

AFRICAN STATES AND THE SOUTH AFRICA PROBLEM

Boniface I. Obichere

The problem of apartheid in South Africa is an African problem. It is a problem that is basic to the existence of the many independent states of contemporary Africa. Africans who find themselves in positions of political, religious, economic, social, cultural and military leadership owe it to other Africa and humanity to face the problem of Apartheid in South Africa as a most urgent problem calling for immediate solution from within. The co-operation and collaboration of the nations and peoples of Europe, Asia, the Americas and Australasia can be sought and should be engendered in the prosecution of military and diplomatic tactics and strategies for the elimination of apartheid in South Africa.

Recently, positive action was taken by the African states who are members of the British Commonwealth of Nations by their effective boycott of the Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh as well as the associated Commonwealth Art Festival which opened in Edinburgh on July 17, 1986. The remorseless and brutal massacre of unarmed Africans in South Africa, the remeditated invasions of Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Lesotho and other independent African states by South African forces with impunity, the obdurate relentlessness of the Pretoria regime and their many other international and domestic crimes are more than enough justification for concerted African retaliation "by any means necessary," according to Malcolm X. The castigation of the white minority rulers of South Africa by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah on April 7, 1960 during the Positive Action Conference For Peace and Security in Africa held in Accra still holds true. He stated: "It is ironical to think that the rulers of South Africa call themselves Christians. If Christ were to appear in South Africa today he would be crucified by them if he dared to oppose (as he would) the brutal laws of racial segregation. Apartheid and nuclear weapons must shake the conscience of the Christian world. But what are the churches of the world doing about these very contradictions of Christianity?" (Samuel Obeng, The Selected Speeches of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah. Accra, n.d., Vol. I, p. 52.)

In an essay published on July 21, 1986, Vishwas R. Sitonde in West Africa, (No. 3594, pp. 1511-1512), Dr. Nkrumah's views were expatiated upon and the statement was added that "one of the startling incongruities in South Africa--heaven knows, there are enough incongruities there--is that the country regards itself as Christian." He went on to point out that the Afrikaners believe that their rule in South Africa is divinely ordained and they do find biblical

rationale according to the warped tenets of their Dutch Reformed Church.

Even though we have asserted that the problem in South Africa is an intrinsically African problem, it goes without saying that African leaders and African states welcome the cooperation and support of other nations in the search for a resolution of the unnatural and repugnant apartheid system as practised by the white minority regime in contemporary South Africa. This is where the question of economic sanctions and other related sanctions come into focus. These will be more effective if African, European, Asian and American states impose them as members of the international comity of nations. In recent months we have heard a lot of political rhetoric and propaganda against sanctions as tools for dealing with the South African problem. Even from Washington, D.C., we have heard the ruling class decry the clamour for "punitive sanctions." By definition, all sanctions are punitive in the modern politics of nations. "Sanctions are coercive measures, usually taken by several nations together, for forcing a nation considered to have violated international law to stop the violation." Sanctions may consist in withholding loans, limiting relations, imposing a blockade, curtailing trade, divestment of capital, ban on new investments, travel restrictions, etc.. Therefore, it does not make sense to argue as Washington and London have done recently that "punitive sanctions" were not to be considered against South Africa. The most ridiculous aspect of the Anglo-Saxon argument against sanctions is that black Africans would suffer more than white South Africans if sanctions are imposed on the white minority and illegal regime in Pretoria.

The best answer to this lame argument was given by none other than Winnie Mandela who stated that Mrs. Margaret Thatcher or Ronald Reagan has no right to prescribe to black Africans how they should suffer. Winnie Mandela speaks, in this respect, for millions of Africans and non-Africans who are of the persuasion that both Ronald Reagan of the U.S.A. and Margaret Thatcher of the United Kingdom are woefully and shamefully out of touch with international reality as far as South Africa is concerned. Blacks in South Africa have suffered in varying degrees since before the battle of Isandhlwana when Sir Garnet Wolseley conquered the Zulu kingdom under Cetswayo in 1879.* Blacks in South Africa have suffered in varying degrees since the inequitable and unholy unification of South Africa under British initiative in 1910. Indeed, Margaret Thatcher should not arrogate to herself the job of prescribing the dosage of suffering Africans should

*See "Resistance Against Intrusion: A Case Study of Isandhlwana." M.A. Thesis by Seshi V. Chonco, 1985, U.C.L.A.

ceive at any point in historical time. It is a manifestation of her racism, her callousness and what the Editor of East Africa (No. 3594, July 21, 1986, p.1507), aptly described as "a position of obdurate ignorance," on the part of this British Prime Minister with respect to the feelings of the leaders of the Commonwealth. Seventy percent of blacks in South Africa support sanctions against the white regime according to recent polls quoted by Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu of Cape Town.

Sanctions, as most people know, are a means to an end and not an end in themselves. In this case as in the case of all the sanctions that have been used in modern history, the objective is to impress it upon the murderous regime of Botha and his henchmen that they have transgressed against international conventions on the Rights of Man, on Human Rights, on decency and civilized political behaviour and that apartheid must be destroyed. South Africa is a multi-racial state and not "a nation of minorities," as the Afrikaners would want the world to believe. Just as the Fascist designs upon Ethiopia put the League of Nations powers to their crucial test, in the words of Frederick L. Schuman (1941, pp.235-239), the demand of Frederick L. Schuman International Politics. 3rd Edition, (1941) for sanctions against South Africa has put the Commonwealth to the test and cornered Margaret Thatcher. In mid-July 1986, the highly respected Lagos Guardian (Nigeria) declared: "If Mrs. Thatcher and her cohorts are bent on breaking up the Commonwealth, we should give them every assistance." The half-hearted debates about the Ethiopian question in 1935 are being reenacted over the question of sanctions against South Africa. The times are different, the political actors are different but the issues at stake--African independence and black political self-determination are, the same. Again, it appears that the champions of white supremacy have allied to concoct and conjure many reasons why sanctions against South Africa will not work. We are not saying that we want sanctions imposed on South Africa in perpetuity. We want these sanctions imposed as a strong demonstration of international condemnation of an immoral and unjust system of the separation of races and "the division of populations not simply by colour but also along tribal lines."

The problem of apartheid in South Africa is now also to be seen in the context of militant liberationist pan-Africanism. The recent visit of the indefatigable everend Jessie Jackson to Lusaka, Harare, Gaborone, etc. underscores this fact. So does the visit of Mrs. Coretta Scott King to Cape Town, Johannesburg, and her meetings with Winnie Mandela and the Rev. Allan Boesak, president of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and the cancellation of her scheduled meeting with Botha. The variety of diplomatic and political actions taken by the leaders of the independent

states of the Caribbean testify to the Pan-African devotion to the destruction of apartheid. The concerted and consistent action of students in American universities, demanding the re-orientation of U.S. business investments in South Africa and the successful movement on several campuses and municipalities in America for divestment of public funds from South Africa are testimonies to the non-racial and humanitarian nature of the attack mounted everywhere against apartheid. Of course, one must not forget the violent and vociferous anti-apartheid activities that have taken place all over Africa and Europe, and in some parts of Asia. In June 1986, the Editor of West Africa (London) pointed out that it appeared that Mrs. Margaret Thatcher was out of touch with reality in her approach to the general and overwhelming demand for sanctions against South Africa. "Her verbal condemnations of apartheid are meaningless, because her other actions seem to suggest one who really wants to give comfort to the Botha regime," the editorial stated.

Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Ronald Reagan should be advised to take seriously the poignant declarations of Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress (ANC), during his mid-year broadcast this year. He broadcasted on Radio Freedom and distilled the present policy and objective of the ANC in these words: "...The way forward is not a Botha government, or a President's Council, not a tricameral parliament, none of these things. It is a people's government the people of South Africa, united as common citizens of a unitary state on the principle of one-person-one-vote." Ironically, Oliver Tambo is stating more clearly some ideas that occurred earlier to Jan Christian Smuts who stated in 1930 that "if black and white in Africa, while faithful to themselves, can manage to evolve a plan according to which they can jointly develop the resources of this continent, a great service will be rendered for the future of the human race...." In Smuts's vision of the 1930s and in Tambo's policy and program for the present, we can create a unitary, just and multi-racial modern nation in South Africa.

In thinking of Oliver Tambo's expression of the popular clamour for a unitary state in South Africa wherein every person will be enfranchised, I cannot help but be saddened by the present "divide et impera" expediency of the Botha regime with its multi-level system of states of emergencies. Africa is not blood-sickened. According to Igbo philosophy, "Oso ndu anagh agwu ike." This means that when one is running for survival, one never gets tired. Transposed into the Southern African situation, this dictum affirms that the struggle for freedom is a perpetual struggle and freedom fighters do not have the word fatigue in their dictionary. As the nationalists in West Africa said in the 1950s, freedom fighters are not afraid to fill the prisons of the oppressor.

Nor are they deterred by abject brutality and ungodly torture. Killings, by soldiers and police of the regime, political assassinations and states of emergency will not deter the freedom fighters of South Africa. In fact, if the Botha regime reviews what happened in colonial Kenya during the Mau Mau, they will learn the hard and painful lesson that the mass detention of Africans by the colonial oppressors only served to strengthen the resolve of the people to be free. Botha and his henchmen have now made avid freedom fighters of hitherto uncommitted and moderated labour leaders, such as Elijah Barayi, president of COSATU, Piroshaw Camay, Head of the Council of Unions of South Africa, NUM, trade unionists, and religious leaders by rounding them up and imprisoning them.

African nationalist leaders like Kwame Nkrumah, Kojo Botsio, Michael Imoudu, Jomo Kenyatta, Obafemi Awolowo, etc. have looked at this type of imprisonment as a necessary initiation into the comradeship of the fighters for freedom in Africa. Winnie Mandela has given testimony that her incarceration and solitary confinement was the turning point in her own involvement in the higher stages of the militant liberation movement in South Africa.

The divide and rule policy of the Botha regime has exaggerated the personality and political differences as well as the ideological cleavages between the African parties, organizations and leaders. The ANC, the UDF, the SACP, and the PAC are all known to have laid emphasis on unity. But the tricameral structure, the President's Council and the Bantustans are divisive forces for the Botha regime and those of J.F. Verwoerd and B.J. Vorster before him. In 1956 when Dr. J.F. Verwoerd was minister of Native Affairs, he stated emphatically that the central government of South Africa (state) laid down policy and the local authorities were nothing but agents of the state as far as the execution of such policy was concerned. As far as Verwoerd was concerned, the expansion of the control and power exercised by the State in matters affecting race was a major element of policy and it did not matter to him that this central control diminished the powers of the local authorities (A.N. Pelzer (ed.) Verwoerd Speaks.(1966) p.127).

Therefore, the divide and rule elements of apartheid which are now manifest have always been an integral part of the system since it was first introduced in the South African parliament in January 1944, by D.F. Malan. According to Malan who is credited with the coinage of the term apartheid, its objective is "to ensure the safety of the white race and of Christian civilization by the honest maintenance of the principles of apartheid and guardianship" (C.A. Woodward, Understanding Revolution in South Africa.(1983). No wonder this is why Kwame Nkrumah castigated the Afrikaners and their

hypocrisy as Christians. In addition, Vishwas R. Gaitonde has shown recently how the Afrikaners perverted sixteenth century Calvinism to create their Dutch Reformed Church and how they have merged church and state in their desperate effort to sustain the incongruities that abound in their unchristian system of the separation of the races (West Africa (July 21, 1986, "The Afrikaner Gospel").

Getting back to the business of the Afrikaner plot to drive wedges between their many opponents in South Africa, one must question the role of Chief Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, the chief Minister of Kwazulu (a Bantustan). He has declared himself opposed to apartheid. Buthelezi is a bundle of contradictions. He is prepared to discuss with Botha and the Afrikaners the notion of "power sharing." He is scared and morbidly afraid of the demand by other Black African leaders for "one-person-one-vote" which means universal adult suffrage and enfranchisement for all Blacks and non-whites in South Africa. Buthelezi's lukewarm attitude to enfranchisement as demanded by Oliver Tambo and others is the result of his view that the whites (Afrikaner rulers) will adopt a scorched earth policy if one-person-one-vote is demanded vigorously. Buthelezi is reported to be seriously considering joining the National Statutory Council which Botha has proposed as a cloak and smoke-screen for rallying the support of selected black "leaders." The selected stooges of apartheid would create the impression that the Afrikaners are expanding black participation through the National Statutory Council which has no political power. Many thoughtful and moderate Africans have already declared that they will not participate in Botha's NSC. For instance, Dr. Sam Motsuenyane the President of the National African Federated Chamber of Commerce, has stated that he will not participate in the Council proposed by Botha. It may be recalled here that the National African Federated Chamber of Commerce represents 15,000 black businessmen in South Africa. They sent a delegation recently to Lusaka, to hold cordial consultation and discussions with the ANC leadership in exile. Most black leaders had categorically rejected Botha's Council out of hand. But Buthelezi who vociferously opposed the 1984 constitution and its tricameral parliamentary arrangement is now willing to join the National Statutory Council on the condition that Nelson Mandela is released from prison. What should be clear to Buthelezi and others is that it is futile for them to join the NSC and "be party to an advisory body when blacks are not represented at the highest levels of government." Even if Nelson Mandela is released, it is highly unlikely that he would have anything to do with a council of this nature. (See Mission to South Africa: The Commonwealth Project, by Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group to Southern Africa. Penguin Books, 1986.)

Inside South Africa, there are many notable blacks who do not see the resolution of the problem of apartheid the same way Buthelezi does. For example, the Chief Minister of KaNgwane, Enos Mabuza, is famous for his anti-apartheid actions. He has gone to Lusaka to visit the ANC. Furthermore, Enos Mabuza has declared openly "that there can be no resolution in South Africa without the involvement and active participation of the ANC." Mabuza is the president of the politico-cultural organization known as Inyandza National Movement. This organization is in constant touch with the ANC in Lusaka and actually visited it recently under the leadership of Enos Mabuza and a communique was issued stating that they were opposed to "separate development" as propounded by the Botha regime, they opposed and rejected the apartheid institutions especially the Bantustans. Saths Cooper, president of the radical and militant Azania People's Organization, and the Most Rev. Smangaliso Mkhathswa of the Southern African Catholic Bishops Conference are additional examples.

Both Kaiser Matanzima of Transkei and Buthelezi of Swazulu violently condemned Mabuza for visiting the ANC. His response was that the ANC has mass support in South Africa. This cannot be denied. However, there is Inkatha, a Zulu politico-cultural organization which has about one million members most of whom support Buthelezi. P.W. Botha has stated that he regards Inkatha as Buthelezi's own version of the infamous Afrikaner Broederbond for the Zulu people. This is no more example of the divide and rule at all levels of black society in South Africa. Not all Zulus support Buthelezi.

In addition to Inkatha, Buthelezi has promoted the formation of an all Zulu trade union known as Uwusa as a counterfoil to the all South African COSATU (Council of South African Trade Union). Is Buthelezi accentuating ethnic tribal-nationalism? Is he behind the acts of violence by Inkatha in Soweto and Natal? Why is it that despite the state of emergency, Inkatha was allowed to hold a mammoth rally in the Mbombani Stadium in Soweto where Buthelezi arrived by helicopter to declare in his speech that Botha's National Statutory Council could be regarded as the benchmark for "the final victory for the black struggle for liberation." Was he speaking out of conviction or to please the crowd of Inkatha members and the Afrikaners who hail him as a moderate non-communist black leader? This is perhaps the reason why Mr. Jiah Mokeba, the ANC representative in Luanda, said that Buthelezi is on the side of the enemy and acts as his master's voice. If Botha boasts that he is not prepared to do anything to destroy the present character of South Africa, how can Buthelezi convince the masses in South Africa and the people of the world that the formation of the National Statutory

Council can be regarded as the beginning of the end of apartheid?

The fractionalization of South African society affects the whites too. The problems of class, ethnic origin and ideology are present in both the white and black sections of South Africa. There are divisions among the whites as well. The intensification of the struggle in recent months has brought out the cleavages among the whites, especially the white business community. Gavin Relly, the chairman of Anglo-American has stated his preference for Buthelezi because Buthelezi "says exactly what we think," and is the single black leader who goes along with their program. This, according to Gavin Relly, should make people forget the "rough game" that Buthelezi plays in Natal. On the other hand, several employers are upset with the excessive repression because it has enraged the workers and they are now striking and are restless and militant. The white Chamber of Mines which represents the six big mining companies have expressed their uneasiness and anxiety over the repressive measures of the Botha regime which they said would damage industrial relations and cut down their profits. Early in July 1986, 2000 miners went on strike in four diamond mines owned by De Beers. In addition, 8000 workers adopted a go-slow tactic in Anglo-American's Free State Consolidated gold mine. Add to these the arrest and detention of over 1000 trade unionists who tried to hold a meeting in Tembisa.

The Chairman of De Beers was upset by the strikes in four of his mines. He dispatched a telegram to Mr. Louis le Grange, Minister for Law and Order, requesting that the Minister should order the police to release the leaders of the National Union of Mineworkers including Elijah Barayi its vice-president. De Beer's chairman argued in the telegram that negotiations were impossible under the conditions where over seventy major leaders of the Unions were in detention. It has been reported that the mines have lost millions of dollars as a result of both the unrest and the industrial action of the trade unionists, both strikes and go-slows. The gold mining sector is said to have lost 14.85 billion rands in the first half of 1986 since the repressive emergency began. Some cruel and reactionary mining managers have resorted to brutality and police-trained vigilantes to break the strikes and go-slows. Corporal punishment and forced labour are said to have been used widely. Workers have retaliated with industrial sabotage, their buying power and their militancy which is obviously on the increase.

Where does the ANC come in and what of the Frontline States and other African states? Let us look briefly at the ANC and the other parties working for the liberation of South Africa. It is evident that the ANC is a very broad-based

movement of national liberation. It is fighting, as its leaders affirm, for the legitimate political, economic, social and human rights of the oppressed people of South Africa. Though Nelson Mandela is still in prison on Robben Island, he is the acknowledged leader of the ANC and the international demand for his release has gathered momentum since 1985. "Mandela is the father-figure of a free South Africa. He has a broad-based appeal and commands loyalties that transcend tribe, ideology and class," commented Pini Jason and Nath Ighrakpata recently. ("The Nemesis of Apartheid: Mandela's Courage is the Key," in This Week [Nigeria] (August 11, 1986, p. 22). Another commentator said that Nelson Mandela "has become a legendary figure almost, the symbol of African independence, and his growing prestige as a sacrificial leader takes some of the sting from the Botha government accusation of communism". (Lewis C.A. Rayapen, "South Africa: Constitutional Change or Violent Revolution," in International Journal on World Peace Vol.III. No.2 (Apr.-June, 1986), p.51. The Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group on Southern Africa visited Nelson Mandela and interviewed him in prison on Robben Island (1986). Since the imprisonment of Nelson Mandela in 1962, leadership has continued to emerge in black South Africa. Here we must exclude those blacks who have been handpicked by the Afrikaners to rule over the miserable homelands or Bantustans. The assassination of Steve Biko in September 1977 came in the wake of the revolt of the youth in the famous Soweto Revolt of June 1976. Biko's death in the hands of the officials of the South African government attracted added attention to the evil nature of the apartheid system in South Africa (See "Soweto, Black Consciousness and Steve Biko," in Frantz Fanon, Soweto and American Black Thought, by Lou Turner and John Alan (Chicago, 1986) pp.15-25.

The ANC and the PAC were both banned after the Sharpeville revolt and massacre of blacks (1960) by government troops. The government evoked the Riotous Assemblies Act (1956) as a justification for banning these parties. Earlier, the Suppression of Communism Act (1950) led to the banning of the South Africa Communist Party (SACP). Steve Biko was arrested, detained and killed in order to stop the Black Consciousness Movement which he founded and led. Though banned, these parties have operated from exile and bases outside South Africa (See Robert W. Peterson South Africa and Apartheid. (New York, 1971) pp. 55-157.

Steve Biko spoke for millions of blacks when he defined "Black Consciousness" and stated its objectives in the struggle. He stated:

"By Black Consciousness I mean the cultural and political revival of an oppressed people. This must be related to the emancipation of the entire

continent of Africa since the Second World War. Africa has experienced the death of white invincibility ...Being an historically, politically, socially and economically disinherited and dispossessed group, they [Blacks] have the strongest foundation from which to operate. The philosophy of Black Consciousness, therefore, expresses group pride and the determination by the Blacks to rise and attain the envisaged self."

Biko pointed out that it was the irrevocable change in the consciousness of the youth of Soweto in 1976 that triggered off the revolt and the birth of the SSRC. Most of the young leaders inside and outside South Africa remember June 16, 1976 "as a day of unity and power and glorious struggle," as Newsweek reported on June 23, 1986 (p.40) in "Soweto: The Spirit of 1976," by Richard Manning.

The ANC is constantly condemned and maligned by the Afrikaner leaders both of the National Party (NP) and the ultraright conservative and reactionary (Afrikaner Resistance Movement (AWB) led by Eugene Terre Blanche. The ANC is accused of being under the influence of communism and closely tied to the Soviet Union. The examples of Dr. Yusuf Dadoo, Joe Slovo who is the head of Umkhonto We Sizwe, the military arm of the ANC, and Nelson Mandela are repeated ad nauseam to support the accusation. It appears to me that the aims and objectives of the ANC stated by Oliver Tambo and quoted earlier in this paper are not identical with those of the South African Communist Party (SAPC) stated in the African Communist, (No.81, p.32). The government of South Africa has appointed itself, puny as it is, as the bulwark to protect the Western world from communism. This is balderdash. In Britain, in the USA, in France, in Italy, in Spain, etc. there exists a Communist Party. Which European or American nation is South Africa protecting from communism? Even a hardcore anti-communist like Ronald Reagan has visited China and is at present arranging to hold a meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, leader of the Soviet Union. And the news has recently been announced that the conservative Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Britain, is to visit Moscow soon on an official visit. Afrikaner leaders have created a dilemma in South Africa because of the primitive way in which they perceive the world. They must adapt to the 20th century and prepare for the 21st century otherwise the predicted bloodbath and civil war will occur in South Africa and will eliminate many innocent persons as well as many Afrikaner who have what I may call the dinosaur mentality, and a commitment to white supremacy.

We have maintained all along that the South African problem is an African problem. The most recent impressive

demonstration of this generalization as well as evidence to support it is the recently concluded 22nd Summit of the Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity which met in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Commodore Ebitu Ukiwe who led the Nigerian delegation held talks with several of the leaders at the summit in Addis Ababa. He called on African governments to impose sanctions on Britain because of Margaret Thatcher's intransigence. It was reported that Nigeria's views were shared by the entirety of those leaders who attended the Addis Ababa summit. Furthermore, the President of Senegal, who has been the chairman of the OAU since the summit of 1985, used the occasion of his last address to the heads of state to lambast the Afrikaners and apartheid. He praised all nations that boycotted the Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh because of the callous and uncompromising attitude of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher against the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa. President Abdou Diouf of Senegal declared that all schools in Africa should carve the words, "APARTHEID IS A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY," on every blackboard so that the present pupils and generations to come will know their enemies. (See David Marsh, Sun City: The Struggle for Freedom in South Africa. New York, 1986.)

Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, head of state of Ethiopia and the host of the OAU Summit enumerated Ethiopia's contributions to the people's struggle in South Africa, especially the aid Ethiopia has given to the ANC and to SWAPO in their liberation struggle against Pretoria. As expected, Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam condemned the USA, Britain, and certain other Western nations for their failure to act against apartheid. He emphasized the point that America's policy towards South Africa was anti-African. He asked African states to make London and Washington D.C. the targets of more pressure after the successful boycotting of the Edinburgh Games and the huge loss of millions of dollars suffered by the British Organizers of the Commonwealth Games.

The new chairman of the OAU, President Denis Sassou-Nguesso of the People's Republic of the Congo, has the task of continuing the offensive of all the African states against Pretoria and the Western bloc. He is supposed to increase aid to the OAU Liberation Committee, the ANC, SWAPO, and the frontline states who suffer constant attacks and air raids by the Botha regime. President Abdou Diouf of Senegal called on all African states to respect their commitment to the UN-sponsored international conference on the critical economic situation in Africa agreed to in May 1986. He declared: "The international community is committed to assisting Africa, but Africa should show first, a loyal and determined application of the approved methods." The UN Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, who was at the summit, gave an address in which he condemned Pretoria's destabilization policies and

actions against neighbouring states. He said that this aspect of Pretoria's policy was "most disturbing" (This Week (Nigeria) (August 11, 1986) "Action Against Apartheid" (p. 23). The solidarity shown in Addis Ababa is very encouraging and reassured the Frontline states of the support of all the other African states. Even Cote d'Ivoire has recently denied landing rights to South African airplanes (David Lamb, The Africans (1985) pp. 213; 317-324).

Apartheid has to be fought inside South Africa if it is to be destroyed. This is not an easy task. The experience of the liberation wars in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola, Vietnam, Algeria, Guinea-Bissau, etc. amply shows that it is not an easy job to defeat and change an oppressive and scandalous political regime. This is where the organizations inside South Africa and their leaders and supporters come in. Some commentators have expressed the opinion that the opportunities for united liberation activities created by Soweto in 1976 have been lost. I do not share in this pessimistic point of views. I agree with Steve Biko that the will to freedom sparked by Soweto and the anti-apartheid consciousness brought about by Soweto are to be seen today in the parties and organizations inside Black South Africa in the urban as well as in the rural areas. Like Sharpville, Soweto (1976) was another point of departure in the struggle for freedom in South Africa. The students who led SSRC till it was banned in 1977 are now young men and many of them are still playing significant roles in various capacities in the UDF, AZAPO, ANC, PAC, etc. For instance, Thabo Ndabene who is now twenty-nine years old was only 19 when he led the Soweto revolt in 1976. At present, he is a leader in the Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO) to which he was attracted while he was in Modderbee prison. He recollects that in prison they discussed "Black Consciousness." Murphy Morobe, now 30 years old, is very active in UDF. He has grown since the days when he led the SSRC and after his incarceration in Robben Island which black activists in South Africa have renamed "Mandela University," according to Richard Manning. The leader of the SSRC, Tsietsi Mashinini, escaped into exile but Seth Mazibuko, now 28 years old, after graduating from "Mandela University," where he was imprisoned after being tortured in the infamous Afrikaner torture chamber called "die waar kamer" (the truth room), is at present engaged in organizing for a church group, another vital and integral part of the struggle. The Soweto boys are now men. They have come to the realization as Thabo Ndabene said that the reality of the South African situation is that it is not easy to overthrow a government. Seth Mazibuko has put on record what a lasting positive impression it has been for them to meet and to learn from Nelson Mandela in prison about whom they had been taught lies as young school boys. The lesson from this short sketch is that the situation in South Africa is not static but dynamic. All the Afrikaner

propaganda about communism is but part of their search for lies and sympathizers. It is spurious. In this respect I agree with the observation of Lewis C.A. Rayapen.

"For many Black Africans, however, racism is a worse evil than communism, for you can change your ideas, should you choose to do so, but you cannot change the color of your skin. Any group working to overthrow the hated apartheid system is an ally. So, the communist threat is there, although it does not present itself as a serious threat to the Black South Africans."

In Soweto, the conflict between Blacks is caused by apartheid, indirectly at least. The generational gap between "Comrades" and the "Fathers" and the violence that has grown out of it is part of the dynamics of social change. The rift between the UDF and Inkatha, the rivalry between the SA set up by Buthelezi and COSATU is to me a sign of the growing pains of the new militant trade unions. The violence by Buthelezi's Amabutho against UDF supporters in Natal is to be regretted. It runs counter to the non-racialism espoused by Nelson Mandela. It will accentuate ethnic chauvinism and divisive tendencies between Zulu, Swazi, Sotho, Xhosa and Asians. Ethnic chauvinism should take a back seat. All Black South Africans should get on with the business of getting rid of apartheid.

On the Afrikaner and white side of the South African situation, there are also both class and ideological conflicts as well as party cleavages. The National Party (NP) which is the government of the day has its hands full with the ultra-right and very reactionary Afrikaner Resistance Movement (AWB) which has created Nazi type brown-shirted military Stormtroopers.* The atavistic AWB is committed to the ideology of white supremacy, and is opposed to the cautious and minor reforms of the Botha regime. There is also the far right Reconstituted National Party (HNP) which espouses pure apartheid and opposed the efforts of the Botha regime to repeal the Immorality Act of 1927 and the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 (both now repealed). The AWB and the HNP are opposed to the efforts of the Botha regime to desegregate the Trade Unions and the Universities which were split by the Division of Trade Unions Act (1957) and the Division of Universities Act (1959). Both parties want to tighten the Terrorism Act (1967) and the Information Act which prohibits the reporting of prison conditions in South Africa--both white prisons and black prisons. One can mention here the quandary in which the Progressive Federal Party (PFP) finds itself. One of the best-known members of the PFP, Helen Suzman, stated last June that it was "a pretty desperate situation for people like myself." Though she has

Rev. Dr. Sipo E. Mzimela Apartheid: South African Naziism (1983)

been bravely fighting apartheid for many years, the PFP is at present unacceptable to Blacks and it is considered irrelevant by many whites, especially with its call for a "federal" system in South Africa. Some of its members have resigned because they feel rejected by the Blacks and the Whites. The former leader of the PFP in parliament, Frederick van Zyl Slabbert, resigned from parliament in February 1986 saying that parliament had become irrelevant in the face of mounting death toll in the streets, imprisonment of thousands and a continuing state of emergency. I have taken the time to give this brief sketch to demonstrate to the readers that the Afrikaner and English elements are by no means a monolithic front. They have their ethnic, ideological and class rivalries just like the Blacks and Asians. There have been many cases when the AWB under the leadership of Eugene Terre Blanche sent their thugs and vigilantes and Storm Falcons to disrupt meetings and public rallies of the National Party. For instance, in May 1986, AWB militants and thugs broke up a rally organized by the NP at which the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Roelof Botha was invited to speak to party supporters. Eugene Terre Blanche is using neo-Nazi tactics in his attacks on the National Party and its leadership. The PFP is running scared too.

In conclusion, the South African problem is a complex problem. It is basically a problem for the Africans in South Africa. It is a problem for African states and their leaders and they have acknowledged this fact. They are also doing something about it, given the precarious economic situation in most of the African states. But as the Holy Bible says, man does not live by bread alone. Africans and their leaders have asked the Western bloc and the Eastern bloc as well as the Asians to join them not only in the moral rhetoric of the condemnation of apartheid but also in substantive action calculated to demonstrate to the Afrikaners and all white South Africans that apartheid is a crime against humanity. This is why South Africa was constrained to withdraw from the Commonwealth in 1961. South Africa has been isolated in terms of world sports, be it in the African continent, the Commonwealth Games and the Olympic Games.

There is the need for the struggle against apartheid to be intensified. Both President Kenneth D. Kaunda of Zambia and Prime Minister Robert G. Mugabe of Zimbabwe have spoken of the need for unity of purpose in the struggle against apartheid. It behooves the Blacks inside South Africa as well as those Black South Africans in exile to work together and cooperate more fully in the diplomatic offensive against apartheid. They should also unify their tactics in the offensive inside South Africa. (See Joseph Hanlon, Apartheid's Second Front: South Africa's War Against Its Neighbors. London, 1986.)

Civil war and the predicted blood-bath may come to pass in the process of the struggle for the elimination of apartheid. On the other hand, change can be forced to occur by the application of superior moral power as Bishop Desmond Tutu seems to believe. Non racialism appears to me to be the keystone that will hold the South African arch together as Nelson Mandela has repeatedly stated. One can understand or sympathize with the extreme position of AZAPO of driving the whites into the Atlantic Ocean, but one cannot fail to see the impracticability of this policy. The question of socialism or communism in a liberated and apartheid free South Africa is a moot point in the present situation of things. What is the most pressing issue is the elimination and destruction of the apartheid system. The one-person-one-vote principle will decide the form of government that will emerge and thrive or survive under such a new system.

When I hear the singing of Nkosi Sikelela i'Afrika (God Bless Africa), the acknowledged anthem of Black African nationalism and Black nationalists, the emotions and sentiments it evokes in me are powerful, stirring, hopeful and tremendously encouraging. Mental echoes of this song conjure up the sweet voices of children and the imploring voices of mothers and women. Women have played a very important role in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa. They have been active in the urban areas and in the townships and squatter towns. They have been active in the homelands and in the most rural of rural South Africa. They will still continue to be a very significant factor in the continuing struggle against apartheid. Their courage, their patience, their leadership will all be assets in the struggle for freedom. There is an abundance of books and pamphlets on the triumphs, tears, activities, hopes and determination of South Africa's black women.

Finally, external and international pressure should be engendered and utilized in the struggle. The United Nations Center Against Apartheid should play a more substantial role. The Western bloc of nations should show a more positive and decisive approach to apartheid. The Eastern bloc nations should increase their aid to the freedom fighters in South Africa. The magnitude of the problem of apartheid makes it necessary for the international community to get involved in the process of its elimination. The Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity made this clear in Addis Ababa recently. In the solemn words of Mafika Pascal Gwala, a Soweto poet of the Black Consciousness movement:

There is a hope
fanned by endless zeal
decisive against the spectre of Sharpeville
hardened by the tears of Soweto.

There is a thunder path
that stretches into jungle heights
where wolves whine and howl
where camouflage is nature's flak guns
where the dream of Pierre Mulele has revived.

There is cause to stand
and utter words hurtful
to those who skulk
in the wilderness of lies
and bias.

For there to be
For there to be facts 'other than'
is our human asset.

Staffrider Vol. I, No.3 (July/August, 1978) p.31,
reprinted in Literature and Society in South Africa
(eds.) Landeg White and Tim Couzens (Longman Group,
New York, 1984) p. 207.

Early Articulation of Self-Determination

The demand for self-determination did not suddenly appear with the advent of the CPSA in 1931. In fact, self-determination was a very old concept. It was first a colonial ideological term with the emergence of the settler colonies in the early 19th century. Black South Africans and the leaders of the independence movement, among them the late Dr. L. S. Maitse, who coined the term "struggle for the 27th June" before Baruch Kanner and the International Negro Improvement Association.

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented to Professor S. J. Maitse's African History Seminar at UNISA, Spring 1988. The author is grateful to Dr. Maitse, Igbo Nwagwu, Greg Smit, P. Geoffrey Smith, Ito Ekwelle, Steve Roberts, Dr. Joseph Mbiti, and Dr. J. Kuper for their valuable contributions to and outside the seminar.