

EDITORIAL

SELF-DETERMINATION OR WHITE PATERNALISM

The Azanian Revolution has a rich historical experience, yet, there has been a dismal failure on the part of some of those who claim to be on the front ranks to learn from past errors; to grasp the historical circumstances and peculiarities of our unique situation; and, to make a proper analysis, in order to carry the revolution through to the end. Fifty years in the life of any organisation is a long time, fifty years of futile struggle..

"Azania News", with a lucidity of thought that was rare in the ranks of our liberation movement before the emergence of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (S.A.), has produced an article: "Conflict in Values in South Africa: The White 'Left' at Work", which we reproduce in its entirety in this issue.

Writing on the colonial question in his preface to Franz Fanon's "The Wretched of the Earth" Jean-Paul Sartre notes: "The European elite undertook to manufacture a native elite. They picked out promising adolescents; they branded them, as with a red-hot iron, with the principles of western culture; they stuffed their mouths full of high-sounding phrases, grand glutinous words that stuck to the teeth. After a short stay in the mother country they sent them home, white-washed. These walking lies had nothing left to say to their brothers; they only echoed."

This has been the demise of certain sections of African "leadership". The emergence of PAC provoked a venomous tirade of attacks from the Government. The fascists wanted the heads of PAC leadership on a silver platter; the white 'Left' was even more strident in its attack of these "extremists"; of course "reasonable African leaders" out-settled the settlers in condemning the P.A.C., their Chief even received the Nobel Peace Prize to show distinction between his policies and PAC policies.

We would like to explain that there is a fallacy that we are oppressed because of our colour when overwhelming evidence proves that colour prejudice is a by-product of capitalism. In our situation racial discrimination is a convenient tool for economic exploitation which leads to political oppression and must be explained through social degradation. In South Africa European origin has been glorified as high-pedigree stock in human development; this virus of racial arrogance has tainted all Europeans with vested interests, as the following article will show.

The earliest colonisers of our country were the Dutch through the Dutch East India Company. During the Reformation the French Huguenots and other European protestants came to settle in our country running away from the wrath of the Catholic Church. These earlier settlers became a strong closely knit community that soon became rich from dispossessing Africans of their land and livestock. Slavery was the base of economic labour. They evolved a distinct culture and language - Afrikaans - and are the main group in the present ruling Nationalist Party.

After the defeat of Napoleon our country was ceded to the British. At this time, because of the Industrial Revolution which necessitated skilled workers as opposed to disinterested slaves, the British initiated a movement for

the Freedom of the Slaves. Note, no philanthropic considerations motivated this but higher economic relations - capitalism - and this was called British liberalism. The Afrikaner community resisted the Freedom of the Slaves movement, eventually moving into the hinterland to escape British authority, where it founded two Boer (Afrikaner) republics of the Orange River and the Transvaal.

Gold and diamonds were struck in these republics towards the end of the last century, the British moved to annex them, mainly because of the mineral discoveries. A war was fought between the British and the Afrikaners (The Anglo-Boer War: 1899-1902). These two capitalist forces fought a capitalist war amongst themselves for capitalist gains, this had nothing to do with the African people whom both sections agreed on their segregation and oppression. The country was rich in resources, minerals underneath, vegetation and beasts above together with tools - tools with voices that would do the labour for the colonists - the Africans. The Afrikaners were virulent in their oppression and the British mixed oppression with paternalism, hence preference of the latter "nicer" oppressor by some African "leaders". To us, they are tweedledum and tweedledee, birds of a feather.

The British settlers, because of the imperialist advantage afforded them earlier by their mother country, became richer. They control the mines and industry: the Afrikaners feel robbed in the sharing of the spoils when, they contend, were the ones that opened up "bush country", as a consequence, there has been perennial quarrelling between the two sections. The British speaking have always sought to enlist the help of the Africans, to use them for gaining hegemony over the Afrikaners. Failure to grasp this contradiction between the two wolves for the economic bone by some African "leaders" brought the African people many political woes until the emergence of PAC in 1959. But fifty years of struggle had gone to waste.

The white "left" in South Africa mainly sprang from the British economic faction. The "liberal", the Missionary, the pseudo-communist factions of the white "left" all have a stake in the economic pie. Unfortunately some African "leaders" mouth their phrases.

H.J. and R.E. Simons, in their monumental work, "Class and Colour in South Africa", record that a leading "communist", Bunting, "came to the conclusion that the setting for a successful revolution was not yet present because of the 'extreme backwardness and widespread apathy of the native masses'." The Executive Committee of the Communist International, on the other hand, in 1927, adopted, on South Africa, "The right of self-determination through the complete overthrow of capitalism and imperial domination," it further "asserted in effect the principle of Africa for Africans: their full freedom, equality with all other races, and the right to govern Africa". The book records that Bunting, in a fourteen-page document rejected the "native republic" slogan, he supposed, was based on Lenin's famous thesis on the colonies adopted in 1920..! Bunting criticised the slogan, and in doing so challenged the thesis itself".

The book asks: "Did this mean that the whites were more powerful, or more aware of issues, or merely more vocal? On this occasion, at least, Bunting ignored their political backwardness and fierce rejection of radical

change. He also underrated the political sense of Africans and their capacity to influence the course of events. His emotional reaction indicated that, as in 1922, he tended to equate worker's power with white power, and refused to credit the possibility of majority African rule."

We quote the above, challenging the psuedo-communists on their own turf, to show what we have always repeated; 1) that they are psuedo-communists who have opposed Lenin on national liberation movements; 2) that they are contemptuous of the African and hope to lead by remote control; and, 3) that they reject the African people's right to rule themselves. The writers of the above quoted book once belonged to the Communist Party of South Africa. We understand why they left it. These psuedo-communists have been likened to O'Neil's Hugo Kalmer who said: "I love the proletariat. I will lead them. I will be like a Gott to them. They will be my slaves."

The unity of views of the Missionary, liberal and psuedo-communist factions towards the criminal intention of PAC to have Africans rule themselves influenced certain governments and institutions. The Soviet Union and other East European countries (except Albania) have been taken in by the bare lies of the Communist Party of South Africa to a point where, they believe, we want to drive the white man 'into the sea', and that when writings appear under our names, someone else must have done it for us because we are not capable. The Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO), unfortunately, fell victim to the tirade of lies and abuse against PAC. Pressures were also applied against it.

Since April, 1969, AAPSO coined a new term, "authentic organisations", meaning those that have Soviet backing regardless of the massive support, the anti-imperialist nature and the militant combativeness of those that are excluded, supposedly because they are not "authentic", whatever that means.

Over a number of years PAC energetically sought membership in AAPSO. An Ad-Hoc Commission on this question in 1965, found a ruse to block PAC membership "despite its militating basis and its anti-imperialist line of action", quoting from the Commissions own report. Our pens have run dry, our type-writer ribbons refitted trying the impossible, as far as our experience teaches us. The term "authentic organisations" is even an unfortunate choice of words as every African revolutionary worker knows. The American CIA-backed International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) also once spoke of "authentic trade unions" in its fight against the All African Trade Union Federation (AATUF). Does the coincidence of terms have any significance? We leave that to history to answer.

Of immediate concern to us is the splittist nature of this appellation "authentic organisations" and attendant activities. The fact that there is more than one organisation in many dependent territories has its own historical background, as the following article clearly shows. The historical necessity is for the organisations to gravitate towards each other, break the outside influences that stifle their normal development, and, unite all sections of the people. AAPSO cannot wish the existence of some organisations away. This runs against the spirit of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and all revolutionary theory and practice. This is what has earned AAPSO ignominy.