

DIALOGUE AND VORSTER'S OUTWARD POLICY

by H. R. Nengwekhulu

Before I plunge into an analysis of this policy I must apologise for my apparent subjectivity. My problem is that I do not believe in the so called intellectual objectivity in matters of value. I believe, however, in intellectual honesty and I will try to be as honest as possible in my approach.

(a) In my attempt to present a vivid revaluative analysis, appraisal and implications of the "outward looking policy" of the South African Government it would be necessary for me to undertake a short excursion into the realm of International Relations since it is my belief and assertion that it is only against the background of International Relations that the aims, objectives, ideas and implications of this policy can be given a clear assessment.

It should be noted, however, that it is difficult to give a precise nature and scope of International Relations since definitionally it is difficult to draw a rigid distinction between domestic and international relations. There are almost as many definitions of international relations as there are scholars of the discipline. But all these definitions have one thing in common: international relations include not only political relations, but also others, such as cultural, ideological, military and economic ones. All definitions of international relations speak, explicitly or implicitly, in terms of states and their governments acting in pursuit of certain goals, aims and objectives, and the dimensions relating to activities of states that transcend national boundaries.

Thus, international relations concern themselves with the study, understanding and comprehension of the relations between independent, sovereign states as members of the family of nations. Order and stability are the pre-requisite of this family of nations.

This does not, however, imply that there is easily achievable consensus among the various states which participate in international relations. International relations take place in a special type of environment since common cultural, social, economic, political or ideological backgrounds are lacking. Within this approximate understanding of some features of the environment in which international relationships take place, the problem of defining a particular country's foreign policy objectives may become clear.

A country's foreign policy goals may be reasonable by its own standards though not necessarily those of others.

In international relations it is therefore unrealistic for any country to expect that it can impose solutions which reflect only gains for its own position on all issues, at all times, and in all places.

"Thus the inability or unwillingness of states to reach agreement on the terms for peaceful co-existence - a characteristic inherent in international relations - is a result of the diversity and irreconcilability of interests, objectives, ideals and aims of states".

But there are only limited alternatives to the solution of this political impasse in international relations: the ability by states to arrive at compromises; the willingness to live with unresolved situations or the employment of coercion. This is the more so since there is a tendency and quite a naive one, in international affairs, for their rights rather than their duties and obligations.

Finally, we should also pay attention to the meaning and nature of foreign policy. A country's foreign policy refers to its attitudes toward the outside world. But it should be borne in mind that the distinction between international and foreign policy is purely academic and naive.

b) The aims, objectives and ends of the South African outward policy towards Africa.

One of the most difficult problems in the sphere of international relations is that of explaining a country's foreign policy objectives, and why states behave as they do. It is sometimes temptingly easy to base our entire theoretical speculations of international relations and foreign policy assumptions about the motivations of states, but it is very difficult to prove that those assumptions correspond to objective reality in a country's foreign policy.

But, it is also easy for us to assume that the activity and foreign policy of a country is goal-oriented; that varying factors, internal and external, to the country are influencing her goals as well as her chances for attaining those policy goals, and that all countries involved in international relations have genuine motivations. We should not, however, close our eyes to foreign policy priorities countries give to their various objectives. It is my assertion that all foreign policies are characterised by power drives.

As Bertrand Russell observed: "of all the infinite desires of many, the chief are the desires for power and glory, and he added some human desires, unlike those of animals, are essentially boundless and incapable of complete satisfaction".

Certainly, considerations of power and glory are not absent from the minds of the architects of the South African outward looking policy.

Unquestionably, a policy motivated by power drives for the sake of "survival" and security based on the realities of the international system, helps us to understand the intensity and persistence of contradictions and conflicts in international relations.

These systems of belief deny the existence of any basis for peaceful co-existence.

This certainly is the driving force behind this "outward looking policy" of the South African policy. South Africa wants to establish and entrench her power in Africa because she believes that this would be a guarantee for her "security". Thus, South Africa is playing a game of power politics - a game that pays dividends. Confronted with a possibility of total isolation and conflict with black states, she has decided to embark on a policy that will ensure her political hegemony in Africa.

Characteristic of this power drive by South Africa is the conclusion that her security could only be assured by a political aggrandisement of the whole continent. It is my belief that, fundamentally, the security of South Africa rests upon the essential autonomy and defensibility of each national territory of Africa. There does not exist neither the moral necessity nor the political excuse for this unwarranted imperialistic expansionism and ideological colonialism.

It is easy and possible to explain these expansionist drives by South Africa. They are the result of a desire to escape from internal tensions, strains and potential crisis. A regime with insecure political tenure at home succeeds too well in transferring its insecurity to the international system. South Africa is intent on making this transference of her internal problems to the whole Africa as acceptable as possible by sugar-coating her true intentions and motives.

Some people might argue that South Africa is being forced to engage in this kind of imperialism in order to maintain a balance of power in Africa. It is apparent that the balance of power is being invoked in such a way as to serve as the moral justification for policies not ipso facto related to balancing anything. It is being used to cloak ideological imperialism and to sanctify the search for political hegemony over Africa.

The significance of this ideological invocation then lies not in any practical belief in the balance of power myth, but in the fact that South Africa feels so convinced of its popularity as to make its conversion into a symbol of proper policy propagandistically profitably. Thus, among the objectives of the outward policy of S.A. are those of aggrandisement and expansionism - physical, economic, cultural, political, military and ideological. But it is still popularly agreed that S.A. is engaged in a drive for peace and security in Africa. But behind the objective of peace and security lie conflicting national versions of what peace and security mean. It is only in her actual, concrete actions and the resulting of such actions that we are able to detect the true intentions S.A. has in Africa.

(c) South Africa Foreign policy vehicles :

In her drive to penetrate deep into Africa, and realise her ambitions and desires, South Africa is employing a number of means which are used as her foreign policy instruments:

(i) Military imperialism and military methods:

Although it is questionable whether the possession of immense military arsenal, with all their modern destructiveness, can still be contemplated in the pursuit of political objectives, it cannot be doubted that the mere possession of such military weapons can be used effectively as an instrument and means of implementing a country's foreign policy objectives and aims. This is the more so in respect of S.A. with her massive arsenal of military weapons - the strongest military power in Africa. Their very possession is being translated into concrete political advantage because of the fear which is inspired in the minds of Black states.

Thus, the psychology engendered by South Africa's possession of immense military arsenal seems to possess an intense impact upon the total environment for international relations in Africa.

The mere possession of these military arsenal and the inherent possibility of their application and employment possesses its own inner political dynamism - military superiority transforms itself from an end to a means of foreign policy. It seduces a sense of insecurity in the minds of Black leaders. Thus, South Africa's military power, is only meaningful in relation to means, and means is only meaningful in relation to foreign policy objectives.

These facts point the moral that foreign policy never can, or never should be, divorced from military strategy. The foreign policy of a country is limited not only by its aims, but also by its military strength, or more accurately, by the ratio of its military strength to that of other countries. Thus, military power being an essential element in the life of a country, becomes not only an instrument of foreign policy, but an end in itself. South Africa will not allow any symptom of military weakness since that will promptly reflect in her political status.

It cannot be denied that South Africa is resorting to the indirect use of military power for political, economic and other advantages in Africa.

This the more so since military superiority can be utilised in ways to constitute the essential backdrop to negotiations between states. It can be used to enable states to make threats and gain concessions. We must admit that the threat of force and its use in international relations is instrumental in achieving a country's desired foreign policy objectives.

(ii) Economic imperialism and methods:

It may sound a political over-simplification to allege that economic strength of a country has always been an instrument of political power and a country's foreign policy. Only the most primitive kinds of foreign policies are altogether independent of economic factors. This reflects that a country's international policies assume a diverse class, industrial and economic base.

The massive industrialisation of Russia, coupled with her immense economic wealth, growth and potential has transformed her from an insignificant agricultural power to a super-power within a space of 20 years. South Africa by a sheer conspiracy of natural circumstances has become the most important industrial-economic giant in Africa.

This economic wealth makes it possible for her to engage in a foreign policy of economic imperialism in Africa. She is able to off her economic and technical aid to the Black states. It cannot be denied, however, that the drive for economic development in the emerging Black states is complex and expensive. Much more, depends, therefore, on the ability and preparedness of more highly developed countries to offer support for these states. It can also not be denied that such support is, on occasions, given as a purely humanitarian gesture, but the usual pattern is to provide for ventures of concrete political advantage.

Thus the policy of South Africa towards the new states is being forced into these states in the guise of economic, technical and industrial aid. These Black states, because of their economic and industrial poverty brought about by centuries of colonial exploitation, are finding it increasingly difficult to close their eyes to the tempting offers of aid from South Africa, despite the fact that she is engaged in a policy of economic imperialism designed to weaken their economic independence and thus make them more dependent on her. One might even say that South Africa is trying to create a welfare colonialism in Africa. Thus it is clear that economic strength and potential is germane to international relations and a country's foreign policy. South Africa's outward looking policy is therefore, a policy of economic imperialism since no aid is given to a country without political attachments.

This policy of economic imperialism is also characteristic of the American Dollar policy through which billions of dollars are set aside for the so-called foreign programmes. By pumping millions and millions of dollars into Africa, Asia and Latin America, America is entrenching her position as a political, military and economic leader of the world because no country which receives aid from her would dare state her ambitions. The British Oil Diplomacy is also a characteristic of economic imperialism. And so also is the outward looking policy of South Africa. It is therefore, obvious that economic aid is used as an instrument of foreign policy. I have no doubt that South Africa's offer of economic aid to the Black states is a handmaiden for her desired political and ideological motives. She is in her pursuit of her political ends, pressing deep into Black Africa so that she can then have a perfect pretext for becoming politically involved. With this excuse she can proceed with impunity and without fear of other countries involving on the side of her unfortunate victims.

(iii) Psychological methods in foreign policy implementation:

The employment of psychological methods in foreign policy implementation of a country's objectives and ulterior motives has become one of the most effective means in modern times. Countries indulge in propaganda activities in their endeavour to implement their foreign policy objectives by manipulating the facts and symbols to attain their maximum desired results, in the minds of their political audiences. Psychological methods are always directed both toward domestic and foreign targets, and are designed to serve two main purposes:

domestically, governments use propaganda to rally the unsuspecting people of the country in support of their foreign policies because foreign policies will become more effective and acceptable internationally if it is known by foreign governments that they have the support and endorsement of the people at home. Internationally, such policies are designed to achieve certain results in other states. These may be of two types internationally. In cases where another government is hostile to and non-receptive of the purposes and objectives of the government employing the psychological methods, such methods are designed to create and ferment internal tensions, strains and opposition and dissension, thus weakening that political hold that country and support which those policies enjoy domestically. Similarly, psychological methods may be, and are being, used to encourage and promote policies which are advantageous to the state that utilizes and applies these methods and techniques.

Psychological methods are used both for defensive and offensive purposes. A given government will use them not only to create positive support for its foreign policy objectives, but also to ward off the negative effects thus the use of similar policies by other states might have in the attainment of countervailing efforts.

Thus, South Africa, in her drive to advance her foreign policy objectives in Africa is employing both blends of psychological techniques. Where there is a hostile opposition to her neo-colonialism and policies, economic, military and ideological imperialism for instance in Zambia, she is trying to create dissension and tensions in the minds of Zambians and thus weaken the leadership of President Kaunda. The disclosure of secret communication between Mr Vorster and President Kaunda by Mr Vorster cannot be seen in any other way than as a psychological, propagandist technique in his endeavour to break President Kaunda's stubborn and uncompromising opposition to the much idealised "outward looking policy".

Internally, Mr Vorster has apparently succeeded in breaking the smouldering resistance that the white electorate might have shown. He has succeeded in convincing them that the "outward looking policy" of his government is nothing else than a guarantee for the continued white domination in South Africa and they have all accepted it. No opposition can dare to oppose the "outward looking policy" since to do so would be to commit political suicide, because all whites in South Africa believe in the continued existence of white domination.

(d) Implications of the Outward Looking Policy of the South African

Government:

It is against the above background that it becomes easy to analyse the implications of the "outward looking policy" of Mr Vorster.

Contemporary trends in Africa - trends in large measure influenced by the outward looking policy - are pointing toward ever more complex and troublesome political dilemmas for Africa and for the black man in South Africa.

This essay is an attempt to examine these recent political developments in the light of this "outward looking policy" with the intention of focussing on and identify two issues. The first development to concern us will be the "outward looking policy" itself with regard to political changes and implications that have surfaced in Africa. Of particular and special importance will be an examination of the meaning and impact and implications of this "outward looking policy", ideological strategy of friendship and cordiality toward Black Africa in light of her equally outward strategy involving the defence of the white regime, of Rhodesia, and her increasing support for the Portuguese within Angola and Mozambique.

We shall try to examine what these quite contradictory and irreconcilable trends portend for the future of the black man in South Africa, and they mean in terms of long term political control in Africa as a whole.

The second and related issue that will concern us is the nature of Black Africa's foreign policy response to these trends.

It is not an exaggeration to say that two distinct and contradictory trends have always dominated politics in Africa: on the one hand, black nationalism and on the other hand, white racism. Despite this apparent coliness there is a smouldering resentment toward this political anomaly. South Africa, despite contradictions in her foreign policy, has embarked on an active policy designed to win friends in blacks - one might say political stooges and pawns.

The emergence of this new ideological strategy has caused consternation among whites in South Africa who fear that any type of equal relations with blacks in Africa will lead to an erosion of apartheid, and thus open the door for political control by the black man.

But, because of the political indoctrination by the government they have now accepted

It is the only weapon against encroachments by blacks in South Africa, since this policy will be able to weaken any moral support the black states could give to the black man in South Africa.

For the implementation of this policy, South Africa is able and prepared to pay. In exchange for nothing more than political neutrality toward her internal policies. South Africa is prepared to provide economic and technical aid. South Africa also expects that these contacts with Black Africa will increase her influence in Black Africa.

It is significant to note that none of the black leaders who are dealing openly with South Africa have intimated that they in any way condone her treatment of the blacks within her borders. They do argue naively, however, that they consider their relations with S.A. to be prompted by a genuine and realistic appraisal of the options open to them in Africa. But, at precisely the same time that S.A. has been evolving her "outward looking" ideological strategy, toward the black states, she has been engaged in a similar outward strategy designed to bolster up and entrench the remaining white colonialists that lie on her borderlands.

Taking an overview of this "outward looking" policy, definite contradictions and paradoxes team in it. On the one hand, South Africa wants to interact with the black states, simultaneously, she is closely interacting with and supporting with other white fascist governments with a view to weaken the black states.

It becomes almost insurmountable to explain this political paradox. It becomes more difficult to explain how South Africa's apartheid regime expect to have close relations with both white and black states. This paradox is in part resolved if we realise that all the increased white-black contact is planned to take place across national lines. None of this interstate handshaking has made the slightest dent in the internal racial malaise of South Africa. If anything, the internal trends in S.A. are toward an intensification of vicious oppression and genocide and a rigid defence of white racial domination. Furthermore, there are no grounds for arguing that in time these interstate contacts may have a spill-over effect on the internal racial patterns in S.A. despite the naive arguments by some black states which want to trust their contacts with a political leper of Africa.

The reason for this pessimistic and dreary conclusion which I am drawing, lies, I believe in the fact that, because of her enormous economic strength, South Africa's dealings with these black states will always be a relationship of almost total economic dependency. This will give her an ample opportunity of blackmailing these states into accepting or condoning her internal policies or at least to remain neutral. All that we will have then will be the emergence of an African system of states that is thoroughly dominated by a single rich, and powerful state - South Africa.

Through the use of trade, aid and with the potential use of her military power always lurking in the background South Africa is intent on establishing Black client states. This constellation of paradoxical force in Africa - political, economic and ideological - poses a policy dilemma for Blacks in South Africa, that is likely to grow more acute in the years to come, unless we do something about it. We should take a stand on the side of those forces that aspire for the fundamental human rights. S.A. is fully aware of the paradoxes in her policy and is doing everything possible both to intensify and implement them. She cannot afford not to do this since she is fully aware of the opportunities open to her in Africa. She commonly defends her growing continental drive for political economic and ideological hegemony - in terms of serving the interests of the "free world" which she imagines is about to be swallowed up by communism. She subtly promises to stabilize peace in Africa. Even Mr. Vorster has once commented, perhaps with an unknown sense of irony, that we have a sense of self-interest .. in the development and prosperity of Africa... but it is not self-interest alone that motivates us.. we have a sense of mission in respect of Africa.

In addition, Providence has been very good to us in Africa and we want to return to Africa something of this... this is the spirit that inspires us... and this is the spirit that will conquer Africa .

This phrasing of South Africa's role in Africa would hardly warm the hearts of Blacks in South Africa, since it is clear that S.A. is embarking on a policy of trying to extend the violence of apartheid to the whole of Black Africa and it is my belief that the Black man in South Africa cannot afford to have a hand in such a policy or give it moral support, since it will be an indirect denial of his own humanity which such a policy is trying to consolidate.

The "outward looking" cannot be seen in anyway other than this. It is also possible to explain this imperialist expansionist drive as the result of a desire by the SA Government to escape from internal tensions and strains which apartheid engendered in South Africa.

South Africa in its drive to woo the Black states into her ideological laager, is motivated by two inner compulsions : the first is the instinctive desire for the whites to cling to power, internally and continentally, as long as it possibly can. The second, is their ideological missionary zeal of the bearers of an oppressive civilization whose innate belief in its racial superiority which compels them to spread their ideological gospel and try to recreate the subject Black race in their own image, regardless of the chances of success. For centuries the contact of the Black man with the whites has been disastrous for him; owing to his enforced political helplessness, black sons and daughters have been sold into slavery. And even today it is customary to excuse racial discrimination on us by the naive explanation and rationalisation that Black is inferior to white and as such incapable of controlling and directing the destiny of Africa.

But, I submit, that even if we are not equal in their capacity to serve the community - a myth which has long been proved naive - but they are equal in the possession of a personality and humanity that are worthy of reverence. They are equal in the right to the development of that personality so far as may be compatible with the common good. And in the determination of what constitutes the common good, they have an equal claim that the judgement would be heard and weighed and that the judgement should be disinterested, non-discriminatory and just.

It is therefore our duty to reject this "outward looking" policy since it is fraught with barbed traps for the Black man in South Africa; and in the whole of Africa. Blacks in SA cannot afford to support a policy of ideological imperialism.

It is quite inconceivable why some Black states show so much emotional enthusiasm in the so called "dialogue with SA". One cannot understand how they are going to reconcile their convictions and beliefs in the dignity and supremeness of man irrespective of race, colour or creed with the dogmatic ideology of white South Africans who fanatically believe in their racial superiority.

It is my conviction that an ideological controversy or dispute is not susceptible to compromise or accommodations, but goes on to climax in victory or defeat. No ideology permits bargaining with evil and to the white equality with the black man is an evil. This is necessarily so since ideology leads inescapably to the formulation of all problems in moral terms. Differences thus becomes the struggle between good and evil.

One cannot dispute or deny that most of these Black states are inspired by a genuine desire to try to resolve the racial impasse of apartheid when they express their willingness and preparedness to enter into a dialogue with SA. They believe that they could convince SA that the Black man is not genetically incapable of controlling the political destiny of his own people. It is their conviction that by sitting around the conference table with 5 African Whites, they will be able to show them the kind of humanism the Black man can instill into the White man's oppressive and demoralizing civilization.

But one cannot help to feel a sense of pessimism about the feasibility of such a dialogue, in view of the exclusive jurisdiction that any state possesses within its territory and to its freedom to act in international affairs without subjection to the legal control of another state, and its policies. Being subject to no legal superior, a country is traditionally left to her own devices for regulating its domestic and foreign policies.

Thus, it is inconceivable that South Africa will allow these black states to interfere with her domestic policies. It might be argued that South Africa maybe by international morality motivated to modify her stance on racialism in a dialogue with these black states. I am convinced there is no connection between power politics and morality. There does not exist any ethical restraint upon the policies of states.

It is against this background that one cannot understand how these black states, propose, to convince South Africa to jettison its racial policies - policies which are the cornerstone of discrimination, oppression and suppressing the black man in South Africa.

Their call for a dialogue is thus a mere exercise in moral fetishism. They are becoming increasingly infatuated with this ideological power keg. No black man in South Africa should allow himself to be lulled by the protestations of these black states: protestations that they are inspired by a sense of moral responsibility towards his plight. We do not doubt their sincerity, but the usefulness of such a dialogue. It cannot be denied that such a dialogue might result in the lessening of international tensions but it cannot help to ameliorate our sufferings.

Change in South Africa will be brought about by the black man himself in South Africa. We cannot expect Zambian children to come and die for our emancipation and freedom. They had to fight for their emancipation from colonialists. We will have to die for our own. For the black man in South Africa to expect the black states to fight for his rights is to indulge in moral mysticism and we cannot afford to live in a sort of "alice in wonderland".

We should be aware of the fact that the black states are committed to a policy of non-alignment. This might be the reason why some states feel that they should enter into a political relationship with South Africa.

But non-alignment with black Africa means that blacks have their own values, their own way of doing things. Any involvement in the "hot" or cold war would, it is my belief, deter them from their goals.

It is also my belief that non-alignment will give Africa an opportunity to crystallise their own political, economic and social philosophies. Non-alignment in Africa should be seen as a commitment standing between the ruthlessness of both capitalism and communism. It is a philosophy evolved to promote and disseminate the principles and ideals of black socialism. This philosophy evolves from an obsession of the black states to defeat and destroy this triple curse of: poverty, illiteracy and diseases., that spring from the evils of capitalism, racism and racialism. This fundamental black orientation with its primacy for the moral dignity of mankind, assures the dignity and humanism of man. It is this belief in the dignity and sacredness of man that provides the common denominator among the black peoples in Africa.

It is an imbilical cord that binds the black man in South Africa with his brethren in Africa. It is this cord that impels most black states in Africa to shun the "outward looking policy" of Vorster.

It is this conviction that should make us condemn "dialogue" and its inherent evils.

There can, therefore, be no marriage of the ideology of apartheid and the black philosophy of man.

As Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, Premier of Mauritius, graphically puts it :

"There can only be a dialogue between persons, of the same and rank and who have the same idea of man. There cannot be a dialogue between the fly and his Lord... there can only be a dialogue between persons having identical ideals... dialogue cannot take place, between people who have nothing in common... I share the distress and curse of our brothers in South Africa".

(Mail 19/5/71)

Thus we should not allow ourselves to be drugged by South African propaganda that her quest for dialogue is a quest for peace in Africa.

We should not allow ourselves to be seduced into passively or actively accepting this kind of political and ideological fraud. We should not accept the public protestations by SA that her drive into Africa is designed to combat communism and its evils, because I believe that the most serious threat to the peace stability and security in Africa is apartheid and its racial discriminatory norms.

SA should, therefore, be calling Black states to enter into a pact with her to wipe out apartheid, sheer grinding poverty that condemns the Black man in SA to live below the bread-line and all traces of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The scapegoating of Communism by SA has become her political strategy in her 'outward looking policy'. This is a grand strategy to divert the world from the horrors and evils of apartheid.

South Africa's ongoing argument that her outward looking policy is necessitated by a quest for national security is only a cloak for a quest for political, military, ideological and economic power in Africa.

We should, therefore, be wary of any policy that parades in the garb of a policy guided by the national security interest. The "outward looking policy" embraces a wide range of goals and objectives extending along a minimum - maximum continuum.

The maximum range continuum is evolved for a permanent consolidation and maintenance of internal oppression and repression. This is the basic aim, and she needs assurance from the outside world that there will be no interference. The minimum goal continuum is the desire to gain direct control and domination of Africa. SA is desirous of making the black states satellites by converting into her economic vassals. The employment of economic means seems to be the only method open to SA since she cannot afford to employ open military force in forcing her aims and ambitions since that would be to risk the loss of the desired influence and prestige that might otherwise be won through less costly alternative means.

The use of military force usually enters only as an exceptional and desperate means of strategy when all other alternatives are exhausted. Thus, so long as the Black states continue to suffer from the chronic economic poverty, we should expect increased economic action from South Africa. The only panacea against this malady is the Black states desire for independence. To overlook the strength of this desire is to misjudge the true temper of the Black states; to misunderstand their desire to see justice is to underestimate the power-thrust of Black consciousness. This might be a consolation to the black man in South Africa South Africa is determined to balkanise the black states in order to make them powerless. The old policy of divide and rule. She is trying to drive a wedge between them.

One cannot deny the possibility exists for this policy to succeed, in view of the fact that most Black states are still economically poor and as such would like to gain economic advantage of South Africa's rich economic, industrial and technological resources. Malawi and Lesotho are there already enjoying the fruits of their submissiveness. It is unfortunate that while content as a whole in being potentially rich, it is still desperately poor. Its rich resources are unevenly distributed; its main sources and reservoir of economic wealth are controlled by expatriate capitalists; it still lacks experts and trained personnel at all levels to man its technical services, and to execute its development programme.

This makes it possible to design a policy of ruling them. It is therefore imperative that we should be always in a state of war against any signs of economic imperialism in palatable concepts.

We should not forget that the economic power-base of SA is the Black man who is being ruthlessly exploited.

Our phobia for any signs of imperialism and racism in Africa, and the consolidation of apartheid in SA in particular cannot be seen as a negative rejection for the subjugation of the Black man. It is also a positive assertion of the right and capacity of the Black to take control and charge of his own destiny and eliminate any signs of the second scramble for Africa to carve it up in more subtly and thus perpetuate white domination.

We should join hands with all those who oppose dialogue and the outward looking policy, in order to make Africa independent, for the elimination of all economic dependence, and the removal of all vestiges colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism.

We have a positive interest in Africa - in doing what we believe can shape the whole continent so that the climate will be more favourable for equal opportunity, the disappearance of racism and racial discrimination and the abolition of all forms of repression and white supremacy and domination. Growing out of this we also have a negative interest in Africa: to stop any movement of ideological, tyranny and imperialism which assumes the semantic guise of the search for peace and security in Africa.

While the totalitarianism of colonialism is still alive in Africa, the totalitarianism of apartheid, racial discrimination and racism is at this moment in the history of Africa by far the most powerful sinister and virulent menace to humanity and human dignity, and we cannot allow it to spread continentally since this will make it more difficult to prescribe a panacea for this malady.

I do not dispute that SA's preparedness to offer economic and technical assistance to Black Africa may be humanitarian. But alleged humanitarian motives may sometimes be used as a cover for other less avowed, sinister motives. This is my main fear and doubts concerning economic and technical assistance to the Black states.

Economic and technical assistance is the vehicle of the "outward looking policy" and dialogue. I believe that for us to support or even passively condone this outward looking policy is morally disastrous. We cannot afford to enter into a moral conspiracy against ourselves and thwart our cause and aspirations. To support it would be tantamount to issuing a certificate of moral respectability and testimonials of good conduct to the white oppressors in SA in their desire to face the outside world and improve the image of apartheid.

I believe that it is for the Black man in SA to show moral resistance, homogeneity and cohesion in this struggle to wipe out apartheid and its soul-corroding effects.

I am aware that some people may accuse us of being "un-South African", by opposing the outward looking policy, but we should not forget that we are not South Africans but the vassals and slaves of the "South Africans". Others may remind us that the quest for dialogue and the drive into Africa by SA is motivated by her quest for the security of SA as a whole. I believe that in SA "National security" means the security of apartheid and white domination.

Many more may try to convince us that S. Africa's outward looking policy emanates from her desire and commitment to curb the infiltration of communism in Africa and thus secure the continued existence of western civilization and interests. But we could remind them that communism might be a threat to capitalism and western interests, but apartheid and its racism is a threat to humanity and the dignity of man.

It will be politically suicidal for us to enter into any collusion with other oppressors in the name of "national security".

Economically it will be disastrous for us to support South Africa's drive for markets and economic dominance in Africa because such a policy is designed to consolidate the economic capitalism of SA which will be a guarantee for the continued oppression and exploitation of the Black man in SA and Africa as a whole.

We should be aware of the fact that the economic strength of SA is a victim of the most ruthless economic exploitation unknown to human history. I believe that the wealth of SA is neither built on gold, diamonds nor secondary industry, but on the toiling Black man. Thus we should see all exports from SA to Africa and the outside world as being a ruthless exploitation of the Black man. As to the "dialogue issue", I cannot help but advocating that we should not support it.

Some people will argue that we should support it since one of its basic aims - at least from the Black African state's point of view - is to try to obliterate apartheid from the map of SA. Granted that this is the purpose of this dialogue, one cannot understand how the Black states can negotiate with SA to remove apartheid from within her borders, because the basis of international relations is the inviolability of the legal and political sovereignty, and independence of each state within her borders, irrespective of her military stature. No state be it the United States, Russia or Zambia has any right to interfere in the domestic affairs of another state. This inviolability of the state's sovereign independence in respect of her domestic jurisdiction, makes it impossible for other states to rectify the ills that may be plaguing another state.

Even the United Nations is incapable of interfering in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of member states.

Thus based as it is on the sovereignty of the member states, the UN Charter necessarily takes the view, expressed in Article 2, paragraph 7, that the organisation has no power to intervene in the domestic jurisdiction of any member state".

This principle of sovereignty of a state is equally applicable in the case of the so-called dialogue.

The Black states whatever the magnitude of their abhorrence of apartheid and racialism, can never ever do anything to abolish it unless SA herself is prepared to make apartheid the point of negotiation and is prepared to abandon it.

But if SA is prepared to enter into a dialogue with the Black states in order to resolve the impasse of apartheid, why can't she enter into a dialogue with us. We are capable of negotiating with the Vorster regime. But the South African government has, for centuries, refused to negotiate with the Blacks within her borders in order to eliminate this inhuman institution. For the black states, despite their fervent wish and desire to emancipate us from our sophisticated slavery, to hope that they can convince SA to abolish apartheid is to indulge in a fruitless exercise in a diplomatic jungle.

I am aware that some people may accuse me of an obsessive pessimism. But, I am only moved by my sense of political realities in SA. I believe that it is for the Black man in SA to strive for his own salvation and redemption from this crushing bondage. For him to entertain a hope that the black states will engender his liberation is to indulge in moral and political romanticism.

They can give us moral support, but we have to take up arms and fight for our cause.

BY HARRY NENGWENKHULU

REFERENCES:

- Corbett P. Ideologies, London (1965)
- Fox H. Theoretical aspects of international relations (Notre Dame - 1957)
- Hartmann F. Relations and Nations (New York - 1967)
- Morgenthau H. Politics among Nations (New York, 1964)
- Waltz K. Foreign policy and democratic politics (London 1967)
- Macridis Roy Foreign politics (New Jersey, 1967)
- Schleicher P. Ideology and Utopia, International Relations (New Jersey, 1963)
- McLellan D. The Cold War in Transition (New York, 1966)
- Newspaper Reports