

CONFLICT IN VALUES IN SOUTH AFRICA

The White "Left" At Work

from AZANIA NEWS

The crucial differences in the liberation movement of our country must be seen in their proper perspective. The people of our country are very clear about what is wrong in their society. Their differences arise over how to correct what is wrong. That is where the burden and predicament of material interest lies. Everyone is claiming his pound of flesh, like the old Merchant of Venice, without the possible loss of a single drop of blood. To understand the matter correctly, we should remove some of the great misconceptions about the political situation in that country.

To begin with, apartheid or separate development, is not the exclusive policy of the present Nationalist regime under the leadership of Balthazar Johannes Vorster, or of the Boer (Afrikaner) section of the white community in that country. All sections of the "Europeans" in South Africa, be they British, American, German, French, Japanese, Hungarian, Russian, Czech, Italian, Nordic or Lebanese, have contributed or continue to contribute their share to the practice of oppression, exploitation, humiliation, persecution and the abomination that is apartheid in the life of the African people. These facts are fully well-known and cannot be denied, but a considerable amount of propaganda has been mounted to divert attention from the real issues of the matter. This deception has even infiltrated the ranks of the liberation movement itself through the "sympathetic" friends of the revolution and those in our ranks who champion their cause.

Every revolution, no matter where it is fought out, must take spheres of influence into account, and ours is no exception to the rule, especially that imperialism has so entrenched itself in that part of the Continent. A book by John Laurence, The Seeds of Disaster, deals quite adequately with the part of the Government and the Afrikaner Nationalist propaganda which it rightly condemns outright. It attaches more importance to what the author calls "the most respectable of the anti-South African pamphlets", which give a horrifying picture of police brutality and white savagery. We use it extensively also to show certain trends, but we cannot allow our people to be taken in by it. We return to the point that the present regime and the Boers are not the only exponents of apartheid and exploitation.

We have warned over and over again that there are individuals and organisations who are seemingly in the fore-front of the struggle of our people for national liberation and social emancipation, but whose identifiable activities are, to our mind, inimical to the best interests of that struggle. This is why our liberation movement speaks in a multiplicity of voices and has become a tower of babel. We isolated this point at the very foundation of our organisation. We warned that the days of the domination of Africa by Europeans were numbered and even in South Africa the writing was glaringly on the wall for

those of our European rulers who had eyes to see and to decipher the message.

We pointed out that there was no room in any way and in any part of Africa for those non-indigenous peoples who deny the indigenous population its fundamental right to shape its own material and spiritual interests effectively. We emphasised that South Africa, which is an integral part of the African Continent, is the inalienable heritage of the African people and its effective control is their undoubted and unquestionable birthright.

When the international community thinks of the political situation in our country in recent years, what looms high in its imagination is the utterly brutal killings of men, women and children at Sharpeville, Langa, Evaton and Bophelong on March 21, 1960. People think of the political crisis that led to a financial crisis and the loss of profits that led to shooting of Prime Minister Verwoerd. They think of apartheid, of race prejudice and race discrimination and of police brutality.

But the oppressed people of Azania think of the campaign of positive action for the abolition of the pass laws; they think of the greatest march in our history that brought the city of Cape Town to a standstill nine days after the brutal shootings when political bankruptcy thought that our people were in disarray. They remember the martyrs of those hectic epic days in our history with national pride, and look forward to the annual occasion to rededicate themselves anew to the struggle for which the heroes died.

However, there are other people inside and outside our country who did not like the effects of that campaign and would hate to see its repetition. By the nature of its policies, the P.A.C. has attracted to itself powerful and cunning enemies which have a vested interest in South African private property. Diverse and conflicting as these interests may be, the enemies of determined decolonisation are united in their desire to mislead and misdirect the struggle of the people for national liberation and social liberation. Their principal weapon is to deceive and divide our people while pretending to be their friends. Such is the role of the agent provocateur.

The implications are quite clear. We should therefore look closely into the case of the individuals who have taken it upon themselves to villify the militant performance of our people and to cast aspersions upon their political motives. We must know what they stand for and their role in the national liberation movement of our country. It is not our intention to use this analysis as a criticism of the African National Congress. What we are showing is that the alleged ideological differences between the ANC and the PAC have always been contrived and intensified by the internal enemies of the African revolution, whose primary motive is to misdirect our struggle for their own purposes. In the main, the differences are mainly organisational. These are, to enlist Charles Dickens support, the Bumbles and the Fagins of the liberation movement. And there are gentlemen with white waistcoats also among them. Even the Beadles are there.

ORGANISATIONAL DIFFERENCES

The organisational differences are inevitable and unavoidable because we find some of the great enemies of the revolution within the liberation movement itself; enemies by effect if not by intent, and more often than not, by intent.

In an earlier issue, we published Alan Paton's letter to Daphne Masekela. Mr. Paton complained that the exponents of "black consciousness" regarded white liberals as their true enemies in spite of the fact that the Vorster regime bans, restricts and imprisons liberals for political reasons. We pointed out to Mr. Paton and his liberal tribe that the white man's predicament in Africa was not of our making or liking, and that in any case, while we make a distinction between black consciousness and national consciousness, our own feeling is that black consciousness is a reaction to liberal paternalism. We of course detest both, the former as a ghetto and gutter ideology and the latter as an ideology of "grinning friends" in the enemy camp in the South African political situation. Both are enemies by effect, no matter how well-intentioned they may be in their political setting.

However, the so-called ideological differences between the P.A.C. and the A.N.C. are superficially manipulated. The people who have contrived these differences, which on occasion have grown into rabid hostility, are the great enemies of our revolution by contrivance as well as by effect. We discovered and exposed these manoeuvres and contrivances almost twenty years ago, and called all sorts of ugly and derogatory names for that. We pointed out that our people had always declared themselves for complete freedom; that they are unflinchingly determined to wrest control of their country from alien hands; that they are determined to exercise that most fundamental of human rights, the inalienable right of indigenous peoples to shape and determine their own destiny as they wish, unmolested, unhampered and unrestricted.

The reaction of the enemies within our ranks, "the Europeans who love us," was sharp and unmistakable. They raved and ranted. Fire spat out of their mouths rapidly and rabidly. In their panic and malice, they took the gloves off and fought with their bare knuckles. They raved mad over our "racial hysterics"; branded us with the mantle of a "menace to white society"; they failed to hide their bitter hatred of "POQO's anarchistic murders," and "the kind of terrorism we have always sought to prevent." They even went out to Moscow in June 1969 and told the world that they had conclusive evidence to show that the P.A.C. was formed with the assistance, and at the behest, of the United States Central Intelligence Agency. The insult to the P.A.C. may be excused. The feelings of the African people who look up to it for leadership are unpredictable.

We pointed out unequivocally, and unambiguously, and emphatically, that because of the activities of a section of the leadership of the white ruling classes, "the Europeans who love us", who had wormed their way into the ranks of the liberation movement, the broad masses of our people were in the extreme danger of being deceived into losing sight of the objectives of our struggle, and that

†were

.....6/a portion

a portion of the black "leadership", which fought and brought division among us in the employ of these "sympathetic friends" had completely abandoned the objective of freedom, and could no longer be regarded as being within the ranks of the liberation movement. It was our considered opinion that such black "leadership" was incredibly naive and fantastically unrealistic to realise that the interests of the subject African peoples were in sharp conflict and pointed contradiction with those of the white ruling classes. That black "leadership" accepted white domination, minus its frills and trappings, and called it multi-racialism.

The present ruling class under Vorster's leadership calls it multi-nationalism. Both groups respectively see virtue in their deceptive phraseology. One enemy is within, and the other is without. The African people are impertinently asked to align themselves with the "lesser evil" and accept its sympathetic leadership. What an affront? What an outrage? What a betrayal!

THE BUMBLES AND FAGINS

Writing in "The New African", Mathew Nkoana made the point that year after year a torrent of abuse comes off the world's printing presses directed against the Pan Africanist Congress of South Africa. It has built up into the most pernicious literature that any liberation movement has had to contend with anywhere in Africa, barring perhaps the Mau Mau, buffeted on all sides by "friends" and foe alike. Using the sophisticated tools of half-truth concocted out of garbled versions of PAC policy statements and reinforced by an occasional blatant lie and a plethora of inferences and insinuations, the so-called South African white "Left" has over the years assiduously constructed an arsenal for counter-revolutionary ideological warfare. What is their motive? Nkoana hastens to reply: What does the intention matter, if the effect is the same; to impede the revolution?

Mathew Nkoana describes Ronald Segal's book, INTO EXILE, as "highly slanted reporting and personal comment." Not only is Segal, in his own words, unashamedly partisan, he is also fiercely hostile to the P.A.C. His consuming hatred of the P.A.C. has led him to some shocking excesses in his book. "I had never had a moment's sympathy," Segal says, "with the aims and activities of the Africanists. Their whole movement was inspired by a black hysteria... The Anti-Indian bigotry, which reverberated through so many Africanist articles and speeches, had reached its flaming climax years before in the Durban riots, when Africans, in an explosion of hatred and despair, had turned from the well-protected whites to the helpless Indians of the city, killing and burning." Nkoana correctly points out that there was no group known as the Africanists in 1949, let alone Africanist speeches and articles, and adds, "of course Segal does not claim that there was either, not in so many words, at any rate, but no one reading that passage can gain any impression other than that the Africanists were possessed of the same 'anti-Indian bigotry' which led to the 'killing and burning' ten years before the P.A.C. came into being on April 6, 1959."

For the "anti-Indian" charge, Segal has nothing

.....7/better

better to offer by way of evidence than the P.A.C. ideological distrust of the Indian merchant class, and for "black hysteria", when he is not adducing completely misleading evidence as in the case of the Durban riots, Segal offers the following scene from the P.A.C. foundation conference: "Sobukwe delivered a long theoretical disquisition to the conference at his opening session, but his example was not rigorously followed. Three clergymen decorated the platform, and in prayers and addresses, they attacked 'the hooligans of Europe who killed our God and have never been convicted,' while cheers greeted the salute to a 'black man, Simon of Arabia, who carried Jesus from the cross'."

In dismissing these racialist overtones, Nkoana tells Segal, "To me politics is a matter of interest, both material and spiritual, and all social evils, including racialism, can have their roots traced to a conflict of interests. This is a position taken in all P.A.C. basic documents, and as expounded by PAC President Sobukwe in his inaugural address on the non-racialist approach of the Africanists as follows:- 'The Africanists take the view that there is only one race to which we all belong, and that is the human race. In our vocabulary, therefore, the word 'race,' as applied to man, has no plural form. We do, however, admit the existence of observable physical differences between the various groups of people, but these differences are caused by a number of factors, chief among which has been geographical isolation.

"In Africa, the myth of race has been propounded and propagated by the colonialists and imperialists from Europe, in order to facilitate and justify the inhuman exploitation of the indigenous people of the land. It is from this myth of race with all its attendant claims of cultural superiority that the doctrine of white supremacy stems.... Let me close the discussion of this topic by declaring, on behalf of the Africanists, that with UNESCO, we hold that 'every man is his brother's keeper.' For every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the main, because he is involved in mankind."

"This is the aspect of the declared philosophy of PAC," concludes Nkoana, "that is never discussed but is simply waved aside by the 'critics,' to whom it seems, the essence of non-racialism is its organisational form." He could have added that according to the PAC Manifesto, "the African people are neither racists nor racialists, and they unreservedly condemn all forms of racialism, including multi-racialism. They do not nurse any crude hatred for European peoples, but they do cherish a deep detestation for the Herrenvolk system."

"What these people do not seem ever to ask themselves," says Nkoana, "is what the various organisations exist for. If an organisation exists for the business of making revolution, its raw material is readily found in the African community, the most under-privileged section of the population. What could be more logical than that such an organisation should be anchored, and anchored firmly, in the African masses? How can that be called racialism?"

Great play has been made by, among others, Segal, to illustrate the supposed anti-Indian and anti-white

attitudes of the Africanists. In his book, Segal reproduced a garbled version of an article by Peter Raboroko which had been published by Segal himself in "Africa South" at the beginning of 1960. Nkoana refers to a vital part of that article which Segal omits in his quotation of it. Raboroko commented on the Congress Alliance and its "Freedom Charter" to show that cooperation with members of the white ruling class and Indian merchant class in the revolution was not feasible and could only result in the betrayal of the struggle. Raboroko said: "To them the master and the slave, the exploiter and the exploited, the degrader and the degraded, are all equals. To them indigenous African nationals and immigrant European nations, the dispossessed and their dispossessors, are all countrymen. For them the progressive and the reactionary, the African subject and his foreign overlord, the African nationalist and the colonialist or white supremacist, the liberationist and the collaborationist, are all brothers".

Nkoana points out that Segal suppresses the dialectical logic of Raboroko's thought process which proceeds to show that "the problem of the synthesis of opposites cannot be resolved by the wave of a magic wand. It is only after all these sets of anti-theoretical categories have been duly reconciled, that we can reach the final categories of equals, countrymen and brothers, which betray no instability. Such reconciliation is possible only in Africanism, the final synthesis which is defined as the social force which upholds the material and spiritual interests of the individual." And this for us is elementary.

MENACE TO WHITE SOCIETY

Brian Bunting is the son of Sydney Bunting, a member of the Communist Party of South Africa, and former member of Parliament who represented "Native interests" in the Reichstag in Cape Town. He says in his book that "the close of 1962 witnessed the emergence of a new menace to white South Africa, the organisation known as POQO and 'believed' (our emphasis) to be the outcrop of the banned Pan Africanist Congress. The South African police held it responsible for the murder of three policemen in Langa, eight murders of African and "Coloured" informers in Paarl, the murder of a headman in the Transkei, the attempted murder of the government stooge, Chief Kaizer Matanzima, and worst of all, a series of attacks on whites. All these crimes", says Bunting, "and a number of others, were placed at the door of POQO, and sent a shiver of fear through white South Africa. The police themselves pointed out that, whereas the banned African National Congress went in for finely-planned acts of sabotage in which the object was not the taking of lives, POQO directed its attacks against the white community as a whole."

This point of view is supported by Mary Benson in her book, *The Struggle For A Birthright*. She tells of "POQO's anarchistic murders" and reports that in numerous trials evidence was led of a planned uprising against whites. We shall return to her presently.

Peter Raboroko, Secretary for Education in the PAC National Executive Committee at its foundation, analysed the role of Mr. Abraham Fischer in our revolution, and traced his political pedigree.

"Unbending Bram", wrote Raboroko, "was a grand-son of the Prime Minister of the Orange River Colony, an allegedly ex-Boer republic which had become a British colony. His father was Judge-President of the Orange Free State division of the Supreme Court, and Bram himself was advocate of the Supreme Court of South Africa. In both social origin and social status, Bram Fischer was a part of the fascist colonialist regime and a pillar of the establishment. Both tended to tell against his loyalty to the cause of liberation.

"Mr. Fischer, by his own account, joined the Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA) in 1940, and subsequently rose to the rank of leader of the South African Communist Party, the direct linear descendent of the C.P.S.A. which dissolved itself in 1950 before the Suppression of Communism Act enacted to outlaw it came into effect. The CPSA had claimed to be the representative of the entire working class of South Africa. Bram Fischer told the Pretoria Supreme Court that he had joined the CPSA when it had already been standing in favour of non-European rights for twenty-years.

"Mr. Fischer told the court that he had been brought up on a South African farm where whites were masters. He had studied the theory of segregation and accepted that whites were masters in South Africa. One night in his life, however, he was placed in a situation where he had to shake hands with an African. This required an enormous effort of will on his part. He spent hours afterwards worrying about this strange revulsion and came to understand that colour prejudice was a wholly irrational phenomenon.

"Finally, Mr. Fischer came round to the crucial point. 'I hold, and have held for many years,' he painfully explained, 'the view that our problems in South Africa can only be solved without violence through a system of Marxism.' He had written to the court earlier, pointing out that 'to try to avoid bloodshed and civil war becomes a supreme duty, particularly for an Afrikaner, because it is largely the representatives of my fellow Afrikaners who have been responsible for the worst of these discriminatory laws'."

The tragedy of the South African situation, observed Raboroko, was simply that many allegedly progressive white liberals and intellectuals are not succeeding to pass the crucial test of outgrowing the racist environment of their social origin as members of that regime and their social status as pillars of the establishment. This/what we call the white man's predicament in Africa. /is

It was in these circumstances that Fischer, holding the dual titles of leader of the working class in South Africa and protector of the sectional interests of his Afrikaner people, referred to "the Bashee River murders and the Paarl riots as just the kind of terrorism that we have always sought to prevent," signifying the rejection by the South African Communist Party of armed struggle as a weapon of revolution. Bram Fischer cited the people's revolts in Zeerust, Sekhukhuniland, Warmbaths, Durban, Zululand, Pondoland and Witzieshoek "as a prelude to violence in its most dangerous form."

On the contrary, a black Communist, Govan Mbeki, in his book, "The Peasants' Revolt", says: "African peasants have a long history of resistance to oppression. They know what is to be crushed by the armed forces of the whites, to be imprisoned without trial, banished to desolate parts of the country and banned from normal social contact.

"Since the enforcement of the Nationalist Party's policies by harsh and frequently violent means, peasant resistance has been widespread and organised. Africans have resisted forcible removal from their homes to new territory. They have opposed the imposition of Bantu Authorities, the extension of passes to women, and schemes for rehabilitation and re-allocation of land.

"Between 1946 and 1962, peasant risings have been provoked in Witziesshoek on Lesotho's border; in Marico just south of Botswana; in Sekhukhuniland in the North West Transvaal; in Zululand on the Natal south coast, and throughout the Transkei, especially Pondoland. They have been suppressed with brutal force."

Which of the two is the voice of the CPSA, the voice of reformist condemnation as represented by Bram Fischer or that of revolutionary encouragement as represented by Govan Mbeki? We have to look elsewhere for our answer.

According to an analysis prepared by the Unity Movement of South Africa, entitled "The Growth of Political Consciousness in the South African Liberation Struggle," one of the documents exhibited at the Rivonia Trial in 1964 and defined as the minutes of a meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSA in 1961 was able to say: "Over the last decade the Communist Party has time and again proved itself to be the core and sole of the resistance movement in South Africa.....the main content of the S.A. democratic revolution, as formulated in our draft programme, is the national liberation of the African people and the organisation which epitomises and represents this struggle is the ANC, the national organ of the African people."

We tried to show, in an earlier article, that the CPSA considered itself as the ideological leader of the Congress Alliance. The 1961 minutes of its Central Committee quoted above declared the failure of the Congress Alliance and attributed it to the fact that "the National Consultative Committee of the Congresses turned itself into a policy-making body instead of an advisory board. The Congress Alliance was never meant to be a federation but a united front in which each organisation was free to follow its own policy. It was not itself an organisation."

The Unity Movement goes on to say that the "CPSA was only interested in the restoration of normal democratic conditions in which it might return to legality and thus be able to propagate its views, organise the workers, and in the ripeness of time, lead the socialist revolution. There was never any intention on the part of the CPSA to allow the Africans to seize power under the leadership of the ANC...That is the special prerogative of the CPSA.... So when the CPSA speaks in this document of the need to

....ll/strengthen

strengthen the bonds of unity between the CPSA and "our" progressive organisations and the masses of the people, it is not for the purpose of an armed insurrection. Even the creation of Umkhonto We Sizwe was intended to provoke violent incidents as an additional form of pressure on the white electorate to unseat Verwoerd at the election polls in favour of the less fascistic United Party, and thus wean the African masses away from the path of revolution.

"At the Rivonia Trial in April 1964, Walter Sisulu pointed out in his evidence that right up to 1962, the African National Congress practiced the policy of non-violence. When the sabotage campaign was launched in December, 1961, the ANC decided it could not undertake a violent struggle, but allowed its members to take part in acts of sabotage....some senior members of the ANC, however, offered to give responsible leadership to the campaign..the ANC took no part in sabotage acts or in recruiting people for military training."

"Nelson Mandela, on the other hand," according to the analysis, "speaking from the Dock at the same trial, said that he had come to the conclusion in June, 1961, that as violence was inevitable, it was wrong and unrealistic for African leaders to continue with the policy of non-violence when the government met our demands with violence. This decision was not easily made but was adopted because (1) it did not involve loss of life, (2) it was hoped it would impose a heavy drain on the economy of the country scarring away foreign capital so as to force the voters to change their allegiance, and (3) would draw world attention to South Africa. Mr. Mandela concluded his philosophy by pointing out that strict instructions had been given to the saboteurs not to kill people, while an open rebellion would offer the government boundless opportunities for action against our people. Guerrillas were trained in case they became necessary.

"Who then", asks the Unity Movement, "was responsible for the formation of 'Umkhonto We Sizwe' in 1961, when in 1962 the ANC was still pledged to a policy of non-violence? When both Mandela and Sisulu clearly pointed out that the ANC had nothing to do with the formation of it? The answer to the riddle is contained in the 1961 secret CPSA document. In a section entitled 'The New Line of Congress', the document states that the ANC has finally discarded the policy of non-violence. The masses are not aware of the new line, and so is the African National Congress, because it has preached non-violence for all the years of its existence. Therefore, the ANC must announce and campaign for its new line among the masses, because the revolutionary African workers, peasants and intellectuals will not fight for and defend Congress leadership, since it will have no confidence in its ability to conquer the armed forces of Verwoerd, and also because they (Congress leadership) cannot succeed unless they enjoy the support of the majority section.

"The document finally makes a remarkable appeal: All sections of the democratic movement should fully understand and appreciate this need, and cooperate in seeing that, particularly in free Africa, both in theory and practice, (+) comes forward and is accepted as the recognised spokesman of the entire democratic movement in the country."

.....12/This

(+) the African National Congress of South Africa

This appeal, presumably, was intended to correct the situation discovered by the Central Committee of the CPUSA and reflected in its minutes over the failure of the Congress Alliance, "the other reason of which was that the African people saw the ANC as being subject to outside domination and not truly a national and African organisation in that it allowed its policy to be decided by non-Africans."

INTERNATIONAL REPERCUSSIONS

The divisive work of the white "Left" as Nkoana pointed out has had a local, continental and international repercussions. "I have never been under any illusions about the incalculable harm which this anti-PAC campaign could do in the sensitive sphere of world opinion," observes Nkoana, "and have attempted to counter some of its deleterious effects. But in my wildest fears I could never have imagined anything approaching the real damage that is being wrought until I read Professor Pierre van den Bergh's book, South Africa: A Study in Conflict. The professor does not claim more than 'some modicum of prior familiarity with South African conditions'. The real tragedy is that it should be possible for an erudite professor, in an otherwise penetrating study, to deliver himself of the kind of diatribe that is found here. The answer lies somewhere in his extensive bibliography.

"In the chapter entitled 'Conflicts: The Non-White Opposition', van den Berghe deals with political attitudes among Africans, Indians and so-called Coloureds. His material and presentation of 'facts' bear striking similarities to Leo Kuper's An African Bourgeoisie, and Segal's Into Exile. I believe it is Segal's book more than any other to which the professor turned for his material on the P.A.C. and a less qualified source can hardly be imagined. 'The Pan African(ist) Congress is militantly anti-Indian, anti-European and anti-Coloured, in spite of declarations to the contrary.'

"Van den Berghe offers not a tittle of evidence for this serious charge, nor does he give any idea what the 'declarations to the contrary' are. This is a serious lapse of scholarship which is not mitigated by the fact that he has been taken for a ride by Ronald Segal."

We have no room here to show more of this, but professor van den Berghe is not the only one who was led astray by the former editor of "Africa South"

THE LIBERAL FACTION

Mr. Segal has a political companion in Mary Benson. Both belong to the liberal faith and stand for merchant democracy. They are opposed to certain glaring consequences of the "South African way of life". They have been persecuted for this, of course, and this qualified them for their "magnanimous" association with the liberation movement. These ideas and their distinctive influence are widely advertised and vividly illustrated in their own writings, and so we come to South Africa: The Struggle for a Birth-right.

We can only deal with one aspect of Mary Benson's

work here. The struggle of our people has many mercenaries, and Mary Benson, regretably, is one such person. She is employed to keep the purse strings of British Colonialism and American imperialism open to the charms of Christian charity and white paternalism. She must also see to it that the cash goes into the deserving hands of her own choice. The western peace-loving world has been led into believing that the anti-apartheid struggle is the struggle of the oppressed and exploited Africans. It has yet to awaken to the fact that anti-apartheid is the struggle of certain vested interests which seek the brawn of revolt and resistance of the African people to help them overthrow the Nationalist Party and get either the United Party or the Progressive Party into power in South Africa, with Alan Paton's now defunct Liberal Party lurking in the shadows, for a form of coalition with the ANC or Congress Alliance.

Mary Benson's book is negative, biased and politically defective. It seeks primarily to re-assure the colonial beneficiaries of apartheid that the struggle is not lost yet. The author has many false things to say about PAC, at home and abroad, and goes out of her way to distort universally known facts and dates in favour of the ANC without realising the harm that this does without realising the harm that this does to the autonomous integrity of that organisation. Of the activists of the liberation movement which she is supposed to be writing about, she says, "...the picture has become one of terrified, dispirited people, terrified of the security police, deadening the atmosphere in the courts with their hopelessness in the face of the law. Why have so few risen in court to make a positive assertion of their beliefs, an avowal that what they did was honourable.....?"

The motive is unmistakable. That is the type of statement that hits the world headlines and works like magic in the money markets. But she rounds up her personal commitment to the revolution beautifully. "Here and now, inside South Africa, dare we indulge even in a flicker of hope? What a huge boost in faith we need...faith that, somehow good will prevail...Africans will win the rights of their birth..." She has no part in the fight. Her faith and hope are for something else, and that is the thing for which she castigates the P.A.C. and humours the ANC, helping to divide the African people and to incite, mislead and confuse the worldwide friends of their revolution.

THE MISSIONARY FACTION

What is the role of the Church in racist South Africa? In his "Researches in South Africa", the Rev. John Phillip of the London Missionary Society wrote: "Missionary stations are the most efficient agents which can be employed to promote the internal strength of our colonies, and the cheapest and best military posts a government can employ...There is not a single instance of a tribe, thus enjoying the labour of a missionary, making war against the colonists, either to injure their persons or to deprive them of their property." The Church in our country is the descendent of the missionary station, and wields a great deal of power and influence inside and outside the country. Some events in its inter-

nal activities warrant examination.

Speaking at the Anglican Consultative Conference in Limuru, Kenya, on February 25, 1971, Archbishop R.S. Taylor, of Cape Town, said that the action of the World Council of Churches to give financial support to the liberation movement in Southern Africa was a matter of great consternation to the white people of South Africa. Its obvious encouragement to violence could only lead to more violence, presumably on the part of either the racist government or the white people. In the Archbishop's opinion the World Council of Churches seemed to identify with those organisations which were trying to change the social order by force, in other words, instead of those who are maintaining it by force. The Archbishop believes that the stage has not been reached when revolutionary violence should become the method of self-defence against reactionary violence.

All past minority racist governments in South Africa have invariably maintained themselves in power by violence. We do not propose to supply the statistics relevant to the issue, as these are fully known to the Archbishop and the Church. In the past, the Church has repeatedly said that it is working to create the changes which will bring about a different attitude in human relations, and that this can be achieved, as the Archbishop told his Limuru audience. In other words, the Church is working hard to improve the slave position of the African people in their own country.

As far as we are aware the most conspicuous role the Church has played has been to drag its feet, shouting and gesticulating nervously from the distance. Those members of the Church ruling class who became more articulate have had their wings clipped, and those who remain behind are fearing for their lives. That is why they often force themselves to speak against the liberation movement. When the brutalised suggest historical methods of change, the ruling class in the Church is always the first to criticise and condemn, in other words, to speak out for racism even though it preaches against it.

Anyhow, this is how we look at what the Archbishop told his audience thousands of miles away in Kenya. What he did not tell it was that right there in his diocese in the city of Cape Town, there is a white charitable organisation whose activities are a matter of great consternation to the African people. The Western Cape Mozambique/Angola Soldiers' Comforts Fund gives material aid to the Portuguese mercenary forces which are murdering the African people of Angola and Mozambique in cold blood for their bid to liberate themselves from the yoke of Portuguese colonialism.

According to an article in "Provincia de Angola", of February 22, 1971, three days before the Archbishop's speech, the Cape Town body sends, every two months, material worth 5,000 rand or 2,500 pounds sterling. This body is one of two organisations that form the movement that gives material help to maintain Portuguese colonialism in Africa. The other is the Mozambique/Angola Fighting Soldiers' Comfort Fund based in Durban, which has, according to the report, contributed two ambulance-

planes each costing 25,000 rand or 12,500 pounds sterling. The Durban body has already contributed 100,000 pounds to the cause.

Its leader, a Mrs. Hanssen and her group of technicians specialise in supplying medical equipment, and intend to set up a first-aid centre where seriously wounded Portuguese soldiers from the front lines could spend at least 24 hours before they are taken away to hospital by helicopter. So far 31 such pieces of equipment, costing 2,500 pounds each, have been set up.

And yet right there in the city of Durban, prominent Churchmen, including Alan Paton, the famous author, and Catholic Archbishop Hurley, have come together to form a Committee of Clemency, whose task is to organise national prayers for clemency for all prisoners, including those detained or restricted for political reasons. That is what the Church can do identify with the brutalised, when it is not finding fault with them. We can only hope that the Church would measure, on the scale of balances, what its members and ruling classes do in practice to support oppressive regimes against its lip-service to the cause of the oppressed.

It does not appear petty on the part of those who envy the freedom fighters the peanuts that are being distributed by the World Council of Churches compared to the large sums of money and purposeful material distributed from the diocesan cities of Durban and Cape Town. This is not saying anything about what is distributed in Rhodesia and other places. The ruling class in the Church and others who criticise the World Council of Churches for its support of the non-military aspect of the liberation movement are silent on this and similar issues.

It would appear to us that, if the Church in racist South Africa has any material role to play in the life of the African people, then it cannot continue to peddle pacifism in the face of racist devilry and banditry against us. It can not expect us to be enthusiastic over its red-cross role of providing verbal balm to soothe the festering wounds of those who have been brutalised by members of the Church in the indifferent presence of the Church. Indeed those who are not with us are against us. No good man can remain silent in the face of evil, but to regard the resistance of evil as evil, is to stand on the side of evil.

It would appear also that the racist Church is quite unaware of the source of thousands of religious sects in the country who have rebelled against the apartheid Church, or the millions who have nothing to do with it because of its callous indifference to the suffering of the African people, or its attempt to water down the people's resistance to tyranny.

The ruling class of the racist church in South Africa is a strong pillar of the present Establishment and a component part of the institutions that make up the system of government followed in that country. It is an accomplice in the baditry that is apartheid. It is a smiling enemy of our people. It is not any different from the rest of the racist fascist gentlemen who are in power, and together, they make wounds in our hearts, these men.

"The reformist position thoroughly describes the political position of the Communist Party of South Africa. It explains its campaign of villification against the P.A.C. at home and abroad. Abram Fischer, leader of the CPSA was sentenced to life imprisonment in the Pretoria Supreme Court in March 1966, 'for preparing to overthrow the South African government by violence'. Fischer's speech summarises the methods of the CPSA. But did his crushing life sentence justify the faith he had in the government that they would play the game according to the rules and finally sit down with his Party in perfect unity to listen to the voice of reason, and then make provision for a peaceful transition to democratic rule? More concretely, did the ends of his Party justify the means? Did those means not lead further and further away from the ends they had in mind?

"It is this complete dislocation between ends and means that is the essential tragedy of the story of Fischer and the CPSA. For running like a red thread through CPSA policy is their willingness to accommodate the rulers at every turn, to the extent of watering down the liberation programme, so that they can become amenable to the idea of sharing power with the oppressed. By accepting the assumptions and presuppositions of the ruling class, Fischer and the CPSA met them unarmed on their battlefield - their own 'reasoning' in the teeth of opposition - and became captives of their special morality. In consequence, their political ends receded and became more obscure as the means of attaining them became more ineffectual. None of this is of the making of the P.A.C., but a scape-goat had to be found."

We have already indicated what the Chairman of the CPSA said in Moscow in June 1969. However, the most devastating effect of this campaign is the attitude of the Soviet Union towards PAC. It follows the line of the CPSA and consistently opposes and speaks derogatively of PAC in international forums at the behest of the CPSA.

From 1963 onwards the Soviet Union opposed the P.A.C. application for membership of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation and associated bodies on ground that PAC does not exist, or if it does, the handful of persons who call themselves its leaders, exist for the purpose of undermining the national liberation struggle in South Africa. The Soviet Union has accordingly used its powerful influence in the socialist world, particularly in Eastern Europe, Cuba and Algeria, to poison the attitude towards, and the relations with, the P.A.C.

This opposition was maintained at Algiers in 1964, at Winneba, Ghana, in 1965, at the Tri-Continental conference in Havana in 1966 where the Soviet delegation confidently stated that the ANC was the only organisation of the Africans in the liberation movement of that country, at Nicosia in 1967, where the P.A.C. became signatory to the "Nicosia Declaration", which declared "for the people of Africa and Asia to know that the arch-collaborator of U.S. imperialism, the Soviet revisionists, are frantically engaged in manoeuvres to destroy the revolutionary unity of the peoples of Africa and Asia." The British newspaper "The Guardian" reported on July 19, 1969, that "Radio Moscow chose the week before the OAU Summit meeting in Algiers to launch a

"The reformist position thoroughly describes the political position of the Communist Party of South Africa. It explains its campaign of villification against the P.A.C. at home and abroad. Abram Fischer, leader of the CPSA was sentenced to life imprisonment in the Pretoria Supreme Court in March 1966, 'for preparing to overthrow the South African government by violence'. Fischer's speech summarises the methods of the CPSA. But did his crushing life sentence justify the faith he had in the government that they would play the game according to the rules and finally sit down with his Party in perfect unity to listen to the voice of reason, and then make provision for a peaceful transition to democratic rule? More concretely, did the ends of his Party justify the means? Did those means not lead further and further away from the ends they had in mind?

"It is this complete dislocation between ends and means that is the essential tragedy of the story of Fischer and the CPSA. For running like a red thread through CPSA policy is their willingness to accommodate the rulers at every turn, to the extent of watering down the liberation programme, so that they can become amenable to the idea of sharing power with the oppressed. By accepting the assumptions and resuppositions of the ruling class, Fischer and the CPSA met them unarmed on their battlefield - their own 'reasoning' in the teeth of opposition - and became captives of their special morality. In consequence, their political ends receded and became more obscure as the means of attaining them became more ineffectual. None of this is of the making of the P.A.C., but a scape-goat had to be found."

We have already indicated what the Chairman of the CPSA said in Moscow in June 1969. However, the most devastating effect of this campaign is the attitude of the Soviet Union towards PAC. It follows the line of the CPSA and consistently opposes and speaks derogatively of PAC in international forums at the behest of the CPSA.

From 1963 onwards the Soviet Union opposed the P.A.C. application for membership of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation and associated bodies on ground that PAC does not exist, or if it does, the handful of persons who call themselves its leaders, exist for the purpose of undermining the national liberation struggle in South Africa. The Soviet Union has accordingly used its powerful influence in the socialist world, particularly in Eastern Europe, Cuba and Algeria, to poison the attitude towards, and the relations with, the P.A.C.

This opposition was maintained at Algiers in 1964, at Winneba, Ghana, in 1965, at the Tri-Continental conference in Havana in 1966 where the Soviet delegation confidently stated that the ANC was the only organisation of the Africans in the liberation movement of that country, at Nicosia in 1967, where the P.A.C. became signatory to the "Nicosia Declaration", which declared "for the people of Africa and Asia to know that the arch-collaborator of U.S. imperialism, the Soviet revisionists, are frantically engaged in manoeuvres to destroy the revolutionary unity of the peoples of Africa and Asia." The British newspaper "The Guardian" reported on July 19, 1969, that "Radio Moscow chose the week before the OAU Summit meeting in Algiers to launch a

scathing attack on the Pan Africanist Congress, which it said was guilty of black chauvinism". This is the language of the Communist Party of South Africa. A PAC supporter in South Africa took the risk of writing to "Azania News" through the post after the Nicosia meeting. He felt we should tell "the Soviet Union and its satellites to go to blazes".

In October, 1966, under Soviet auspices a seminar was organised on "Africa: National and Social Revolution". African revolutionary movements, some of whom were actually not only engaged in armed struggle, but which also enjoyed considerable popular support in their respective countries, were deliberately excluded from participation in the Seminar. We were painfully reminded of the Berlin Conference of yester years which balkanised Africa to create spheres of influence for the imperialist powers. A Soviet professor advocated gradual transformation of dependent societies over a number of decades to enable the African revolution to proceed along a non-capitalist path through peaceful means. By ruling out the use of revolutionary violence in advance, much as British imperialism did in Rhodesia, we saw this Soviet move as seeking to disarm Africa's revolutionary struggle and giving imperialism the unhampered right to employ counter-revolutionary violence against the liberation movements and the emergent and emerging African States.

We warned that the liberation movement of our continent should exercise vigilance against being unnecessarily divided within itself. Three years later, in January, 1969, a conference held on African soil introduced into the ranks of the liberation movement the spurious policy of what was called "authentic organisations", again under Soviet sponsorship. We saw this as an attempt to convert patriotic movements into puppet organisations, but the irony is that some of the movements concerned actually fell for that bit of green cheese and consider themselves as qualified to judge as to who should lead the people of fraternal territories.

We have the feeling that the Soviet Union is badly misled about the African people, and in its assessment of the integrity of the CPSA it should ponder the 1928 resolution of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the South African situation.

IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

We must point out finally that we have irreconcilable ideological differences with the white "Left" in South Africa and the world-wide anti-apartheid network which is under its thumb and is being used unwittingly on the part of certain sections within it to conciliate our revolution. But, of course, our main struggle is in South Africa, where our people will decide their own fate, regardless of the interests of others. Characteristic of these differences was the letter of our Liaison Officer with the Defence and Aid Fund in 1967, Barney Desai, who pointed out to Dennis Brutus in his capacity as "Director of the Defence and Aid Campaign for the Release of South African Political Prisoners", that "it appears that the general aims of the present campaign had become settled as a result of your earlier discussions with a section of the South African Liberation Movement in London, and that the P.A.C. having been consul-

ted at the tail end, was presented with fait accompli....

The way the present campaign has got off the ground has not been very re-assuring in view of the sectional consultations that have taken place...I can only assume that you were badly advised for it is certainly too early for you to forget that the P.A.C. has thousands of prisoners of conscience ; that they have representatives who can speak from personal experience about conditions in jail, and that they have their own independent message to the world.

"For example our position with regard to the improvement of jail conditions is clearly different from that of your campaign. We reject such a demand on political grounds, viz, we do not accept the moral validity of the white man's laws nor the machinery for enforcing them are impassioned by the violence on human dignity. Dare we then ask the guatiliers for moderation in this violence?

"It is our fervent hope that out of the candour of this letter will come a new understanding and durable co-operation which should stand up to the tremendous demands that the revolution in Azania imposes on all our compatriots of conscience."

Barney Desai brought up in his letter one singular point which must be made here. Throughout the years, the representatives of PAC have recieved shabby treatment and material assistance from Defence and Aid International, both at home and abroad, because of its almost exclusive "flooding" with members of the South African white "Left" and other members or supporters of the "Congress Alliance", with the result that we have to "dig out" whatever indifferent assistance our people recieve from this organisation. We have posted our stoutest "diggers" to London with little avail hence Desai's reminder to Dennis Brutus: "Perhaps you are not aware that the Chairman of the Defence and Aid, Canon Collins, for whom we have a high regard and respect, has had to declare from time to time that he considered the Defence and Aid Fund a servant of the Liberation Movements, and that it would always be guided in its activity by the wishes of both the P.A.C. and the A.N.C.

When the leader of PAC was transferred from Robben Island to the mainland, the Communist Party made a statement that is characteristic of its contemptuous attitude towards PAC and the African people. It said it warmly welcomed the recent long overdue release of Mr. R. Sobukwe, six years after his term of three years imprisonment had expired, though he would remain under 12 hours house arrest and is restricted to kimberley. "Perhaps", went on the statement, "the fascist government was hoping that by this release of a minor political prisoner, head of a break-away organisation which had long been discredited and has disintegrated, it would blind the world to the terrible plight of those thousands who still remain in its jails, under house arrest and other forms of lawless restriction. It hopes to present a totally false image of a more 'enlightened' and 'liberal' turn in its policy".

The Communist Party of South Africa has, no doubt, a phenomenal integrity, though this cannot in any way affect Sobukwe's national stature. Minor political prisoner as he is by CPSA standards, racist Minister of Justice, Petrus Pelser, had this to say of Sobukwe: "We must realise that

he is not an ordinary person, he is a leader, a man who had the entire country in a turmoil within the space of a few months...The powers that seek our downfall are gathering their forces to destroy us, and are at this moment assiduously looking for a star to give lustre to their nefarious schemes...Can it now be reasonably expected of me, willingly and with the knowledge at my disposal, to play into their hands and give them the opportunity to rally around the man who, they believe, can mobilise them and bring about the unity which will eventually lead to our downfall?"

Recently, the racist Minister of the Interior was forced to grant Sobukwe an exit permit to leave South Africa for good, just as much as the leaders of the CPSA have done. In the case of Sobukwe, however, the Minister of Justice refused to relax Sobukwe's banning orders, which restrict him to Kimberley, to enable him to travel to an international port of departure! Radio South Africa said in a commentary that it saw no conflict in the attitude of the Ministers. The Minister of Justice was doing his work. He had sufficient cause to believe that, in South Africa or abroad, Sobukwe will continue to be a risk to the security of the state. The activity in which Sobukwe was involved cannot be countered with kid gloves and it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to ensure that a man of Sobukwe's potential is not allowed to endanger the security of the state.

History cannot be rubbed off. It is not late to turn a clean new page on which to write the future history of the people of Azania, if we can find wholesome minds with whom to do it. As for the white "left", we commend it to the question Alan Paton asked Daphne Masekela. It must choose between becoming guerrillas and joining the Nationalist Party. "Masso day's done" in the South African political situation. The African people are in full charge of their own destiny. In the words of Mangaliso Sobukwe, "we are ready. We will not go back. We will not look back. We will not deviate, come what may."

-ooOao-

Having read the comments on Sobukwe's detention by the South African Communist Party, read an independent reportage on the last page then you will understand what we mean when we say the pseudo-communists of South Africa despise an African. This time the insult is directed at their leader. We cannot forget or forgive this insult.

-ooOoo-

Subscribe to:

"Azania News"

c/o Revolutionary Command

Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (S.A.)

P. O. Box 2412,

Dar es Salaam.

United Republic of Tanzania

Our Party must have faith in the people!

Our people must have faith in the Party!

The Party must be the Party of the people!

The man S A fears

FOR the sixth year in succession, the South African Parliament has approved the continued detention on Robben Island maximum security prison of Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe.

The former leader of the banned Pan-Africanist Congress is to be held for yet another year although his prison sentence has been fully served.

Asking Parliament for approval for Sobukwe's continued detention, the Minister of Justice, Mr Piet Pistorius, has said it is not in the national interest to free Sobukwe. He would, said the Minister, simply take up the struggle against apartheid where he had left off in 1960 when he was imprisoned for three years for incitement.

The law under which Sobukwe is being held provides that if the Minister of Justice is satisfied that anyone serving a sentence for certain specified political offences is likely to further any of the statutory objects of Communism, he may keep him in prison from year to year, provided Parliament approves. Sobukwe alleges that the police have told him his determination will be "life-long".

Sobukwe was president of the Pan-Africanist Congress, which was formed in 1959 and which organised anti-pass demonstrations which led to the Sharpeville shootings in 1960, the banning of the PAC, and the declaration of a five-month State of Emergency.

From STANLEY UYS

Sobukwe himself was charged with incitement and sentenced to three years' imprisonment. He completed the sentence in May 1963, but just before he was due to be released the Government introduced a law providing for "extended detention". Every year since then the law has been renewed for a further year.

Every year since then, too, the Opposition in the South African Parliament has opposed the renewal of the law, without success. The Minister has refused to budge.

He has just told Parliament: "I would have failed gravely in my duty if at this stage I were to let the interests of the country give way to a strong humanitarian impulse to make a change in this man's fate... Let me tell you frankly that there is peace between me and my conscience.

"The powers that are seeking our downfall are gathering their forces to destroy us, and are at this very moment assiduously looking for a star to give lustre to their nefarious schemes. And the man concerned here would, if he were given the opportunity, I believe, not hesitate to do everything in his power to make up and regain what he has lost during his time of detention, because in his life and aspiration he has in no way changed in his attitude or aims.

"Can it now reasonably be expected of me, willingly and with the knowledge at my disposal, to play into their hands and to give them the opportunity to rally around the man who, they believe, can mobilise them and bring about the unity among them which will eventually lead to our downfall?"

Opposition politicians, though, remain sceptical. "It is incredible that with all the powers which the Government

has at its command it should be so afraid of a single African man that it keeps him in detention even after he has served his jail sentence in full," said Mr Michael Mitchell, MP. "For how much longer will this continue?"

Sobukwe, now 43, was a demonstrator in the Bantu Department of the University of Witwatersrand (Johannesburg) at the time of his arrest. He holds a B.A. honours degree.

When his period of "extended detention" started, the Government issued a statement in which it said Sobukwe

would be detained "under a completely different set of conditions" from those under which ordinary prisoners were held.

"Instead of being imprisoned in a cell, he will henceforth live in quarters which up to the present have been occupied by Coloured (mixed race) warden trainees. He will have complete freedom of movement within a large prescribed area. Newspapers can be supplied to him, and he will be able to receive visitors weekly. He will by no means be treated like a prisoner, but will receive special treatment in respect of food, movement, utilising of leisure hours, hours of rising and retiring, clothing, etc."

In 1964 Sobukwe applied for a one-way exit permit to leave South Africa permanently, but it was refused on the grounds that he would resume the leadership of the PAC in exile.

A few Government and Opposition MPs have been allowed to visit Sobukwe on Robben Island. One of the Government MPs, Mr G. Froneman, has said that when he saw Sobukwe he noticed various books on Marxism and Leninism on his bookshelves.

If Sobukwe were to be released, said Mr Froneman, he would become the leader of "the terrorists waiting on our borders".

The Minister of Justice,

however, has stated that "I will not say Sobukwe is a Communist", but he believed Sobukwe would incite people "to commit the deeds which Communism aims at".

An Opposition MP who visited Sobukwe, Mrs Helen Suzman (the only Progressive Party MP), said that Sobukwe was studying French, and that he had the Bible and a wide variety of literature on his shelves, "which so doubt he is reading to keep himself sane".

Sobukwe, the "man on the island" as he is known, is the only person who is being held under the "extended detention" law. It is not known whether other non-white leaders will be similarly detained once their sentences expire. — OFNS.

H.B. Stanley Uys is Chief Political Commentator of S.A.'s highest selling paper - "SUNDAY TIMES".