have plenty of time. It may sometimes be used at sessions of our people's congress. Comrades from provincial, prefectural and co-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

untry Party committees, when you call meetings in future, you too can adopt this method if conditions permit. Of course, you are busy and cannot usually spend a lot of time on conferences. But there's no harm in having a try when you find the conditions right.

What sort of method is this? It's the method of democratic centralism, the method of the mass line: first democracy, then centralism; from the masses, to the masses; integration of the leadership with the masses. This is the first point I wanted to discuss.

The second point: The question of democratic centralism.

It seems that some of our comrades still don't understand democratic centralism as described by Marx and Lenin. Some of these comrades are already veteran revolutionaries, of the 1938 mould or some other mould — anyway, they've been members of the Communist Party for several decades and still don't understand this question. They are afraid of the masses, afraid of the masses speaking out, afraid of mass criticism. What possible reason is there for Marxist-Leninists to be afraid of the masses? While they avoid mentioning their own mistakes, these comrades are likewise afraid of having their mistakes mentioned by the masses. The more they're afraid, the more they're going to be haunted by ghosts. In my opinion, one shouldn't be afraid. What is there to be afraid of? Our attitude is, uphold the truth and readily correct mistakes. The question of what is right or wrong, what is correct or incorrect, in our work falls under contradictions among the people. Contradictions among the people can't be resolved by curses or fists, still less by knives or guns. They can be resolved only by discussion and reasoning, criticism and self-criticism. In a word, they can be resolved only by the democratic method, by letting the masses speak out.

There should be full democracy both inside and outside the Party, that is, democratic centralism should be practised in earnest in both spheres. Problems should be brought out into the open frankly and the masses allowed to speak out, even if we are going to be abused. The worst that can come out of this abuse is that we will be toppled and thus be unable to

continue in our current jobs — demotion to lower organizations or transfer to other localities. What's so impossible about that? Why should a person go only up and not down? Why should one work only in one place and not be transferred to another? I think that, whether they are justified or not, both demotion and transfer have advantages. They help to temper people's revolutionary will, enable them to investigate and study many new situations, and acquire more useful knowledge. I myself had experience in this respect and benefited a great deal from it. If you don't believe my point, you might give it a try. Szuma Chien said: «When King Wen was detained, he produced the *Book of Changes*; when Confucius was in distress, he compiled the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. Chu Yuan was exiled and so composed the *Li Sao*. Tsochui Ming lost his sight and the *Kuo Yu* followed. Sun Tzu was mutilated before he wrote his book on military science. Lu Pu-wei was transferred to the Shu region and so the world inherited his *Lu Lan*. Han Fei was imprisoned in the Kingdom of Chin and he wrote 'Shui Nan' and 'Ku Fen', two chapters of his great work. Of the 300 poems in the *Book of Odes* most were written by sages to vent their pent-up indignation.» In modern times, people have had doubts about whether in fact King Wen produced the *Book of Changes* or Confucius compiled the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, and we can leave these examples aside and let the specialist solve these problems. But Szuma Chien believed these things to be true. And it is a fact that King Wen was detained and that Confucius was in distress. Except for the one about Tsochui Ming's going blind, the events related by Szuma Chien all refer to the incorrect handling of people by their superiors in ancient times. There were cases where we too handled some cadres incorrectly, and no matter whether their handling was completely incorrect or only partially so, after re-examination they should be rehabilitated according to the merits of each case. But, generally speaking, such incorrect treat-

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

ment — demotion or transfer — tempers their revolutionary will and enables them to absorb much new knowledge from the masses. Here I must make it clear that I am not advocating indiscriminate, incorrect treatment of our cadres, our comrades, or anybody else, in the way the ancients detained King Wen, harassed Confucius, exiled Chu Yuan and removed Sun Tzu's kneecaps. I am not advocating this way of doing things, I am opposed to it. What I mean is that at every stage of human history there have always been such cases of mishandling. In class societies such cases are numerous. In a socialist society such things cannot be entirely avoided either. They are unavoidable whether in periods of leadership with a correct or with an incorrect line. There is one distinction, however. Under a correct line, as soon as cases which have been mishandled are discovered, after re-examination the people concerned will be rehabilitated and apologies will be made to them, so that they will enjoy ease of mind and lift up their heads again. But under an incorrect line, this becomes impossible, and the mistakes can be corrected at a suitable occasion only by those who represent the correct line through the method of democratic centralism. As for those who have actually made mistakes and who, after criticism by comrades and review at a higher level, have been correctly demoted or transferred, it goes without saying that such demotion or transfer will help them correct their mistakes and acquire new knowledge.

At present, there are some comrades who are very afraid of the masses initiating discussion and putting forward ideas which differ from those of the leading organs or the leaders. Whenever a problem is being discussed, they suppress the initiative of the masses and don't allow them to speak out. This attitude is abominable. Democratic centralism is written into our Party Constitution and state Constitution, but they don't apply it. Comrades, we are revolutionaries. If we have really made

mistakes, mistakes which are harmful to the cause of the Party and the people, we should seek the opinions of the masses and of comrades and criticize ourselves. Such self-criticism should sometimes be repeated several times over. If once is not enough and people are not satisfied, it should be done a second time; if they are still not satisfied, then it should be done a third time%: it should go on until nobody has any more criticisms. Some provincial Party committees have done just this. A few provinces have shown some initiative and let people speak out. The early ones started self-criticism in 1959, the late starters began in 1961. Some provinces, such as Honan, Kiangsu and Chinghai, were forced to carry out self-criticism. Some people say there are other provinces which seem to be starting self-criticism only now. But no matter whether they carry out self-criticism on their own initiative or are forced to do so, no matter whether they do so early or late, provided they look squarely at their mistakes and are willing to admit and correct them and let the masses criticize them — provided they adopt this attitude, we should always welcome it.

Criticism and self-criticism is a method; it is the method of resolving contradictions among the people and indeed the only method. There is no other method. But if we don't have full democracy and don't truly practise democratic centralism, this method of criticism and self-criticism cannot be applied.

Don't we have many difficulties right now? It is impossible to overcome these difficulties unless we rely on the masses and arouse the enthusiasm of the masses and the cadres. But if you don't explain the situation to the masses and the cadres, open your hearts to them and let them voice their opinions, if they are still afraid of you and don't dare speak, it will be impossible to arouse their enthusiasm. I said in 1957 that we should create «a political situation in which we have both centralism and democracy, both discipline and

freedom, both unity of will and personal ease of mind and liveliness.» We should create such a political situation both inside and outside the Party. Otherwise it will be impossible to arouse the enthusiasm of the masses. We cannot overcome difficulties without democracy. Of course, it's even more impossible to do so without centralism. But if there's no democracy there won't be any centralism.

Without democracy there can't be correct centralism because centralism can't be established when people have divergent views and don't have unity of understanding. What is meant by centralism? First, there must be concentration of correct ideas. Unity of understanding, of policy, plan, command and action is attained on the basis of concentrating correct ideas. This is unity through centralism. But if all those concerned are still not clear about the problems, if their opinions are still unexpressed or their anger is still not vented, how can you achieve this unity through centralism? Without democracy, it is impossible to sum up experience correctly. Without democracy, without ideas coming from the masses, it is impossible to formulate good lines, principles, policies or methods. As far as the formulation of lines, principles, policies and methods is concerned, our leading organs merely play the role of a processing plant. Everyone knows that a factory cannot do any processing without raw material. It cannot produce good finished products unless the raw material is sufficient in quantity and suitable in quality. If there is no democracy, if there is no knowledge of what is going on down below and no clear idea about it, if there is no adequate canvassing of the opinions of all concerned and no communication between higher and lower levels, and if instead issues are decided solely by the leading organs of the higher levels on the strength of one-sided or inaccurate material, then such decisions can hardly avoid being subjective and it will be impossible to achieve unity in understanding and action or achieve

true centralism. Isn't the main topic of our present conference opposition to decentralism and the strengthening of centralism and unity? If we fail to promote democracy in full measure, then will this centralism, this unity, be genuine or sham? Will it be real or empty? Will it be correct or incorrect? Of course it will only be sham, empty and incorrect.

Our centralism is centralism built on the foundation of democracy. Proletarian centralism is centralism with a broad democratic base. The Party committees at all levels are the organs which exercise centralized leadership. But leadership by the Party committee means collective leadership, not arbitrary decision by the first secretary alone. Within Party committees, democratic centralism alone should be practised. The relationship between the first secretary and the other secretaries and committee members is one of the minority being subordinate to the majority. Take the Standing Committee or the Political Bureau of the Central Committee by way of example. It often happens that when I say something, regardless of whether it is correct or incorrect, if the others don't agree, I must accede to their opinion because they are the majority. I am told that that there are now some provincial, prefectural and county Party committees where all matters are decided by the first secretary alone. This is quite wrong. How can we justify the idea that what one person says goes? I am referring to important matters here, not to the routine work coming after decisions. If a matter is important, it must be discussed collectively, different opinions must be heeded, and the complexities of the situation and the dissenting opinions must be analysed seriously. Thought must be given to the various possibilities and estimates made of the various aspects of a situation, what is good and what bad, what is easy and what difficult, what is possible and what impossible. This should be done as carefully and thoroughly as possible. To act otherwise is just one-man tyranny. Those first secre-

taries should be called tyrants and not «squad leaders» practising democratic centralism. Once upon a time there was a certain Hsiang Yu, who was called the tyrant of Western Chu. He hated listening to opinions which differed from his own. One Fan Tseng offered him advice, but Hsiang Yu didn't listen to what he had to say. There was another man named Liu Pang, the founder of the Han Dynasty, who was better at accepting ideas different from his own. An intellectual called Li Yi-chi went to see Liu Pang. When he was first announced, it was as a scholar of the Confucian school. Liu Pang said there was a war on and he couldn't see scholars. Li Yi-chi flared up and said to the gatekeeper: «You get in there again and say that I'm a drinking man from Kaoyang, not a scholar.» The gatekeeper did as he was told. «All right, ask him in.» When Li Yi-chi entered, Liu Pang was washing his feet but he quickly got up to welcome him. Still angry because Liu Pang had refused to see a scholar, Li Yi-chi gave him a dressing down. He said, «Look here, do you want to conquer the world or don't you? Why do you take an elder so lightly?» Li Yi-chi was then over 60 and Liu Pang was younger, so Li called himself an «elder». At this, Liu Pang apologized and promptly accepted Li Yi-chi's plan of seizing the county of Chenliu. This incident can be found in the biographies of Li Yi-chi and Lu Chia in the *Historical Records*. In the feudal period, Liu Pang was described by historians as a hero «who was generous and openminded and who readily listened to advice.» Liu Pang and Hsiang Yu fought for many years. In the end Liu Pang won and Hsiang Yu was defeated. this was no accident. Today some of our first secretaries can't even match the feudal Liu Pang but have a bit of Hsiang Yu in them. These comrades don't change, they'll ultimately be overthrown. Isn't there an opera called *The Tyrant Bids His Lady Farewell*? If these comrades remain unchanged, the day will come when they too will be «bidding their ladies farewell».

(Laughter) why do I have to put the matter so strongly? It's because I hope that by speaking a bit sarcastically, I can prick some comrades and get them to give this some hard thought. It will be best if they can't sleep for a night or two. if they can sleep, then I'll be the unhappy one because they still haven't felt any pain.

Some of our comrades can't bear to hear any opinion contrary to their own and can't tolerate any criticism. That is very wrong. During this conference, the group meeting of one province started off in a very lively manner, but as soon as the secretary of the provincial Party committee went to sit in, a hush fell and nobody said a word. Comrade provincial Party secretary, why do you go and sit there? Why don't you stay in your own room and think things over and let the others talk freely? Since such an atmosphere has been brought about and people don't dare speak in your presence, then you should absent yourself. Whoever makes mistakes must criticize himself, and we must let others speak up, let others criticize. On June 12 last year, the last day of the working conference in Peking convened by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, I discussed my own shortcomings and mistakes. I asked the comrades to convey what I said to the provinces and localities. I found out later that many localities were not informed. It's as if my mistakes could or should be kept hidden. Comrades, they mustn't be kept hidden! Of all the mistakes made by the Central Committee I am responsible for those directly related to me and I have a share of the responsibility for those not directly related to me, because I am its Chairman. It's not that I want other people to slough off their responsibility — there are some other comrades who also bear responsibility — but I am the person who ought to be primarily responsible. The secretaries of our provincial, prefectural and county Party committees, right down to the secretaries of Party committees of districts, enterprises and communes, being first sec-

retaries, should bear responsibility for shortcomings and mistakes in work. Shirking responsibility, fearing to shoulder it and forbidding people to speak out as if one were a tiger whose backside no one dares touch — ten out of ten who adopt this attitude will fail. People will always speak out sooner or later. You think that people really won't dare to touch the backsides of tigers like you? They bloody well will!

Unless we fully promote people's democracy and inner-Party democracy and unless we fully implemenent proletarian democracy, it will be impossible for China to have true proletarian centralism. Without a high degree of democracy it is impossible to have a high degree of centralism, and without a high degree of centralism it is impossible to establish a socialist economy. And what will happen to our country if we fail to establish a socialist economy? It will turn into a revisionist state, indeed a bourgeois state, and the dictatorship of the proletariat will turn into a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and a reactionary, fascist dictatorship at that. This is a question which very much deserves our vigilance and I hope our comrades will give it a good deal of thought.

Without democratic centralism, the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be consolidated. To practise democracy among the people and to exercise dictatorship over the enemies of the people — these two aspects are not to be separated. When they are combined, we have proletarian dictatorship, or what may be called people's democratic dictatorship. Our slogan is: «A people's democratic dictatorship led by the proletariat and based on the alliance of the workers and peasants.» How does the proletariat exercise leadership? It leads through the Communist Party. The Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat. The proletariat unites with all classes and strata who favour, support and participate in socialist revolution and socialist construction, and exercises dictatorship over the reactionary

classes or rather their remnants. In our country where the system of exploitation of man by man has already been destroyed and the economic base of the landlord class and the bourgeoisie done away with, the reactionary classes are no longer as formidable as in the past. For example, they are no longer as formidable as in 1949 when the People's Republic was founded, or as in 1957 when the bourgeois Rightists frenziedly attacked us. Therefore, we speak of them as the remnants of the reactionary classes. But in no case should we underestimate these remnants. We must carry on our struggle against them. The reactionary classes which have been overthrown still seek a comeback. And in socialist society new bourgeois elements continue to emerge. Classes and class struggle exist throughout the socialist stage. This struggle is long and complex and at times even very acute. Our instruments of dictatorship must be strengthened, not weakened. Our public security system is in the hands of comrades who follow the correct line. But it is possible that security departments in one place or another are in the hands of bad people. And there are also a few comrades doing public security work who don't rely on the masses or on the Party. In ferreting out counterrevolutionaries, they don't follow the line of working through the masses under the leadership of the Party committees, but rely solely on secret work, on so-called professional work. Professional work is necessary; investigation and interrogation are absolutely necessary in dealing with counterrevolutionaries. But the most important thing is to follow the mass line under the leadership of the Party committee. It is especially necessary to rely on the masses and the Party in exercising dictatorship over the reactionary classes as a whole. Dictatorship over the reactionary classes does not mean the physical elimination of all reactionary class elements; the aim is to remould them, to remould them by suitable methods, to make them into new men. Without broad democracy for

the people, it is impossible for the dictatorship of the proletariat to be consolidated or for political power to be stable. Without democracy, without arousing the masses and without supervision by the masses, it is impossible to exercise effective dictatorship over the reactionaries

and bad elements or to remould them effectively; they will continue to make trouble and may stage a comeback. We must be vigilant on this question, and I hope comrades will give it a good deal of thought too.

THE LESSON OF KAMPUCHEA

BY SAMIR AMIN

INTRODUCTION: This article was first published in French in 1976, in *«L'imperialisme et le développement inégale»*, Minuit. The extract is from Chapter 8, «The Problem of Transition and the Building of Socialism». Samir Amin, the author, was born in Egypt and is now director of the U.N.-sponsored African Institute of Economic Development and Planning in Dakar, Senegal. He wrote *Accumulation on a World Scale* (NY 1975). The article deals from a serious Marxist point of view with how the Kampuchean Communist Party went about dealing with the question of transforming their society along socialist lines, and certainly by direct implication gives the lie to the distortions and horror stories of massacres that the imperialist and revisionist mass media have been pouring out in order to discredit the great example of socialist construction in Kampuchea.

There is one very recent socialist revolution that we hear nothing about. This is no doubt partly because the Cambodian revolutionaries themselves do not feel themselves accountable, to all the «heralds» of socialism. But it is also because this revolution, like certain others, has departed from the established formulas. It took place in a country which is among the most «backward» in the world capitalist system; it took the form of a peasant war led by a tiny group of «intellectuals» in a country with almost no working class; it seized decaying towns without firing a shot; it immediately closed the country almost entirely to all external influence; and it carried out a rapid disurbanisation. Out of some resentment, some people already regard it as an insignificant peasant rising (jacquerie), while others will claim, against all evidence, that the revolution was imported. In our view, the lesson of Cambodia is quite essential, because it occurred in a country whose structures and situation are highly reminiscent of those of the average African country and of some regions of Asia. Thus the victorious strategy of our Cambodian brothers

must be systematically compared with those advocated elsewhere by the various people concerned.

Cambodia is a small country, both as to population and as to its place in the world capitalist system. Being relatively under-urbanised and under-industrialised, it was ranked at the tail-end of the underdeveloped countries. A few years ago, its rural masses did not seem any more ripe for a revolution than those of the African Sahel, the Congo, Zaire, Dahomey, Madagascar and most of the other «backward» regions. Its urban masses did not seem much more ready; a tiny so-called «privileged» working class, a petty bourgeoisie of nationalist intellectuals and civil servants, a foreign comprador bourgeoisie, a few large-scale imperialist interests concentrated in the small areas of plantations. After direct colonisation, there was a neo-colonial regime characterised, as elsewhere, by the rapid enrichment of a political class which used the State apparatus to get its percentage out of foreign capital, investing the proceeds of its misappropriations in the construction of villas rented to foreigners,

in the running of lorries and taxis, etc. in a way, an average African republic.

NATURE OF CLASS SOCIETY IN KAMPUCHEA

But we need to push the comparison further. The abundance of land had also delayed the development of a precapitalist class exploitation of the peasant masses. Not that Cambodian society was classless. The Khmer State belonged to the type of State that extracted from the villagers a tribute in kind, in labour and in men. For this it could rely not only on its army of civil servants, but also its allies within the peasant society. The latter was thus composed of families of unequal personal status («slaves», free men etc.), and unequal social and political status (chiefs, dependents, etc.) and even unequal economic status (unequal access to the good land and in varying quantities, etc.) But the economic exploitation of some by others was, if not non-existent, at least marginal. There was nothing comparable to the so-called «feudal» structures of China, Vietnam, Northern India or Egypt, for example. On the whole it was a society very like most African societies.

As a reaction against the hollow assertion of the national or neo-colonial leaders that their societies had been classless — which ignored the state exploitation that they inherited and maintained — progressive European sociologists endeavoured to highlight the internal class differentiations of these peasants societies. This approach frequently induced them to confuse the relations of social domination with relations of exploitation (extortion of a surplus). This inaccurate view entails a strategy which the Cambodian experience has now shown to be mistaken.

When imperialism found ready to hand some advanced pro-capitalist forms of exploitation within the peasant society itself, it had no difficulty in finding allies in the exploiting rural classes and in integrating the conquered society into the capitalist system. Gradually transformed in this way, the old class differentiations changed their form and content, and were reduced to the opposition between land-

owners (estate-owners and/or kulaks) and working peasants (medium peasants who were thus unable to expand, poor peasants, tenant farmers, sharecroppers, landless peasants, farm labourers). The large estate-owners and the kulaks — a minority — formed an alliance with imperialism and developed the cash crops which the imperialists were interested in. They took advantage of this integration into the world system, often accompanied by the land hunger of those who were more exploited, to impose continually increasing farm rents and tougher terms for sharecroppers, and to reduce the wages of the farm labourers. The working peasants, and particularly the majority, and often the overwhelming majority, which the poor and landless peasants tended to become, were able to become the army of a revolution that was first national and democratic and then socialist. The history of the way the Egyptian «feudal lords», the Indian zemindars, and the Chinese gentry turned into latifundary estate-owners follows this model.

At a certain stage in its development, imperialism had to transfer the centre of gravity of its rural alliance with the latifundaries to a broader class of rich peasants, who benefited from bourgeois land reforms. At this stage, the enlargement of the internal market by the development of import substitution industries required both an increase in agricultural output for the urban markets and the release of extra manpower so that urban wages could be reduced.

IMPERIALISM AND THE PEASANTRY

But, when faced with societies such as those of Cambodia and many regions of Africa, imperialism was somewhat at a loss. It could of course form an alliance with the reigning monarchies and the local chiefdoms in order to establish its political and military domination. But how could it exploit the peasant masses and force them to produce for it?

One possible procedure: to expropriate the indigenous inhabitants and establish settlers on the land or to give the land to capitalist settlers on the land or to give the land to capitalist firms, granting them the necessary resources to develop export crops by modern methods,

and providing them with cheap labour by various means ranging from pure and simple coercion (forced labour) to «economic» constraint (compelling the indigenous people to obtain money in this way to pay their taxes, confining them to inadequate «reserves» etc.). The imperialists did do this, but the areas developed in this way were usually limited, and above all the majority of the peasant population remained outside this system, except in South Africa, Rhodesia, Kenya and Algeria.

In Cambodia — where it is Vietnamese — and in Madagascar and Africa as a whole, the wage labour of the colonial plantations never represented more than a small fraction of the rural labour force. occupied towns, attacked all the symbols of their oppression, mercilessly fired on all the «men wearing ties», burned the airconditioned villas, and did not spare either the missionaries in charge of their souls, or the medical personell in charge of their bodies, or the teachers in charge of their brains. There are similar examples everywhere, from Cameroon to Kenya and Madagascar. All these revolts were crushed. Was this because of their internal divisions? Or the treachery of the «privileged» among them? Not at all. The revolts were crushed from outside, by a more powerful and better organised enemy.

What they had to do, then, in order to win in their turn, was to weaken their common external adversary by dividing him instead of allowing him to accentuate their own internal divi-

sions. But for this they had to rise above their rural horizons, find allies in the towns, and acquire a leadership that could coordinate their attacks against the towns and weaken the enemy from within. In short, they alone can make their revolt against capital a stage in the world socialist revolution.

So there are two opposing strategies here. The first, suggested by those who dwell on the internal divisions of the rural world, advocates categorically the all-out and immediate development of the class struggle in the countryside. This strategy may seem «revolutionary»; by compelling somparison with China or Viet-nam, it may attract left-wing sympathy. But it leads to failure and makes itself the objective ally of imperialism by speeding up, after the defeat, the disintegration and subejction of the countryside. The second strategy is the one which led our Cambodian brothers to victory. Being better Marxists, they realized that their country was neither China nor Viet-nam. They formed a peasant army, united those who had been divided first by the old Khmer kingdoms and then by imperialism, and weakened the enemy by depriving him of the support of the workers and the dispossessed of the towns as well as the patriotic sections of the petty bourgeoisie, undermined its army of repression, and finally won. **The lesson in revolutionary strategy they have given us is doubtless the most relevant one for most of the countries of Africa.**

BUT WHAT ABOUT SOCIAL IMPERIALISM, COMRADE DAN?

ROSS J. LONGHURST

DAN NABUDERE, The Political Economy of Imperialism: Its Theoretical and Polemical Treatment from Mercantilist to Multilateral Imperialism, Zed Press and Tanzania Publishing House, 1977. Price 7.75.

In the thirty odd years since World War II most of the colonies of the old European imperialist powers have gained nominal political independence. During the same period the world's first socialist country, the U.S.S.R., has undergone a counterrevolution and been

transformed from a society where socialism was being constructed into a form of state monopoly capitalism: social fascism. These two developments taken together go a long way towards explaining the dearth of serious Marxist investigations into and theorizing about

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

imperialism until about ten years ago. On the one hand the liberation of many Third World countries from direct colonial rule temporarily obscured the fact that the domination of finance capital in these countries has been maintained. On the other hand the degeneration of the Soviet Union brought about confusion among those adhering to a Marxist outlook with the result that serious Marxist scientific study more or less came to a halt while new political orientations and alignments took place.

But things are very different now. In the last decade a quickening flow of treaties on modern imperialism has been pouring from the presses. Among these works are *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* by Andre Gunder Frank, *Unequal Exchange* by Arghiri Emmanuel and *The Economics of Imperialism* by Michael Barratt Brown, just to mention a few. One thing all these authors have in common is a claim to approach the question of imperialism from a Marxist standpoint. Another common factor is that they all, to a greater or lesser extent, set out to revise Lenin's theory of imperialism. Either it is claimed that Lenin's interpretation was incorrect even for the period he was dealing with or else that monopoly capitalism has undergone major qualitative changes in the last sixty years and thus Lenin's theory needs to be expanded and developed to bring it up to date.

One of the latest contributions to the literature on imperialism is *The Political Economy of Imperialism* by Dan Nabudere. This book stands out sharply from the other books mentioned for as well as providing a concise general account of the development of imperialism in the capitalist era it is a polemic directed against the main contemporary theorists of imperialism.

Nabudere writes from a Marxist-Leninist point of view and sets out to show that the neo-Marxists' theories are «no more than a reformulation of the outworn products of bourgeois economism and Trotskyism» p. viii. He does this by providing a thorough analysis of post-war U.S. multilateral imperialism, based on a wealth of concrete data, which demonstrates the essential correctness of Lenin's theory in

addition to mounting a polemical critique directed against the neo-Marxist revisionists.

IMPERIALISM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM

The first three parts of Nabudere's book are devoted to a wideranging account of the rise and growth of capitalism and the changing types of imperialism which constitute an integral part of the capitalist system. During the Middle Ages in Europe, when the capitalist mode of production was still growing within the womb of feudal society, **mercantilist imperialism**¹ based on **feudal merchant capital** made its appearance. Nabudere's account of this type of imperialism closely follows that given by Marx in *Capital*. It was essentially based on the **unequal exchange** of commodities between Europe and the rest of the world, first of all Asia and then later on Africa and the Americas. This exchange of unequal values resulted in the European merchants accumulating vast sums of gold and silver bullion. Straightforward trade was supplemented by outright military conquest, plundering and enslavement of aboriginal peoples. The outcome of this early form of imperialist exploitation was the **primitive accumulation**² of capital which provided the foundations for the rise and eventual dominance of the capitalist social order in Europe. At the same time the hegemony of capitalism in Europe brought about the demise of mercantilist imperialism.

The next stage of imperialism was **free trade imperialism** based on **industrial and local capital**. This is most closely associated with the rise of industrial capitalism based on machine production which first emerged in Britain during the eighteenth century. At this point in the development of capitalism the bourgeoisie were first confronted with the problem of a falling rate of profit. The value of composition of the capital invested in the productive process was increasingly concentrated in machinery, buildings, raw materials, etc. — the **constant capital**³ — and a decreasing proportion of capital expenditure was paid out as wages to the workers employed, i.e. **variable capital**⁴. Since the profits of the capitalist are constituted by the unpaid labour time⁵ worked

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

by his employees a rise in the proportion of constant to variable capital inevitably tends to reduce the rate of profit he receives from the capital invested. However much the capitalist class attempted to and succeeded in intensifying and increasing the rate of exploitation of their indigenous proletariat they were still confronted with the spectre of a falling rate of profit. This was particularly the case in the most technologically advanced industries such as cotton spinning and weaving where the rate of **organic composition**⁶ of capital was the highest.

Foreign trade provided a way out for the bourgeoisie who were faced with this crisis of profitability. The finding, opening up and development abroad of new sources of cheap raw materials served to reduce the cost of the elements of constant capital and thus to reduce the organic composition of capital. At the same time cheap foreign supplies of food were procured which enabled the real wages of the British proletariat to be maintained while simultaneously increasing the rate of surplus value extracted from them. The comparatively advanced technology of British industry meant that these raw materials and food stuffs from outside of Europe could be paid for by the sale of low priced industrial manufactures to the countries that supplied the primary commodities. This economic strategy enabled the British bourgeoisie to reduce the organic composition of the capital while continuing with technological innovation, maintain and even increase the rate of exploitation of the British proletariat and at the same time to realise this ever expanding volume of surplus value by selling the commodities produced in the new foreign markets.

In putting forward this account of free trade imperialism as it was during the late eighteenth century and first two thirds of the nineteenth century Nabudere is basing himself on Marx's theory as expounded by Lenin. As Nabudere points out, this conceptual framework is very different from the popular underconsumptionist misinterpretation of the Marxist theory of imperialism which attained theoretical expression in **The Accumulation of Capital** by Rosa Luxemburg. According to this view the

motive force behind free trade imperialism is the inability of the home markets of the capitalist countries to absorb the growing volume of goods produced. Consequently, it is argued, the capitalists must find markets abroad in order to realise the surplus value embodied in these goods. This perspective locates the fundamental causes of imperialism in the sphere of **exchange** as opposed to the sphere of **production** and such a line of reasoning is a radical departure from the basic premises of Marxist political economy. The errors of Red Rosa on this score have been exposed many times before but it is important to draw attention to the matter once again because underconsumptionist views are far from dead as the pervasive influence of Baran and Sweezy demonstrates.

Free trade imperialism, unlike mercantilist imperialism, did not in general consist of an exchange of unequal values. On the contrary equal values were exchanged but even so this phase of imperialism had a catastrophic effect on the pre-capitalist societies into which it intruded. The older mercantilist imperialism had little effect on the mode of production of these societies. Very often, the European merchant capitalists were out to obtain supplies of handicraft products. For example, throughout most of the eighteenth century there was a steadily rising volume of calicos exported from India to Britain. This cotton cloth was produced by traditional craftsmen. While India was subject to British military intervention this in itself did not greatly disturb the feudal relations of production which prevailed. The advent of free trade imperialism radically transformed this state of affairs. From the end of the eighteenth century cheap machine-made cloth was exported to India from Britain. The price per unit of this produce was far less than that of the Indian handicraft product and so the steady ruin of calico manufacture and trade both for the home and export markets of India came about. At the same time the demand of British manufacturers for cheap raw materials, for example jute, stimulated the growth of agricultural production for exchange rather than for the immediate subsistence of the producers. These developments «burst asunder», to use

AZANIA (SOUTH AFRICA) IS AN AFRICAN COUNTRY

th expression of Marx and Engels, the feudal relations of production which had hitherto prevailed in India. Thus free trade imperialism accelerated the break-up of feudalism in the countries such as India and China. Again, Nabudere's account is not simply of historical interest in stressing the exchange of equal values under free trade imperialism. This is an important point to make for, as we shall see, many of the contemporary theorists of imperialism quite inncorrectly resort to the notion of unequal exchange in trying to explain modern imperialism.

Nabudere's sweeping historical exposition of pre-monopoly capitalist forms of imperialism is of particular value for readers in the imperialist countries. It draws attention to the fact that capitalism from its beginning has had an imperialist character. What is more, imperialism is not a purely fortuitous side-effect of capitalist development but constituted a necessary and integral part of the actual genesis of this social system. Imperialism, in its different forms, is and always has been an integral element of capitalism. The lesson to be learnt is that imperialism can and will only disappear with the final demise of the reign of capitalism.

MODERN IMPERIALISM

It was the British bourgeoisie who, during the first half of the nineteenth century, were the most enthusiastic advocates of international free trade. This was entirely natural because since the industrialisation of Britain had preceded that of other countries by nearly a century British capitalists could easily overcome any competition from their less technologically developed foreign rivals. But from around 1870 France, Germany and the U.S.A. presented a growing challenge to the international hegemony of British capitalism. The Tarriff barriers went up and the British lion's share of international trade was slowly but surely nibbled away.

Meanwhile the struggle of the capitalists in these countries to maintain their rate of profit

was bringing about the transformation of competitive capitalism into **monopoly capitalism**, as described by Lenin in his work **Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism**. *For the capitalists the tendency of the rate of profit to fall manifested itself in the form of the continuous necessity to introduce technological innovations into the productive process and to produce on an ever larger scale so as to try to keep costs of production down and profit margins up. Thus the concentration of capital, i.e. a growth in the account of capital owned by an individual capitalist, and the centralisation of capital, i.e. the merging of hitherto separate capitals, rapidly took place. While this economic strategy gave temporary respite from the profitability crisis for some individual capitalists it nonetheless raised the organic composition of capital as a whole and thus merely accelerated the tendency for the rate of profit to fall. The extensive reconstruction of capital which took place in the last part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries, sometimes called the **second industrial revolution**? necessitated the investment of massive new sums of capital. Previously, industrial and bank capital had been in the hands of different sections of the bourgeoisie. But the industrial capitalists were unable to assemble sufficient new capital from their diminishing flow of profits and thus had no choice but to turn to the bank capitalists. In this way the rule of **finance capital**, the merging of industrial and bank capital, came about.*

The rise of monopoly capitalism within Western Europe and the U.S.A. brought into being a new phase of imperialism the central feature of which is **export of capital**. The earlier free trade imperialism had been driven abroad by the search for supplies of cheap raw materials but had mostly obtained these in exchange for industrial products. But the massive increase in the productive power of monopoly capitalist industry meant that the existing sources of raw materials were scarce in terms of quantity and dear in terms of cost. In order to counteract the tendency of the rate of profit to fall it was necessary to lower the organic composition of capital. This could be done by cheape-

ning the cost of raw materials. So it was that in the last decades of the nineteenth century vast amounts of capital were invested in mining, agriculture and the building of railways and ports in the economically undeveloped regions of the world. Since the workforce employed in these projects had a customarily low standard of living and since they were often forcibly coerced to work for the foreign enterprises the imperialists were able to extract a very high rate of surplus value. This, together with the comparatively low organic composition of this *exported capital*, meant that the imperialist investors received a very high rate of profit. Thus it was that the second major crisis of profitability of capitalism was temporarily resolved.

As Lenin pointed out, the whole world was quickly divided up among the imperialist powers. However, the inexorable advance of the productive forces and the resulting growth of monopoly capitalist industry on an ever expanding scale determined that wars of redivision among the imperialist powers were inevitable. So far we have lived through two such wars, World Wars I and II.

MULTILATERAL IMPERIALISM

Nabudere makes his own contributions to the theory of imperialism in his discussion of U.S. imperialism. From the beginning of World War II the aim of U.S. policy was to penetrate the spheres of domination of Britain, France, Germany and Japan. After World War II the way was clear for U.S. monopoly capitalism because its war-depleted rivals were in no position to dispute U.S. hegemony. The U.S. Government set out to reduce trade barriers on a world scale so that it could penetrate the markets of the older imperialist countries, both at home and abroad. Important instruments of this policy were the International Monetary Fund, The World Bank and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In theory these were set up as international agencies but in practice have been means for advancing U.S. monopoly capitalist interests. Not only did the U.S.A. succeed in penetrating the Third World preserves of the other imperialist countries but

it also gained a large degree of control over the economies of these countries by means of direct investment, especially through the Marshall Plan. This programme of investment was inspired not solely by economic motives but also by a desire to stabilize these capitalist countries in the face of a perceived threat from the then existing socialist camp headed by the U.S.S.R.. This economic strategy was backed up by a massive armaments programme to equip the U.S. led system of military alliances, e.g. NATO and SEATO, that were established throughout the capitalist world.

In the multilateral phase of modern imperialism the very intensifying concentration and centralization of capital takes on a new form, the giant **transnational corporation**, which combines the earlier forms of monopolisation, (cartels, syndicates and trusts), at a qualitatively higher level. The transnational corporations have typically developed from export-oriented production into the setting up of production plants abroad although centralized financial direction is retained. One of the characteristic features of post-World War II imperialism has been the great expansion in foreign-owned industrial production in the Third World. While the supply of cheap raw materials to the U.S.A., Western Europe and Japan is more vital than ever before it is at the same time true that the imperialist grip on the Third World has been consolidated by means of investing capital in industrial development.

Nabudere emphasises the fact that the transnational corporations obtain a much higher rate of profit abroad than they do at home. The key element in the transnational corporate strategy is the massive amounts spent on research and development and the resultant advanced technological, management and marketing techniques. Much of this R & D is government financed. Needless to say, the giant corporations jealously guard their monopoly of science-based production methods and by means of patents and licences are able to obtain a huge income from firms only partly or not at all under their ownership. Nabudere goes on to give a detailed catalogue of the methods employed by the transnationals to move their

funds around the world unhampered by the economic policies of national governments.

But the world hegemony of U.S. imperialism is crumbling and indeed has not gone unchallenged ever since its beginning. The rising tide of national liberation movements in the Third World have persistently opposed the advance of U.S. monopoly capitalism, most spectacularly in Indo-China, and now the U.S.A. is very much on the defensive. Furthermore, the formation of the E.E.C. and the resurgence of West Germany and Japan in the 1960s and 1970s has trespassed on U.S. markets and sources of raw materials. Even though U.S. capital has a significant stake in its competitors' home industries it is nonetheless a fact that the old rivalries and conflicts of interests are reasserting themselves.

RECENT THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM

The most interesting part of Nabudere's book is his critique of recent «Marxist» analyses of contemporary imperialism. These works fall into two broad categories: the 'underconsumptionist' represented by Baran and Sweezy and the 'unequal exchange' school of which Emmanuel is a leading exponent. Nabudere exposes both of these trends as departing from the fundamental tenets of Marxist political economy and as incapable of explaining the reality of imperialism today.

According to Baran and Sweezy the intervention of the state in the economy helps monopoly capital to reap higher than average profits. In fact, they argue, the combination of the ability to impose high price levels and to greatly reduce costs by means of largely government financed R & D results in the monopolies having at their disposal a vast and ever-growing surplus. Reinvestment of this surplus in productive activity simply amplifies the problem so the surplus, which must be absorbed if economic crisis is to be avoided, has to be spent on unproductive activities, especially advertising, government services and, most importantly, military spending. Thus the rise of the warfare state based on the 'permanent arms' economy. As Nabudere points out, this theory tends to suggest that U.S. monopoly

capitalism wages wars of imperialist oppression in order to use up its surplus! This line of reasoning is really a return to Rosa Luxemburg's underconsumptionism. It abandons Marx's premise that the crises of capitalism are ones of overproduction and not ones of underconsumption. Baran and Sweezy explicitly abandon the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall and in so doing put forward a form of Keynesianism in Marxist clothing. If the theory of Baran and Sweezy were correct then surely the problem of U.S. imperialism would not be to use every means possible to maintain its exploitation of the Third World but rather how best to persuade the people of the world to unburden them of this embarrassing surplus by accepting it as a happily disposed of gift?

Emmanuel and others try to explain modern imperialism in terms of an *unequal exchange* of values between the imperialist 'centres' and the neo-colonial 'peripheries'. In other words they are arguing that mercantilist imperialism is still very much alive. Emmanuel's particular version of this thesis centres on wage differentials between the centre and the periphery. According to Emmanuel a country with lower wage levels loses in exchange with a country with higher wages. This is supposed to be because prices are determined by wage rates. Thus the country with the low wage rate sells its exports below value and the high wage rate country exports at prices above value. Emmanuel argues that the high wages of the workers in the centre are dependent upon the low wages in the periphery. The drain of value from periphery to centre stunts the economic development of the former and enhances that of the latter.

Once again, Marx has been cast aside. Relative prices are not determined by wage levels. Rather they are determined by the socially necessary labour time needed to produce a given product. Wage levels are determined by the value of the goods and services necessary for the maintenance of the worker and his family at their customarily established standard of living. In the Third World the value of wages is comparatively low, for reasons mentioned earlier, and thus rates of profit are comparatively high. Also, the relatively low organic composition of capital in the periphery means that pro-

ductivity is not very high and thus even with low rate of surplus value the real wages of the workers will not be very high. Emmanuel also overlooks the fact that most of the capital in the periphery is owned or effectively controlled by imperialist interests and not by a national bourgeoisie. It is not the case that the workers in the imperialist countries are in general the direct beneficiaries of the extreme exploitation of workers in Third World countries. The class character of Emmanuel's thesis is made clear by Nabudere. It posits an antagonistic conflict of interests between the workers in the centre and those in the periphery. Not only in Emmanuel's thesis erroneous but it is also dangerously counter revolutionary.

A CHALLENGE TO THE AUTHOR

Cont. from Inside Front Cover

the multi-racial concept peddled by the hacks of the white-led so-called South African "Communist" Party. The ANC-CP sees the struggle in Azania as one for "racial harmony" which means in reality that the Black people who are the victims of white racism/national oppression must bend over backwards to accommodate themselves to this racialism. This concept we reject entirely. The robbers (the white settler colonialist bourgeoisie) cannot sit at the same table with those they have robbed on a basis of equality. Equality means that they (the robbers) must first be dispossessed. This is also the essence of the class struggle in Azania.

IKWEZI is a direct reply to the garbage of the "African Communist" a journal that is African in name only, since its entire staff is composed of South African whites. There is not a single Black writer on the staff! The African names like A.N.C. Nxumalo is pseudo names for hacks like Ronnie Kassrils, Brian Bunting, Ruth First. This is a shameful and cynical deception practised upon the African people by the white-led ANC-CP who in the 50 miserable years of its existence has been unable to train any African communists. No, having consistently betrayed the national struggle and unable to take up a correct Marxist-Leninist position on the national question because of their own white racialism, they dare not trust Black communists except those who play the role of stooges like Alex La Guma, Reggie September, Dr. Dadoo, etc. who have as much communism in them as there is in an elephant's fart.

IKWEZI takes a firm stand against Russian social-imperialism and regards it as being the greater danger compared to American imperialism which is being forced to make concessions to the national struggle of the Azanian people and has developed contradictions with the white racist bourgeoisie on this basis. The ANC-CP are nothing more than stooges of social-imperialism and is working overtime to deliver the country to this new imperialist power. Social-imperialism itself has abandoned all revolutionary principles and only wants stooges whom it anoints with Marxism-Leninism and the white-led ANC-CP set up fits in perfectly with this. Social-imperialism (itself practising its own brand of white chauvinism/national oppression against the huge population of national minorities in the Soviet Union) sees the struggle in Azania as one for multi-racialism and condemns the Pan Africanist Congress as a black chauvinist organisation.

Dan Nabudere has written the best book on imperialism to appear in recent years. The present reviewer has learnt much from studying Nabudere's concentrated exposition and argument. But there is one glaring omission in this work — SOVIET SOCIAL IMPERIALISM. At no point in the text is this critically important development ever raised for discussion. Even in Barratt Brown's book the possible existence of such a beast is discussed and rejected despite the presentation of much evidence suggesting the opposite conclusion. But Nabudere is silent. The readers of **Ikwezi** do not have to be convinced that Soviet imperialism does not exist and is making rapid advances in Africa. Dan Nabudere, himself a Tanzanian, cannot fail to have noticed the Soviet intrusion on his own doorstep. So why has he nothing to say?

HELP IKWEZI FINANCIALLY. KEEP IKWEZI ALIVE. SUBSCRIBE! DONATE! SELL IKWEZI.