

TRANSCRIPT OF SPEECH ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION (Lusaka Jan.1970)

BY

I.B.TABATA

For many months now all our meetings have been business meetings. Purely political meetings and discussions have been all too few.

It is necessary to place our position (the struggle in S.Africa) within the perspective and framework of the international situation, as we have always done at home. Now, on looking back, I realise the importance of the training we have had at home in the past. In every conference we had discussions on the international situation and reviewed our problems in that perspective. At the time we did not fully realise the importance of this. But the moment we left home it became clear to us that we can understand events taking place in our own country only if we place them within the framework at least of the African continent and Africa, in turn, within the framework of the world situation.

I think that it is this approach that has enabled us to live through the most difficult time abroad. If we had not been armed with this approach, I doubt if we would have survived the problems and difficulties that have confronted us in Zambia, Tanzania and further afield. I have therefore decided that - before we discuss South Africa - it would be a good idea to view the whole epoch and the whole historical process which we are going through, in order to understand better what faces South Africa and why it faces it, and what prospects there are for us within this setting.

I think the best starting-point is to take the span of the last fifty years. The Russian Revolution marked a turning-point in history. We haven't time to go into the details, so we'll mention simply certain landmarks which indicate a continuity in the events as they unfolded, and at the same time provide an unmistakable direction of the historical developments

Immediately after the October Revolution, as you know, everyone thought that a revolution was on the way in Europe, and that in fact the only thing that would save the revolution in Russia was a revolution in the West, particularly in the highly industrialized Germany. This hope did not materialize. First of all there was the Chinese Revolution of 1925-7, which failed. ~~Then~~ there was the German Revolution, which failed. And thereafter there was one failure after another. As a result, the Russian Revolution suffered a set-back. The new State was surrounded by an aggressive imperialism. This gave the impression that the Revolution was thrown back on itself and could only survive by relying entirely on its own resources. The economic as well as the political set-backs which the country - the Revolution - suffered both at ~~home~~ and on an international scale, prepared the soil for the emergence and growth of Stalinism. Stalinism arose because the objective conditions that permitted it existed in full force. The bureaucracy arose because the young Socialist State was surrounded by enemies and was fighting for survival.

The Stalinist bureaucracy appeared in the eyes of the population as a saviour standing guard over the conquest of the October Revolution, and because of this it entrenched itself more and more by gradually removing itself from control by the population. The bureaucracy annihilated all the old revolutionaries and in the process destroyed all

the institutions that had been created to ensure internal democracy. Finally it imposed on society a naked bureaucratic ~~hierarchy~~ dictatorship. When you examine and trace back Stalin's own outlook, you come to the conclusion that he was a Menshevik. He had always been a Menshevik inside the Bolshevik Party.

He was never organically a Bolshevik. All that followed after the death of Lenin: the declaration of war against the Party, the declaration of war against Bolshevism itself was proof of this fact.

Following upon all the defeats mentioned above, there came a time when people began to feel that there was something wrong with Marxism-Leninism itself and all sorts of theories arose. There was, for instance, a theory that the working-class was organically incapable of ~~power~~ assuming power, because it had failed in so many ~~many~~ countries. There was, of course, Stalin's own theory of "socialism in one country." Another theory put forward by the American, Burnham, was that the managerial system was on the order of the day. Then finally, when the Chinese revolution overtook the theorists and came to a successful conclusion after the second world war, another theory was put forward, namely, that since the working-class in the metropolitan countries had proved incapable of taking power, a revolution can now come only from the colonies. Now this idea held sway for some time. And indeed it did appear that the axis of the revolution had shifted to the colonial countries.

What did in fact take place was that, since the socialist revolution had failed in the metropolitan countries, due primarily to the lack of mature leadership in the various countries, and also due to the imposition of Stalinism on all the local Parties, that is, Stalinist theories which in effect ensured the failure of the revolution, then the second imperialist world war, which should have brought about revolutions, succeeded merely in arousing a revolutionary tendency in the West and an increased ~~tempo~~ tempo amongst the colonial oppressed. The Chinese revolution accentuated this process that was taking place.

Up to that time it had been felt that the axis of revolution had shifted to the colonial countries. But, particularly in Africa, when, after China, the wave swept across the continent, the oppressed people proved to be too backward to strive for a socialist revolution. For them what was at issue was the establishment of bourgeois national States and bourgeois democracy.

Meantime in Europe the war itself awakened a revolutionary spirit amongst the working-class and at the end of the war, particularly in France and Greece where there had been underground movements which were very strong, there was a revolutionary upsurge. Don't forget, too, that Yugoslavia achieved its revolution during the war. This revolutionary wave swept across Europe after the war, but again it was throttled by Stalinism. How did Stalinism achieve this? By the same method as before. First of all consider Stalin's position in the war itself. An imperialist

world war should bring to the sharpest point all the contradictions between capital and labour, but these were blunted by the bureaucracy in the very home of the October revolution, where Stalin decided to sit side by side with Roosevelt and Churchill for the redivision of the world, even before the war was over. In other words, Stalin, who was supposed to represent the revolution, betrayed it. He joined the imperialists in the technique of redividing the world, the conquest of the colonies and the creating of spheres of influence.

In France after the war, where the working-class had shown great heroism in the underground struggle and when now it was a question of mobilizing the population for a revolution, it was the Communist Party that was in full control. Stalin stepped in and himself gave orders for the crushing of the revolution and the handing of power over to the bourgeoisie. It was de Gaulle who was to re-organise France. I shall not go into the details of what actually happened. They are sordid enough, especially when we remember that the failures and sufferings in the world to-day are due to - I won't say mistakes, because I don't think Stalinism is to be defined as a mistake - but to a deliberate policy flowing from a specific philosophy.

Here it must be said that Stalinism and the Communist Parties all over the world had posed the slogan of democracy, of bourgeois democracy ~~over~~ against fascism. With fascist Germany and Italy defeated, instead of counterposing to fascism the revolution and socialist democracy, they counter-posed bourgeois democracy. As if fascism was anything else but bourgeois democracy pushed to its logical and most naked form. As if you could pose fascism against itself, that is, against its other wing, its more democratic wing. Thus once more the revolution was stifled and the European working-class exhausted. Meantime the revolutionary ferment moved eastwards ~~through~~ through China and, as I said, reached the continent of Africa, but there found the movements very backward. The people demanded simply liberation from the foreign oppressor and this meant the replacement of a foreign ruler by an indigenous ruler while retaining the capitalist base.

The European powers that ~~xxxx~~ had come out exhausted from the last world war, unable to maintain their ex-colonies by force, hit upon the method which Britain had successfully ~~xxx~~ used, that of granting independence. Very few people understood the dangers inherent in this granting of independence. I remember a discussion I once had in Ghana as to whether Nkrumah did not make a mistake in waiting for Britain to grant independence ~~xxxx~~ officially and peacefully. Would it not have been better if he had seized power before Britain was ready to grant independence? She was in no position to use force. If Nkrumah's Party, by relying on the masses, had seized power by force, it could have utilized the revolutionary élan engendered during the fighting and this would ~~xxxxxxx~~ have carried him a great deal further. For he would have had the population behind him. Having fought for independence, they would have been ready - all too ready - to build a new system. And they would have defended it with their lives. By granting him independence Britain hedged him in with all sorts of checks and balances that made it impossible for him to change the system. When he took over,

he found himself face to face with the colonial army and the police-force and could do nothing about it. He had no army and no police force of his own. The population had been granted independence on a platter, and he was to pay very dearly for this. To-day, Nkrumah realises that from the beginning the odds were staked against him.

Now this in fact is the position with all the African States that were granted independence. At the time they were granted independence they were helpless and conditions are such that they will continue to be strangled economically. Yet the world thought - including the Africans - that there was a revolution going on. Historically, however, we must see it as the era of neo-colonialism, of the coming into being of bourgeois states in Africa. I would call them semi-bourgeois states. During this period the people who figured in the front pages, and who typified this process, were the Nassers, the Nkrumahs and the rest. All those petit-bourgeois who at the time thought they were fighting for independence for the people, were simply paving the way for neo-colonialism. And neo-colonialism means the entrenchment of the capitalist system in Africa. It was a period when the feudal and tribal relations were in the process of being pushed off the stage, and, with the entrenching of capitalism, the local capitalists were allowed to participate in the economy and in the making of decisions. I say "participate", because the important decisions still lay outside the country.

When the world, including Africa, hailed this process, saying: "The era of colonialism is gone!" in point of fact what was happening was that a new kind of colonialism, the American kind, was being ushered in. The U.S. had been operating this successfully in Latin America throughout the century. So now British imperialism tried out the new method of holding her former colonies, rather than lose all. She considered it wiser to let the petit-bourgeoisie and the intellectuals in the various ~~xxx~~ countries participate in government and have some shares in their company for super-exploitation, rather than see everything slip out of her grasp. These, then, were the plans of the imperialists, and if we follow the logic of it we shall find that it had its effect in our own country.

It was logical ~~xxxx~~ in the setting of this era that the Movement in our country which typifies this particular stage of neo-colonialism in Africa should be the African National Congress. Before looking further into this point, we must say that at the same time a particular set of circumstances made it possible for the Unity Movement of South Africa to emerge, a Movement unique in the national movements of the world. South Africa is a country with striking contradictions. For many years it has been a highly industrialised country tied to the European economy and in every sense European. But superimposed on a bourgeois economy is a bastard element that is neither European nor African, but contains elements of feudalism and slavery. Because of these contradictions there has arisen within the womb of society a section of the ~~xx~~ population that is politically highly advanced and could match itself politically with Europe - Just as in the gold mines which employ migrant peasant labour you find the most up-to-date machinery for the extraction of gold. Such are the contradictions in South African society with this telescoping of economic development, that political development in one section of the oppressed has been catapulted to a highly advanced stage of political consciousness.

This situation, however, did not typify South Africa nor Africa in general. The section that typified Africa, then, and particularly this stage of neo-colonialism, was the African National Congress. We were to appreciate the full significance of this only after we left home. At home we dubbed them simply as stooges of imperialism, stooges of the South African liberals and the C.P., which, as you know, was indistinguishable from the liberals. Once out of South Africa, however, we could see the phenomenon more clearly. It was no accident that the African states embraced the Congress as against the Unity Movement. It was neither an accident nor a mistake. Of all the South African organisations, the African National Congress more truly represented the stage of neo-colonialism common to Africa in general. It was on the order of the day and everyone applauded it. They did not reckon with the difficulties that lay ahead of them.

The ~~xx~~ people themselves in the different countries, like those in South Africa, had been aroused during the war by the slogans of democracy. They had been told they were fighting fascism in defence of democracy. And for them democracy was something very real. It meant the right ~~of~~ to ~~existing~~ live instead of merely existing; it meant the right to participate not only in the production of goods in one's country but in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labour. That is why we did not find it difficult to get a response from the masses in South Africa. But what we did do was to direct their energies towards a certain goal and translate for them the real meaning of democracy, a workers' democracy. And a section of them acted on this, more especially the landless peasantry of the Transkei. (See the Presidential Address to the APDUSA, 1962.) That is why to this day it is not possible for a Verwoerd or a Vorster to crush that spirit out of them in spite of violent repression. That spirit is there until such time as the population shall achieve something.

The crisis in S. Africa is not temporary. The crisis is due first of all to the historical period we are going through, to events on an international scale. It is also due partly to the fact that we brought political consciousness to bear on their experiences; they felt the old oppression to be intolerable. The crisis will continue till it is resolved, not on the basis of the present system but on a completely different basis.

It is for us in the Unity Movement to decide ~~what~~ what this basis is and to lead the country in that direction. (See "The Revolutionary Road For South Africa", 1969. published in England.)

Now there is a development going on in the rest of Africa. While the petit-bourgeoisie were willing to take over power and maintain the existing system because it was profitable for them to do so, the masses are discovering that for them there is hardly any difference in their existence. Yes, they see black faces debating in Parliament, but they themselves come back to their old hovels and the old starvation. Only the top layers manage to catch some crumbs that fall from the table, but they can't get at the meat. Thus throughout Africa it is not possible to reach stability or maintain it at any time.

There is another basic reason for this instability. Africa has come on to the scene too late for it to be possible to establish a bourgeois order. In this it is similar to the situation in Russia in 1917. Because of this, the period of the nascent bourgeoisie is not only unstable; it will also be shortened. Furthermore, today imperialism can no longer

tolerate even a semblance of independence. Similarly, in Latin America today the United States cannot tolerate even a bourgeois democracy. It must see to it that a dictatorship is imposed on all the states. With weapons in hand it goes to defend that dictatorship. Since the success of the Cuban revolution it has found that it is no longer safe to allow a bourgeois democracy in any of the colonies.

This, then, is the situation. On the one hand imperialism is not permitting even the natural development of capitalism towards independence in these countries. It has to put a check on the development. On the other hand this very situation prompts the populations from below to push upwards, struggling at least for democracy. They don't define that democracy, but they know that it means living and not mere existence. These two forces on a world scale are clashing all the time. Thus the leadership in the various countries is confronted with the necessity of making a choice: Which way must we go? To join our masters against the people, or our people against the masters? This is the question that faces every state in Africa.

South

Now, as I have said, when we came out of Africa, the organisations that were acceptable to the African states were the Congresses, the ANC and the PAC, because they typified the epoch of neo-colonialism in Africa. It has always seemed strange to me that they say in one breath that they are for the liberation of South Africa and yet they support the African National Congress. This to me is a contradiction and utterly senseless as soon as one is aware of what the ANC stands for. But it becomes understandable as soon as we grasp the fact that all the struggles in Africa were leading towards neo-colonialism. Though the African states ~~it~~ didn't give a political name to the policy of the Congress in South Africa, they instinctively smelt it out as a brother, as an organisation which was facing in the same direction as themselves. So they embraced it with all its contradictions.

But now we come to the consideration of a new and far-reaching development that has been taking place on a world scale, particularly in the European countries. It has been going on for some time, but even progressive groups have been ~~slow~~ slow to realise its full significance. It is what I call the second industrial revolution. Automation was coming into being. This process is different in kind from the simple rationalization of production, of finding quicker and more efficient methods of production. It is qualitatively different from the old methods of production under capitalism. It gave birth to something new. It is bringing about, also, a qualitatively different milieu. It is in the process of altering society itself. It has been doing this for ~~it~~ a long time, almost unobserved. On coming to England I find that there is a great deal of excitement over the Common Market, for example, and what it means for the mass of the workers. Now it occurs to me that we used to discuss these problems already at our conferences in ~~South Africa~~ South Africa. In "Education for Barbarism in South Africa" we raised the problem of automation and how it was going to alter the basis of society. This was in 1959, I think.

In Europe today they are profoundly concerned with this problem of automation which they see as a new factor responsible for the new

simple ways. With the sharp nose of the bourgeoisie for profits, those in the book-trade are publishing ~~Marx's~~ Marx's writings and books on Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, in all languages throughout Europe. A new period was setting in and these books were in demand. Why were they in demand? Because the youth of today, in order to take part intelligently in a debate find that they have to read.

In this way Marxist ideology is spreading throughout the world. At the same time the new industrial revolution, the technological revolution, is having a profound effect on society, shifting the class barriers by depressing a section of the petit-bourgeoisie into a working class. Thus several factors are operating together: Marxism is on the order of the day; the monolithicism of the Soviet state is breaking up and an intense debate is being carried on. Europe is seen to be waking up once more and its working class is on an upward grade. There have always been periodic depressions under capitalism before and after the imperialist world wars, but now they are taking place within a new political milieu on a world scale. And that is an additional factor. This is an epoch of resuscitation; there is a resurgence ~~in Europe~~ of the struggle in Europe and Europe itself is moving towards the socialist revolution. The same thing is taking place in Latin America, which has been bogged down by (U.S.) imperialism for a hundred years, its development arrested at the ~~stage of~~ stage of neo-colonialism. Now that the people are struggling to free ~~themselves~~ themselves, it is no longer a fight for bourgeois democracy. It is a fight for socialism. Once more Europe is taking the lead in the struggle for socialism. At the end of last century and the beginning of the present century, it led the way with Marxism. But the Revolution did not take place first in western Europe. It was achieved first in Russia. We do not know what will happen, but one thing we are clear about. The struggle for socialism is again on the march, and throughout the world.

Thus an epoch is coming to a close. Monolithicism in the socialist bloc, that is, in the Stalinist camp, is broken for good. This has given an opportunity to the communist parties in different countries to at least try to work out their own problems. And in order to grapple with these problems they had to ^{re-}turn to Marxism. These are the signs of a new epoch opening up in all the continents.

Now as to the United States, it is evident that there, too, a new development is taking place. It is my view that even the most advanced on the left are in danger of missing the boat there. I consider that the situation in the U.S. demands a closer understanding between ourselves, that is, our organisations, and the revolutionaries in the U.S., especially the Black organisations. If you examine our conditions and theirs you will find many similarities between the position of the Blacks in the U.S., the Afro-Americans and other Non-Whites there and our position in South Africa. In both countries there is an advanced stage of capitalism; in both countries you find nationalism, that is, of the oppressed Blacks as a group. These Black groups are like a colonised people, colonised by the same ~~same~~ country in which they live and in general by the same imperialist powers. These similarities - conditions - posit an additional factor over and above the straightforward conflict between labour and capital. This is so, irrespective of the fact that in the U.S. the colour bar is made illegal. Theoretically it is supposed not to exist, or at least is minimal. But defacto it is very much in existence. In South Africa it exists by law and in fact. In truth

the situations are practically identical. I'm not going into the legal niceties whereby in the U.S. a Black man is supposed to have certain rights, for example the right to vote. But this vote isn't worth a hundredth part of the vote of the white boss. Factually the Black man in the U.S. suffers the same disadvantages and disabilities as the Black man in S. Africa. It follows from this that their struggles are similar. They ought, therefore, to be in contact and consulting one another. I feel that the Black man in the U.S. would benefit from a knowledge of the experiences of our people in South Africa, and an understanding of the way the Unity Movement of South Africa has tried to grapple with the situation. Likewise, too, we can learn from their experience.

To come back to the situation in South Africa. I have surveyed the events as marking the end of the epoch of the ascendancy of neo-colonialism and the emergence of a new epoch. This must be accompanied by an increase of instability in Africa. The rolling of presidential heads is no accident. Imperialism is aware of the dangers to itself in developments that are taking place on a world scale and therefore cannot tolerate even a semblance of democracy in the colonial countries. It needs complete subservience, a complete take-over. For now the two systems, capitalism and socialism, are face to face, preparing for the confrontations that must come. They must therefore whip Africa into line. All those who have any ideas about independence, which, in terms of today are likely to follow the road of Cuba, must be suppressed with a ruthless hand. There is the ever-present fear of the fact that the populations themselves are pushing upwards towards real independence. Cuba, incidentally, has been responsible for a lot of things. While it gave inspiration to revolutionaries throughout Latin America, paradoxically it was responsible for a number of ill-considered imitations of the methods adopted by the Cubans, but which, in the given circumstance, could end only in frustration and failure.

A number of countries thought they could repeat the Cuban experience and it was only after several failures that people began to realise that the Cuban revolution is not capable of being repeated anywhere else. It was when they understood that only the revolutionary example of Cuba and those aspects of their experience that could be generalised, adding fresh tactical ammunition to the sum total of the revolutionary arsenal, that the Cuban experience could be of great value. Thus we have learned a political lesson from Cuba; on the one hand it gave a tremendous boost to the revolutionary spirit of the oppressed people, but on the other hand it brought about the mistaken idea that it could simply be imitated and this had led to failure.

As for imperialism, it also learned a great lesson from Cuba. At first the people were simply fighting against the autocrat, Batista. They were fighting for ordinary bourgeois rights. Castro himself was a member of the petit-bourgeoisie and the United States did not oppose him seriously. They thought it might be better to get rid of Batista and things would remain the same except that the people would be rather more satisfied. However, Castro, having succeeded, found himself in a dilemma. When he had started as an ordinary petit-bourgeois to conduct a revolution, he had aroused the support of the peasantry in the countryside. And the peasantry supported him on the basis of a programme that was going to give them liberation. You will remember that at first Castro, having achieved power, handed it over to a petit-bourgeois. Why? Because he seemed honest.

Similarly, the Mensheviks in Russia, in 1917, as soon as they had gained power, were ready to hand it over to the bourgeoisie, until the Bolsheviks stepped in.

Well, Castro at first made the same mistake. The fellow to whom he handed the power behaved true to form, deserted and handed it back to the United States. The masses were outraged at this. They pressed on and called on Castro to take over the ~~new~~ reins of government. Castro had to keep his promise to the masses. He was carried forward by them step by step until at some point he turned into a revolutionary. There was no other road for him. Fortunately, too, he realized the necessity to study Marxism seriously and he had men around him, like Che Guevara, who were Marxists. Because he was a man of great integrity he was able to grow with the revolution - which is a very rare thing.

As we have said, imperialism learned its lesson from ^{this} Cuban revolution. From that time it is not taking any chances on this question of allowing even a doubtful petty-bourgeois to step in. Today Africa is paying as a result of those lessons learnt by the U.S. That is why in Africa the heads of States are rolling. The U.S. means to see to it that whoever does not conform must give way, that is, amongst all those who received independence.

Nevertheless the United States has to reckon with new developments with what I have called a new epoch. We see the signs in Europe and we see them in Africa. In fact the process of change is on an international scale. This brings us to the point we made earlier: now the leadership of a country is faced -confronted - with a choice, either to take its stand on the side of the population and face the enemy, imperialism; or it must go to the other side and face the people as an enemy. There is no middle course any more. That time is coming to an end. If the leadership goes over to the other side, imperialism will protest it as much as it can from its own people. If it goes over to the side of the people, they will protest it against imperialism. You can observe a change taking place in the Portuguese territories, for instance. There is a slight change in the approach of the people involved in the struggle. It started as a struggle of the petit-bourgeoisie, but today, if not in actions, at least in words they are paying homage to revolution. The term was not readily used under neo-colonialism. It was independence that was the slogan. But now you hear even the most obviously petit-bourgeois amongst the Black leadership calling themselves revolutionaries.

Our own country cannot be immune to this process that is beginning to show itself in Africa. If today we see the disintegration first of the PAC and then of the African National Congress, it is not accidental. It is not because the leaders of the Congress suddenly become corrupt or change their nature. They are the same people that they were when they left South Africa. They retain the same basic outlook. Corruption is indicative of something else. The question is: What is it that engenders corruption? There is something that is lodged in the situation itself, in the historic epoch of neo-colonialism.

If we look at our own situation since we left home, the attitude of some of the officials is at least changing towards us. As the situation in the OAU became more and more complicated and they were confronted with problems, the officials became willing to have discussions with us

The younger ones especially, being acutely aware of the immediate problems, were keen to discuss with us. They don't really understand what our true position is, but at least there is sympathy and a willingness to understand our point of view. They realise that we are seriously concerned not only with solving our own problems but that we also understand the problems confronting them, even though they have been granted independence. This is a further sign of the changing situation in Africa.

Now the leadership in the various independent countries are face to face with the apparently insoluble difficulties of constructing a viable state. They are moving towards the position of having to make a choice. It is in this situation that they are open to ideas and begin to realise the inter-relation between our struggle and theirs. This is so, even though we are at different stages in so far as they are already concerned with the problems of reconstruction while we have still to achieve freedom in our country. However, when I say that one epoch is closing and another is opening up, it does not follow that we immediately come on to the stage - just as it does not follow that, simply because people are disillusioned with the African National Congress, they will automatically turn to us. We still have a battle before us and a very big battle. Incidentally, it must not be assumed that the fall of the Congress is completed. An epoch may take a long time to unfold itself. One thing that is clear is that, in so far as South Africa is concerned - and I think to a certain extent in the Portuguese territories - imperialism is losing the initiative. This leaves room for us to take the initiative.

When imperialism was by way of losing out in S. Africa, that is, to the extent of failing to get rid of Verwoerd and taking over completely, it got its agents to operate outside South Africa in order to hold back the revolution to which conditions under fascism were driving the country. We know that imperialism feared that Verwoerd would drive the country into an abyss, opening the flood-gates of revolution, and therefore it wanted to replace him with a government that better understood the economic and political needs of the time. But since they were unable to depose Verwoerd in the normal way through the ballot and by manipulating the stock-market, they resorted to another scheme. We know it well.

They made use of that section of the population that was amenable to their plans, namely, the South African liberals, the Communist Party and the Black Congresses, more especially the African National Congress. This had one purpose, to divert the revolution from its proper channels. They sent their agents to Africa, Europe, the U.S. and organised the whole campaign for anti-apartheid. The press in these countries took it up and thousands became sympathetic to a struggle in South Africa, that was presented simply as an anti-apartheid struggle. Concretely, what did this mean? It cannot be said too often that it means only the removal of the Verwoerd-Vorstser regime Government and putting into power the imperialist wing of the herrenvolk. It actually means putting the segregationists into power. Yes, imperialism has always used racial segregation to intensify economic exploitation.

This propaganda campaign for an anti-apartheid grew by leaps and bounds, successfully covering the whole of Europe. I myself have been up against the full force of that propaganda. In Scandinavia, however, we decided to have a head-on collision with it. Fortunately many people are beginning to doubt the validity of the anti-apartheid line. Concretely it meant that in Europe the goodwill of the population was directed into harmless channels and the moneys collected have been used for a struggle that is simply for a system of neo-colonialism. As I have said, however, the revolutionary spirit is growing in Europe and the people are engaged in their own struggles. Therefore they are beginning now to view the struggles of other peoples in the light of their own.

What was called the NEW LEFT that sprang up in the United States and England - a nebulous term covering a number of groupings - is breaking up and a section is beginning to move really to the left. Since they, too, are facing problems, they are asking: "What kind of struggle is it that the oppressed of South Africa are really engaged in?" Yesterday it was enough for a Black face to show itself on a platform in Europe, in London or the U.S. and make a recital of grievances suffered by people in South Africa. Then the women shed tears and the men opened their purses and threw their pennies at you. Today, however, people are asking the right questions: "What exactly are you fighting for in South Africa? And how do you propose to conduct your struggle?" This is not simply because they are disillusioned and they know that their moneys have been squandered. It is something else. There is a progression in their thinking. They are grappling with their own problems and the struggle in Europe is becoming transformed. Since their debate on Marxism, too, people are beginning to think in terms of socialism. It's no longer a question of pity for the "poor black fellow". They are asking ~~instead~~ instead: "If you get rid of the whites, do you intend simply to step into their shoes?" These are the questions they are asking today. These are some of the signs of the change in Europe, signs of the opening of a new period.

It is in this context that we must see our struggle in South Africa. South Africa cannot be separated from the general struggle that is taking place. It is a development that has already shown itself in Africa. Today for the first time our original Memorandum on the political situation in South Africa, which we presented (in 1963) to the Liberation Committee of the OAU, is finding a readership in Europe. The Committee ignored it when we first sent it out. Only some revolutionaries in Canada who received it said: "This is a document for all time." And they reprinted it. (Under the title: UNITY: THE STRUGGLE IN SOUTH AFRICA.) Today it speaks to the people. That is why we are able to send out also: THE REVOLUTIONARY ROAD FOR SOUTH AFRICA. And it, too, talks to the people. It itself is a measure of development. In other words, with the closing of one epoch and the opening of another, language itself alters, expressing new ideas. New parties and new personalities that give expression to the demands of the time can now enter the stage. History has a way of destroying the froth, the counterfeit article that goes before the genuine one steps in.

When, concretely, we deal with South Africa and refer to the fall of the African National Congress, we realise that history now demands that living parties, living political organisations should enter on the stage.

still

It is true that imperialism has the power to maintain the Congress. And the Soviet Union, too, will continue to do so. They have the power to prop up the dying corpse for a long time to come. But the fact is, it is a corpse; while history demands living political organisations. If these don't come forward, then reaction starts all over again. This demand holds a good everywhere.

It is in the light of these facts that we see our struggle in South Africa. We have stayed long enough outside. We have fought to maintain our position and, thanks to history being on our side, we have managed to survive. Thanks to the fact, also, that things move fast in this atomic age. Epochs come and go in a short time. This present span of history, this epoch of change, of set-backs, of the continuance of the liberatory struggle, covers a comparatively brief number of years. Now we stand on the threshold of a new era. It is up to us to get on to the stage. The doors are opening. We have to force our way. That door won't open of itself. We ourselves have to force it open. This is the way we must view our position in South Africa.

Now lastly a few words about South Africa itself. I think we have commented before on the language used by what is considered to be the most backward section, the peasantry, and which it learned from us. It is the language of the new ideas of struggle introduced by the Unity Movement. Today those Africans who run the Baboon's Parliament of Government stooges in the Transkei Bantustan (Cape Province), are finding it necessary to use that language in order to maintain their position amongst the people. This is not because they want to use it. It is the pressure of the population from below that forces them to do so. (They have to pretend to make democratic demands.)

Another sign of the times is the cracking up of the fascist Party (Nationalist Party) itself, the split between the Vorster wing and the extremist Hertzog wing. This indicates the strong pull of finance capital breaking up the fanatic Broederbond. Our article in the APDUSA on Verwoerd's Assassination anticipated the outbreak of flashing knives behind the facade of unity. This has been fully borne out with the passage of time. Imperialism had its own way of taking a hand in this process by wooing the Afrikaner financiers. We have analysed all this before. I only wanted to remind you what we said about Vorster, that he is the last of that line in South Africa, the line of Malan, Strydom, Verwoerd, Vorster. Even at the time of Verwoerd's assassination they were looking for a half-way (compromise) candidate until they could find a Prime Minister who would symbolise the marriage between the Afrikaans financiers (such as the tobacco king, Rupert) and the imperialists epitomised in Oppenheimer. The mention of Schoeman's name for the job revealed the strength of the financial wing within the Volk. He had been a great admirer of Smuts, the imperialist stooge. I must say that what we did not foresee was that the fire-eater, Vorster, that same Black-Shirt, that same worshipper of Hitler, would today be accused by his own right-wing of being a kaffir-boetie (nigger lover). As someone once expressed it: if history needs a camel and cannot find one, it takes a howdah and puts it on a donkey, and lo and behold, you have a camel! The conditions in South Africa required a compromise Prime Minister. Vorster, an out-and-out fascist, is today trying to play the same role that a Schoeman would have played, or his successor, when he, too, would have been slaughtered like Verwoerd.

Thus we see that in South Africa itself things have reached such a pitch that there is a rift in the monolithic party of the Afrikaners. And this we must understand, that everything that happens, the general crisis and the specific crisis, is due primarily to the position of the Blacks. It is the Blacks who create a crisis in South Africa. Their very presence creates a setting for a crisis and their actions create a crisis. It is because most of them have gone beyond the old idea of accepting their position of inferiority. Even if the Blacks are not yet doing anything positive, everyone in South Africa knows that they are living on a volcano. All the signs are there.

There is no need to speak about the peasantry and their attitude to the Baboon's Parliament. After all, it is lodged right in the Transkei, where our ideas were the strongest and today the peasants speak our language. Let us consider the most backward section of all - barring, of course, the Indian merchants. Consider the Coloured section in Johannesburg and how they behaved over the elections. (i.e. for Coloureds only, in their segregated Group Area). They are positively beginning to talk the language of the Anti-CAD of yesterday. (That is, of the Anti-Coloured Affairs Department that was affiliated to the Unity Movement.) Consider the results of the elections to the Coloured "Baboon's Parliament." The issue was clear-cut, between the supporters of ~~the~~ Apartheid and Anti-Apartheid. The very fact that they took part in the segregated elections revealed how backward they are. Yet they carried the day amongst the Coloured people because they said they were against Apartheid. Whether they really are is another matter. But they won on the ticket of Anti-Apartheid. This is bound to create an acute crisis amongst the ruling party.

These are signs that reveal the way the wind is blowing. And imperialism recognises them. Unfortunately the oppressed themselves cannot read the signs because they ~~themselves~~ are in a language they don't understand. The imperialists, on the other hand, are very busy because they see the signs. With the aid of the Soviet Union they are working hard to patch up the corpse of the African National Congress and breathe some life into it. First they take it to Khartoum (Conference) and then out of Africa to Rome, to get the papal blessing. (Reference is to Soviet-dominated conferences of AAFSO.)

Who was it who once said: whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad? When a class is doomed, every step it takes is wrong and must be wrong. The African National Congress is shown up to be wrong and its actions become ridiculous. We must not think, however, that Imperialism will give in.

What I am saying is: the turn of the historical wheel is ~~with us~~ favourable to us now. It is up to us to put our shoulders to that wheel and exert every ounce of energy we've got in turning that wheel. We have the opportunity. Historically the wheel is turning in the right direction.