

# **SOLIDARITY**

**official organ of the  
Black Consciousness  
Movement of Azania**

**No. 10**

**1983**

- **President's Council**
- **On Culture And Politics**

**PRICE 75c**

**SOLIDARITY**  
Published quarterly by the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania

**Editorial Office:**

BM BOX 4830  
LONDON  
WC1N 3XX

**Distribution:**

BCMA  
BOX 13038  
Washington, DC. 20009

410 Central Park West, Apartment 12D New York, New York 10025

Oppelnerstrasse 41, 6900 Heidelberg, West Germany

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania.

**SOLIDARITY**

News, theoretical and discussion journal of  
the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania

**CONTENTS**

**No. 10**

THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL .....	Page 1
ON CULTURE AND POLITICS ... José Luis Najenson	Page 5
BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE NATURE OF THE AZANIAN REVOLUTION ... Ranwedzi Nengwekhulu	Page 20

# The President's Council

Since 1652 Blacks in South Africa have fought with singular determination against land dispossession. The 1909 Act of Union, enacted by the British, set the stage for depriving Blacks of their land. Successive Boer governments have since entrenched that position of Baaskap, with the collusion and connivance of their imperialist friends. In "legally" handing over power to an unholy alliance of predominantly Dutch and British settler colonialists, the British parliament had, in the Act of Union, hoped to put paid to the aspirations of Blacks.

Now, in 1983, the settlers, using the stage so callously set by the British and backed up by the props of western capital, play out the same drama. A new Act, but still the same theme: apartheid and the entrenchment of white control and Black subjugation.

It is dubbed "Reform" - "Reform" a la Piet Wapens Botha. All that the President's Council stands for remains contradictory to the principal demand of the dispossessed: the return of our land and control of our destiny. It therefore becomes an irrelevant irritant as every other measure which proceeded from the bowels of the white minority.

Having tried to delude the world that enlightened self-interest has finally convinced the white minority regime that change must come even to South Africa, the Botha regime seems intent on enacting a white lie. The President's Council is no more than a council for the perpetuation of white minority rule, but with this qualification: this time with the active collusion of a few puppets who will sit in a separate chamber alongside the white Baas to be called upon occasionally to participate in electing the Big Bass and cast 25% of the votes in the President's Council.

The whole exercise is like moving the Transkei "Legislative Assembly" to Cape Town and hailing it as a major move away from Bantustans. The white "House of Assembly", the 'Coloured' "House of Representatives" and the 'Indian' "House of Deputies" will each meet in their own ethnic corners and discuss and decide their "own affairs".

## The New Dictatorship

South Africa's history of repression is already legend. With an iron hand, it has taken for itself draconian powers and introduced dictatorial measures in an attempt to stifle the struggle for liberation. Its ministers, police and army already enjoy the powers of a military dictatorship and now, the new "Executive President" shall have vested in him supreme control over defence, declaring war and peace, security laws (including detention) and proclaiming martial law. He shall be the ultimate, deciding (with the advice of the President's Council where he deems fit) which matters are "own" or of common concern. The Supremo can also dissolve "parliament" and his decision cannot be questioned in any court of law. Those 25 'Coloured' and 13 'Indian' members of the electoral college (there are 50 white) who consider the Executive President crass about apartheid will have to canvass a majority vote in each of the three (3) Houses. (178 white; 85 'Coloured'; 45 'Indian') before the President can be removed. Not a very likely event in the House of Assembly!! (It seems that these Boers have learnt a great deal from their association with countries of a similar smell in South America!)

The big cake which the "Coloured" Labour Party and the Rajbansys wanted a big share of was the President's Council. "At last we will have a real say in our affairs" rang the retort. This Council will have 20 white members, 10 'coloured' and 5 'Indian' elected members from each of the Houses. To these will be added 25 members appointed by the President. These appointments will, like the CRC before, obviously ensure that the white minority view prevails. What a say they will have! It is here where disputes between Houses will finally be settled and questionable measures passed. Puppets will continue to be appointed to give the final seal to the plan.

### The show must go on!

In defending its decision to support the President's Council's proposals the Labour Party promised boldly: "We will use it to work for the inclusion of the majority". That was a foolish and dishonest claim. Since the advent of these Boers to South Africa, lies and treachery have been the order of the day. Did the Labour

Party really delude itself that it would be different this time. Is a Botha really all that different from a van Riebeeck, a Verwoerd or a Vorster? Hendrickse's belated cry: "There is nothing in this for Blacks", sounds as hollow as a Judas' attempt to throw back the token 25 "ja-baas votes" when the repercussions of his filthy deed became known. So easily did he and other collaborators fall into Botha's trap for sowing division among blacks, undermining a unity among blacks so painstakingly built since the advent of Black Consciousness in the late 60's. It must be clear to the Labour Party and all other collaborators: the language of the proposed legislation is different, but the ethos and policy is the same - apartheid and white control. More importantly, the pretext for joining, if it had any foundation at all, now lies in ruins and the message is constitutionally enshrined: Nothing in the tricameral structure can be changed without absolute majorities in each of the three Houses! **BAASSKAP PREVAILS.**

Let the Labour Party and other puppets who accept crumbs in self-deception and for self aggrandisement be clear of their sellout. The President's Council's proposals reveal all: white control will not be relinquished, not in the tricameral structure of Cape Town, nor in the all-powerful empire of the Brothers Matanzima or any structure of Pretoria's making. All that you will ever have jurisdiction over, while this regime remains in power, is an "own affair". "General Affairs" will continue to be the preserve of the white minority, who will continue to control through its 178 member House of Assembly, its 75% membership in the President's Council and its all-powerful President.

### CONCLUSION

Since the early 70's, in large part due to the activism of the Black Consciousness Movement, the tactics of boycotting dummy institutions and puppet bodies, has united Black people in exposing collaboration and intensified the struggle for majority rule and authentic participation in decision making on their destiny. Mobilisation of the oppressed majority led to exposure and rebuff of collaborators in Urban Bantu Councils (Now Community Councils - the 6 per centers, so-named after

dismal performances in their elections), the Coloured Representative Council, South African Indian Council, Bantustans and a glut of puppet institutions created by the white minority to divert attention from the legitimate struggles of the people. With equal vigour, determination and activism, the oppressed majority will rise to oppose and expose collaborators in Botha's fraudulent constitutional arrangements. All enemies of the people will become irrelevant to the cause of black liberation.

Recognising the fraudulent and irrelevant nature of the so-called 'New Constitution' we wish to reaffirm our total rejection of the constitutional proposals and call upon all the oppressed masses of Azania to unite in total opposition to these and other proposals and arrangements which defy, ignore and fall short of our basic minimum demand: the repossession of our land.

That all matters which affect the livelihood of the oppressed of Azania, be they economic, social, cultural or political are matters to be determined by us in a free and independent Azania. We therefore reject the notion of "own" and "general" affairs or any other euphemistic constructions which seek to disguise the perpetuation of apartheid, white minority rule.

All those who collaborate with arrangements which seek to divide the oppressed masses in their struggle for liberation shall be exposed as enemies of the people and shall be treated as such.

ONE AZANIA...ONE NATION

VICTORY IS CERTAIN!

---

"... in an effort to maintain our solidarity and relevance to the situation we must resist all attempts at the fragmentation of our resistance. Black people must recognise the various institutions of apartheid for what they are - gags intended to get black people fighting separately for certain "freedoms" and "gains" which were prescribed for them long ago. We must refuse to accept it as inevitable that the only political action the blacks may take is through these institutions". Steve Bantu Biko

With the permission of the Editorial Board of the LATIN AMERICAN RESEARCH UNIT (LARU) we reproduce parts of José Luis Najenson's article: ON CULTURE AND POLITICS (LARU Vol. 1V, No. 3 June 1982)

## 1 TWO MEANINGS OF IDEOLOGY

The use of the term ideology as a category of analysis in the social sciences has its origins in the thought of Marx and Engels. As a philosophical concept, and belonging to political philosophy, it is considerably older. It had already been sketched by Condillac around the middle of the XVIII century, and systematized by the so-called French "ideologues" of the last decade of the eighteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth. Destutt de Tracy considered ideology to be the most general philosophical discipline, as the study of the representations and the object of knowledge.

Like all globalizing theories of social reality, historical materialism has also suffered the "law of unequal development". One of its more "underdeveloped" areas is the theory and analysis of ideologies. Only during this decade has the study of the ideological superstructure become one of the predominant topics among Marxist scholars. Due to this unequal development with respect to dealing with the economic and political aspects, for instance, and the complexity of ideological processes in themselves, many of the concepts and categories relevant to this field are "polysense", that is, they involve various different, and sometimes even contradictory meanings, even among Marxist authors. The basic notion of ideology is perhaps the most controversial of all, and its implicit or explicit meanings determine its use in research. It therefore becomes necessary to define the concept of ideology by means of setting out its dimensions.

There are two generic meanings for the concept of ideology a) as "Weltanschauung", or conception of the world and of life, and b) as false consciousness or distortion and concealment of reality. In spite of the existence of diverse definitions, these generic concep-

tions may be inferred from Marxist literature from the beginning, and in our opinion, they are not contradictory but actually complementary<sup>2</sup>. The unilateral consideration of either of them as the basis for a definition and development of the concept of ideology leads to a limited understanding of its links with social practice. When false consciousness is accepted as the only possible generic meaning, definitions are formulated of the type ideology vs. science/Marxism, where science is situated in some hypothetical and a-structural limbo, or at best, restricted to the exclusive field of practice. When the notion of "Weltanschauung" is understood to be the only generic meaning, we have definitions that gloss over the class function of ideology, with the subsequent distortion that this implies. If, however, we accept that these two generic meanings are complementary, ideology is not systematically opposed to the concept of science, on the one hand; and on the other, both ideology and science, or rather the whole of ideology/science, necessarily involve some kind of distortion in their representation of reality. Thus, instead of an opposition between two presumably differentiated (and even antagonical) instances, we would have "more or less scientific" ideologies, according to the development of the productive forces and cultural evolution of each social formation. We understand the search for scientific knowledge and transformation of the ideological "Weltanschauung" as productive processes, as one single process of "mental production", of "production of consciousness"<sup>3</sup>. In this sense, the ideology/science whole is situated at the same time in the field of structures and in that of social practice. Its "raw materials", "means of production" and "products" can be situated on different levels of both fields. Its "raw materials" are theories, hypotheses, arguments, etc., or ideas, projects, myths; these co-exist at the level of superstructure and that of ideological practice. A common "means of production" is language, as a social product. Other means of production of consciousness are necessarily common as well, such as universities, publishing houses, the press, mass media, libraries, etc. The common product is not so much the formulation of new theories or ideas as ways of interpreting the world but the transformation of the consciousness

of the "forms of social consciousness". From this point of view, the process of ideological-scientific production may be visualized as a dialectical movement with three moments. 1) Thesis: Ideology as false consciousness, distortion, concealment and inversion of reality, fundamentally in a class society. 2) Antithesis: first empirical knowledge, then scientific knowledge, according to the level of development of the productive forces and the historical conditions of production in each formation. 3) Synthesis: Ideology as "Weltanschauung". Includes the previous moments and constitutes a real-historical synthesis of the forms of social consciousness as world conception, life and society in each social formation. This "Weltanschauung", which is characterized in terms of class and class domination (dominant ideology, revolutionary ideology, etc.), serves as a guide to social practice in general, and to the political practice of the class struggle in particular. The practice of science, of theory and of scientific teaching as a social practice refers back to other practices, especially political practice. This does not occur in "pure" terms, however, but rather within the ideological practice of which it forms a part. That is, ideological practice is always more or less scientific, just like the "Weltanschauung" that guides it and is in its turn transformed and conditioned by such practice. Scientific practice is necessarily more or less ideological, not only because ideology includes it, but because the former always constitutes a "distorting" practice to some degree. This implies not only recognizing the existence of Marxist ideologies - as Lenin did - but extending the nature of the "distortion" to the entire ideology/science complex.

The concept of "distortion" also involves two generic and complementary meanings. 1) that which we could term "class distortion". That is, the meaning related to the social function of ideology, and fundamentally to the essentially unconscious fact of concealment of the relations of exploitation and class domination that contribute to maintaining the class structure. 2) that which we could call "structural distortion", which is inherent in ideology as superstructure, as a part of the structures conditioned by the development of the productive

forces of a society and mediated by its history. If we conceive of the content of science and knowledge in general as incorporating the ideological superstructure of each concrete social formation, as well as its productive forces, the ideological-scientific "Weltanschauung", the necessary synthesis representing reality, is both "true" and "false" at the same time. Thus, structural distortion is an attribute of all ideology and not only of those belonging to a class society. There is no "pure" science or "perfect" consciousness, only that synthesis of the universe and life, that set of ideological forms expressing the social consciousness of each historical conjuncture and serving as a frame of reference for the social practice of classes and groups. Structural distortion is manifest principally at the level of ideological alienation and of what we could call the "incompleteness of knowledge". If we conceive of human knowledge as a process, that is, as something that changes due to the change characteristic of the reality that is its object, we must conclude that there is no definitive or "complete" scientific or philosophical theory, not even Marxism. Any scientific or ideological conception, just as the culture of which they are part, is historically determined and therefore subject to partial or total revision and rejection. In this sense of its internal dynamics, its situation of constant development, the "incompleteness" of knowledge in general can be understood. Here a Gramscian concept might be useful; that of "relative ignorance" of reality. Analyzing the notion of "phenomenon" developed in The Holy Family of Marx and Engels (in relation to the problem of the external objectivity of reality), Gramsci asks whether phenomena exist objectively in themselves or whether they are qualities highlighted by man according to his practical and scientific needs. "Having stated that what we know about things is no more than ourselves, our needs and our interests, in other words, that our knowledge is superstructural (or non-definitive philosophy), it is difficult to avoid thinking about something real beyond our knowledge, not in the metaphysical sense of "noumeno", of an "unknown God" or an "unknowable", but in the concrete sense of "relative ignorance" of reality, of something still "not known" but that may be known some day, when the "physical" and

intellectual tools of men have been perfected, when the social and technical conditions of humanity have progressed". Of the two levels at which structural distortion is manifest ideological alienation and incompleteness of knowledge - we harbour the hope that the first may be overcome some day (along with the other forms of alienation), and that the second shall never be overcome. We are in agreement with those who conceive of alienation not as something inherent to human nature, nor even to highly technological societies in general, but as something which may be overcome in a progressive process, slow and difficult as it may be. We are confident, however, that the relative ignorance of human knowledge is reproduced dialectically every time it is overcome, as a constant challenge to human vitality. Otherwise, as Croce once hinted, if we had the answers to all our questions, we should paradoxically begin to fear the end of the species.

To continue now with the analysis of the concept of ideology, attempting to locate its dimensions within the framework of Marxist theory, we find that, from the above-mentioned generic meanings, we may take the following possibly "useful" dimensions in relation to the object of this work.

I. IDEOLOGICAL SUPERSTRUCTURE IN A GIVEN SOCIAL FORMATION. This is the ideological whole of a given society, a sort of "universal set" including the ideological "sub-sets" concerning the other dimensions of the concept.

II. DOMINANT IDEOLOGY. That is, the ideology of the dominant class in a particular social formation. This is the "Weltanschauung" of the class which possesses or controls the means of material and "spiritual" production and the power of the state. The ideas of this dominant class are the dominant ideas of the social formation in question, during its period of predominance.

III. REVOLUTIONARY IDEOLOGY. This refers to the "Weltanschauung" of the revolutionary class - once it has achieved the level of Marx's "class for itself" - which is the fundamental class in a social formation, besides the dominant class. In its confrontation with the latter, the revolutionary class appears as representative

of society as a whole, which it intends to unify under its leadership against the ruling class. Thus its own ideology is seen as "the" ideology for all of society.

IV. COUNTER-IDEOLOGIES. This term refers to those ideological "sub-sets" which, being to some degree opposed to the dominant ideology but different from the revolutionary ideology, reflect the contradictions between the ruling class and other social classes and factions in a given social formation. In some cases the term may also designate the alternative ideas of a class faction within the ruling class, expressing the interests of a "non-dominant" sector of that class.

V. PHILOSOPHIES. Since these are the most elaborate and sophisticated forms of ideology, they are, unlike the other dimensions, fundamentally manifest and conscious. They attempt to offer an explanation of the world and of life at various levels, and in this sense they are "Weltanschauungen", though they are systematically and intentionally formulated, which presuppose and attempt to include the "proof of truth" of themselves. They must not be confused with the scientific knowledge within the different class ideologies, although historically there has always been a mutual interrelation and influence between these two forms of practice of theory. When philosophies go beyond the sphere of their individual creators and become a way of thinking, a way of investigating reality, for many "organic intellectuals" (in the Gramscian sense)<sup>6</sup> and even for large sectors of one or more classes, those philosophies come to incorporate the context of the class "Weltanschauungen", that is, of the dominant and revolutionary ideologies or counter-ideologies, depending on the case in question. It is in this sense that philosophies become, in our opinion, a dimension of ideology, when they become "organic ideologies" (also in the Gramscian sense)<sup>7</sup>.

VI. POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES, of the social forces in a given society at a particular conjuncture. These are the organic bodies of ideas formulated or adopted by political parties, pressure groups and other political organisations or governmental institutions, concerning the object<sup>8</sup> of the political class struggle: state power. They mark off the political interests of the various social forces and reproduce their respective points of view on

the principal political questions in a social formation and at the international level, as well as the political projects involved. Since they are less inclusive than the class "Weltanschauungen", and given specificity of their object, they are referred to social forces and not to classes in the strict sense. Although the majority of the social forces at a particular political juncture are formed of classes themselves, they may also include social groups or categories that do not constitute classes (e.g. bureaucracy or the army). In addition, since the social forces are the fundamental components of that "force field" that is every political conjuncture, it follows that political ideologies are basically referred to such social forces, although more than one political ideology may exist within a single social force. If political practice, in achieving state power, concentrates the contradictions of the other levels of social practice<sup>9</sup>, political ideologies, as a guiding factor in political practice, which is in turn conditioned by that practice, constitute one of the links between the ideological superstructure and the field of social practice. If political practice constitutes a privileged moment, a level of consummation of the class struggle, political ideologies constitute a privileged aspect of the class "Weltanschauungen", since they reflect the level of ideological practice in arriving at its product: the transformation of the forms of social consciousness.

VII. RELIGIONS. These may form a part of all class "Weltanschauungen", to a greater or lesser degree; but also they may constitute ideologies in themselves, that is, a dimension of ideology in general. In class societies, religion has historically almost always been a basic component of dominant ideologies; less often of counter-ideologies, and exceptionally in revolutionary ideologies.

As a dimension of ideology in general, religion is equivalent to philosophy although of a different nature. They constitute "Weltanschauungen" in themselves, with a greater or lesser degree of complexity, they are overall conceptions of the world and life that guide aspects of social practice in so far as they make up "organic ideologies". The basic difference between religions and philosophies, from this point of view, lies in the cri-

teria of truth, in the ideological content as such and in the nature of their respective social practice; "religious" practice is not essentially a practice of theory. In any case, religious practice of theory would be theology, which belongs to the same ideological dimension as philosophy, in our opinion. Thus, religions constitute one dimension of ideology, and therefore all religion necessarily implies as well a "Weltanschauung" in itself, even though class ideologies are a component of it. Religion also implies, whether explicitly or implicitly, a world vision, a conception of life and death, an idea of man, of the non-human and the holy, a morality and a present and future social project, etc. In other words, it implies a response to the essential questions concerning the adaptation of a human community to nature and society.

As we can see, the above-mentioned dimensions of the concept of ideology correspond to different levels of the socio-ideological reality. Dimension I designates superstructure as a whole, points to an object which is more theoretical than real, providing an abstraction which is necessary for analysis. As a totality in itself, as a universal set of ideologies, it lacks an identity and a real existence (that is, a social existence) of its own. Its only possible social "carrier" would be the entire society, the whole mass of the population in a given social formation. The whole mass of the population in a class society, however, cannot be the carrier of a uniform ideology, except of dominant ideology in the case of an accepted imposition (Nazism is the historical example that comes closest to this hypothetical situation, without exemplifying it precisely). In general, the societal mass as such is the carrier of "civilizations" and "cultures" rather than ideologies. Dimensions II, III, IV and VI, on the other hand, refer to the real social level of ideology, in so far as they constitute the ideological expression of historically definable social classes and forces at a given political conjuncture. At this point we could state, as did Lenin, that "...in general, in a society rent by class contradictions, there can never be an ideology apart from class nor above class"<sup>10</sup>. Class "Weltanschauungen", that is, dominant and revolutionary ideologies and counter-ideologies, must not be



confused with concepts such as "culture" or "civilization", which are much more extensive and refer to a different facet of social reality. Both categories are referred to whole societies or sets of societies, rather than to their classes. Class "Weltanschauungen" (II, III and IV), however, involve a synthesis of the forms of social consciousness in a given historical present. These syntheses are the expression of existing relations of production as they are experienced and perceived, defended or challenged by the social classes and forces. In other words, they are relations of production themselves, "conceived as ideas"<sup>1</sup>. Political ideologies (VI) incorporate class "Weltanschauungen" in a relation of the part to the whole. Political ideologies reflect such ideological syntheses at a specifically political level, according to the political interests of the social class or force they represent. Philosophies (V), as we have said, form a part of class "Weltanschauungen" restricted to an academic sphere<sup>1</sup>, or become "arbitrary ideologies" in the Gramscian sense<sup>2</sup>. Religions (VII) also form part of the class "Weltanschauungen", but they constitute a dimension of ideology on their own, as we have seen. Thus, like philosophies, they are inserted into the context of culture, since their carrier is generally the society as a whole (people, nation, etc.), rather than one or more classes in particular; even though they are generally used to the ideological (according to the 2nd meaning) advantage of the ruling classes, and very exceptionally by the revolutionary classes, at least up until the past decade.

Now, all dimensions of the ideology mentioned here are included in the more extensive concept of "culture", in terms of their object or content. It must be pointed out, however, that they make reference to a selection or emphasis entirely different from the real, which unlike culture and civilization, is completely of a structural nature (that is, it forms a part of the structures). In order to better distinguish these categories of analysis, our second chapter develops the dimensions of the concept of "culture".

## II. THE DIMENSIONS OF CULTURE

The concept of culture involves an even greater number

of possible dimensions than that of ideology. It is sufficient to recall the now classic classification by Kroeber and Kluckhohn, which was an attempt to classify some one hundred definitions of different types, formulated mainly in connection with the theoretical approaches of specific disciplines<sup>3</sup>. For the purposes of this study, this kind of classification would be not only incomplete, due to the constant renewal and combination of approaches and definitions, but also inadequate. We are attempting to point out here only those basic dimensions which permit a clear distinction to be made between culture and ideology, and which, either directly or indirectly, may be relevant to this problematic as set out from the perspective of historical materialism.

1. CULTURE AS THAT WHICH IS OPPOSED TO NATURE. This is the most "extensive", in terms of the elements it contains, of the dimensions of culture. It includes all man's works and activity, material and non-material, past and present, even that activity which is operated upon nature and humanity itself. The latter is in fact the only "subject", "carrier" or "agent" possible in this maximum dimension in all its historical and spatial extension.

Aside from its broadness, this dimension is equivalent to that first dimension we set out for the concept of ideology; that is, designating the cultural "totality" as a universal whole which would include the sub-sets corresponding to the other dimensions of culture. Its relation to the maximum dimension of ideology, however, and subsequently with the rest, is that of the whole with respect to the part. Culture necessarily includes ideology - ideologies - as one of its features, although these categories point to different levels of structuring of social reality (ideology as a whole is a part of those structures; culture as a whole is not, or only in part, in that it includes the structure and superstructure of all of society), from different analytical points of view. From this perspective, it concerns an object which as a whole (not taking each particular feature on its own) is essentially theoretical (though every cultural feature has a concrete manifestation) and constitutes a necessary abstraction for analysis. The underlying assumption beneath the maximum dimension of culture is the basic initial

nature/man opposition (the source of the process of production and reproduction of material and spiritual life), of which it is the synthesis. That is to say, if nature is the thesis and humanity its antithesis, culture as man's total work, as the self-betterment of mankind and its own nature, is the synthesis.

2. CULTURE AS THE "WAY OF LIFE" OF A SOCIETY. This definition implies a partialization of the previous dimension both in the sense of referring to culture (as the total work and practice of man) in one or a number of social formations and during a given historic period.

If the first dimension can be ascribed only to "culture" in general, the second must necessarily relate to "cultures" and to a culture in particular, understood as a social and historico-spatial concretion of the total work of man; that is, a particular way of life which is somehow unique and original, referred to concrete social formations or particular historical societies. If the possible subject or agent of the first dimension is mankind as a whole, the carriers of the second dimension are whole societies (not classes or other social segments, but peoples, nations, tribes, etc.), constituted as social formations which are relatively differentiated, as are the cultures they carry. From this point of view, this constitutes a more "real-social" than "theoretical" dimension, equivalent to dimensions II, III, IV and VI considered for the concept of ideology. In any case, as we have pointed out, all dimensions of culture include those of ideology in a relation of the whole to the part, with the exception of pre-classist societies, where only dimension I is valid (ideological superstructure) from the theoretical point of view, and to some extent dimension VII (religion) as a conception of the world and of life.

3. CULTURE AS "CIVILIZATION". This is a specification of the previous dimension from the evolutionary point of view. It is a category common to all evolutionist and Marxist thought since Morgan and Engels; here, the term civilization refers more to a specific type of culture or way of life, to one moment in the cultural development of a society which involves - among other features - the formation of cities (civitas). The establishment of civilization is possible only at a certain level of development in the productive forces of a social formation, where an

economic surplus has been achieved sufficient to maintain one class free of the task of direct production, which drives cultural development (calendar, "state" religion, sometimes alphabet, etc.). The advent of civilization coincides with that of the class society. To this classic concept of civilization, which groups together all urban cultures from the very beginnings, we must add certain nuances for the purpose of characterizing the cultural development of mankind in the contemporary age. We are now in a process of transition which is gradually homogenizing those aspects of the way of life of societies which suffer the impact of technological and scientific transfer from the highly developed countries. On the other hand, in certain peripheral areas we may observe a cultural renaissance and the affirmation of vernacular values, in contrast to the military-technological-economic dependence and the penetration of ideology from the hegemonic centres. This double and contradictory trend is at the base of the instability of civilization's present frontiers, which appear to fade out at some levels and reappear at others, to be present in some places and nowhere at the same time.

In any case, faced with the question of "one civilization or several" (for the contemporary age), our response is "one, and several, at the same time": a process of transition toward an ecumenical civilization in which several developing civilizations still subsist, evolve and interpenetrate each other - these would be the elements for a new synthesis. One of these civilizations in transformation is the (problematically termed) "Western" civilization; not the oldest, but in the historic present that which enjoys the greatest cultural diffusion in terms of certain basic features: technology, science, theory (Marxism, as a scientific theory and revolutionary ideology, also originated in the West, and is a singular "intellectual product" of Europe, including Western Russia).

The problem of the conception and use of the concept of culture in the context of historical materialism is even more difficult than in other global theories. This is principally due to the undeniable fact that the theory of culture is one of the less developed areas of Marxist thought, to the fundamentally pragmatic use of this category by the majority of the great thinkers of classic

Marxism, and to the superposition of meaning and object with respect to certain essential Marxist concepts - such as the notion of structure itself - which has often given rise to confusion.

The incorporation of the concept of culture into the context of Marxist theory has been a subject of growing interest in the Latin American milieu. Given the nature of this study, we will not attempt to make an exhaustive analysis of this problematic, nor discuss the various approaches. We believe, however, that the recovery of the clearer of the classic anthropological meanings of the concept of culture - as in opposition to nature; as the total work and practice of mankind - is not in contradiction with the related categories of Marxist context (ideology-superstructure-social formation, etc.), even though the latter point toward different levels of analysis of social reality, which not only cannot be confused with each other, but complement each other.

We understand the categories of culture and ideology to be specifically complementary. Just as ideology-science constitutes an organic whole in our opinion, it forms part of culture as a broader totality but also complements it. In this sense, ideology as "Weltanschauung" is structural, (that is, it forms part of the structures-as-a superstructure), when it is considered from the point of view of the different conceptions of the world of the various classes in a social formation, and it is cultural, that is, it forms part of culture, when it is considered from the "supra-class" perspective, in relation to social formations or whole societies (and eventually, mankind in general), it is a specific set of cultural guidelines or a feature of culture, in any one of the three dimensions we have mentioned. For example, a single religious belief - the coming of the Kingdom - as expressed in the gospel, may constitute a crucial element in certain Christian-Socialist ideologies and at the same time, from another point of view, be a recurring feature of Western civilization (for instance, the re-interpretation of this belief carried out by the Chiliasts of the Millennium during the European middle ages). Similarly, an element belonging to the field of the productive forces such as the domestication of plants and animals, or another element corresponding to the field of the relations of production,

(or structure as such) as, for example, the "feudal pact" also constitute, from another point of view, features of culture or civilization.

#### NOTES

1. The "dimensions" of a concept are the different meanings that have been established for it; in scientific practice the most "useful" or appropriate of these possible meanings are selected in order to use them as categories or units of analysis.
2. Cf. José Luis Najenson: "Ideologías, contraideologías e ideologías revolucionarias". Revista Latino-americana de Ciencias Políticas, ELACP-FLASCO, August 1972, Vol. III, No. 2, Santiago, Chile. With regard to the second meaning, Hegel constitutes a precedent to Marx's conception, to a certain extent, in understanding the possibility of "false consciousness" as a moment of the systematic-historical dialectics of consciousness.
3. Marx and Engels refer on several occasions to the concept of "mental production" or "consciousness", e.g. in The German Ideology: "The production of ideas, of conceptions... The same applies to mental production as expressed in the language of the politics, laws, morality, religion, metaphysics of a people. (Int. Publishers, New York, 1947)p.14
4. E.g. Marxism is now triumphing unconditionally over all other ideologies of the working-class movement." (Marxismo y Revisionismo", 1908). In Marx, Engels, Marxismo (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967), p.252
5. A. Gramsci, El materialismo histórico y la filosofía de Benedetto Croce (Nueva Visión, Buenos Aires, 1971) p.48
6. Cf. Antonio Gramsci, "La formación de los intelectuales" (in Obras, by A. Gramsci, Juan Pablos, Mexico, 1975).
7. For instance, positivism as an ideology of the pre-monopolic bourgeoisie; Marxism, as a "philosophy of praxis", as an organic ideology of the revolutionary proletariat of the twentieth century.

8. Cf. Nicos Poulantzas, *Clases sociales y poder político en el estado capitalista* (Siglo XXI, Mexico, 1969).
9. Cf. Nicos Poulantzas, op. cit.
10. V.I. Lenin, *Que hacer?* (Quimantú, Santiago, Chile, 1972)p.52
11. Cf. K.Marx and F.Engels, *La ideología alemana*, op. cit.
12. Cf. Antonio Gramsci, *El materialismo histórico y la filosofía de Benedetto Croce*, op. cit.
13. Alfred L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn: "Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions" (Papers of Peabody Museum of Archeology and Ethnology, 47 1952)  
See also Clyde Kluckhohn: "The concept of Culture" (In *The Policy sciences*, Ed. D. Lerner and H.D. Lasswell, Stanford, 1951)

## **Black Consciousness And The Nature Of The Azanian Liberation Struggle** - Ranwedzi Nengwekhulu

One of the major criticisms against Black Consciousness is that it is not a viable ideology i.e., it can't lead to the liberation of black people in South Africa because of what these critics claim are intrinsic and inherent weaknesses which militate against it transforming itself into an ideology for liberation. Others even question its validity as an ideology i.e., they maintain that black consciousness is not an ideology but rather an emotional reaction to oppression and as such it is a negative result of the policies in South Africa and therefore it is nothing else but an anti-white movement.

Perhaps it is necessary that we begin by assessing the validity of black consciousness even before we can begin to think about talking about its validity.

The question about ideological validity is indeed a very crucial one since an ideology is an indispensable vehicle for the proper and meaningful prosecution of any serious and meaningful cause.

In the field of politics for liberation an ideology is a concise and incisive embodiment of principles, ideals and objectives. In short, it is a definitive statement of the basic principles of how one sees society or rather how one would like to see the society or country in which one lives structured. Thus for a capitalist, an ideal society is that in which the principle of the appropriation of profit should prevail. The hallmark of such a society is private ownership of property and predatory pursuit of profit making through the brutal appropriation of surplus value by exploiting workers. But for the socialist the ideal society is that in which there is no exploitation of man by man and the principle of the survival of the richest is replaced

by collective endeavour for collective survival.

Ideology then means a statement of principles which indicates the goals, means and forms of practical and above all, political activities of classes, social groups and individuals. Accordingly, it supplies the justification of various social, political, moral and aesthetic ideals. It therefore contains a generalised interpretation of the character and course of human development, its foundations and its motive forces.

As a theoretical pattern of beliefs, ideology can and must therefore be looked at on the basis of whether it adequately or inadequately reflects social reality, on the basis of its cognitive possibilities. We may therefore apply to ideology the criteria of truth and falseness with scientific objectivity.

An ideology is produced under concrete historical circumstances and it is therefore not timeless and as such contains historical specificity. To understand any ideology, we must understand its historical origin and development. Its complexion is therefore determined by the material conditions which produce it. It is therefore a reflection of the concrete and objective conditions which produce it and these conditions are themselves formed historically.

But in reflecting a social reality from the vantage point of interests and aspirations of a particular class or social group, it provides a practical guide to action of the class as a whole and defines the tasks, aims and limits of activity of the group. Ideology therefore evolves together with society and changes as the material conditions change, but in turn influences changes in society.

This is obviously a simplistic way of illustrating the meaning and function of ideology but the purpose however, is to delineate its broad perspectives and dimensions.

It is within this general definition of ideology that we want to determine the validity and viability of Black Consciousness in Azania. But perhaps the proper starting point for an analysis and evaluation of the validity, viability and appropriateness of Black Consciousness is

the definition of Black Consciousness.

Black Consciousness can be defined as an awareness by Black people that in order to be able to liquidate the status quo in Azania and thereby liberating themselves from economic exploitation, political emasculation and social degradation, they must come together as Blacks. It is an ideology which posits that the struggle for Black liberation can only be fruitfully prosecuted if and when Blacks come together to the total exclusion of whites. It is therefore group consciousness. Thus the concept of Black Consciousness means an awareness which rests on the belief that Blacks wield tremendous political and economic power as a group. In other words, Black Consciousness means cohesion and solidarity. Black Consciousness in Azania is therefore synonymous with national consciousness, for both national consciousness and Black Consciousness mean that sense of oneness which emanates from a community of aspiration, response and action. Thus Black Consciousness means group self-awareness engendered, as will be shown later, by the realisation that Black people in South Africa should and must seek their salvation as a group in a society in which they are oppressed and exploited as a group. Black Consciousness is therefore in this respect a political programme for group emancipation from oppression. It is therefore not and can't be political and emotional narcissism as some critics would like people to believe. It is rather an ideological outlook that seeks to mobilise Blacks into a black or national liberation movement for the liberation of their country.

Its origin should and must be sought within the womb of the socio-economic conditions which prevail in Azania for, as we have stated above, an ideology is produced under concrete historical conditions and therefore possesses historical specificity which defines its nature and complexion and the historical and concrete specificity within whose womb Black Consciousness was born is white settler colonialism which defines the nature and essence of Black CONSCIOUSNESS and its political strategies and tactics. It is therefore theoretically wrong and politically dishonest to contend that Black Consciousness is false consciousness as some philistine and rabid opportu-

nists would like the Blacks in Azania to believe.

It is theoretically and politically wrong and incorrect, for an ideology is a reflection of the concrete and living conditions. And the ideological requirements for the development of the various social forces and the need to resolve the concrete contradictions and tasks, depend on the historically produced concrete conditions.

And since the concrete and historical reality of Azania is the existence of white settler colonialism, the main and principal contradiction is therefore between the oppressed blacks and dominant white settler colonialists. The proper and correct starting point in examining and comprehending the nature of the Azanian struggle and the role that the Black Consciousness movement plays is therefore the appreciation that Azania is a colonial possession of the white settler community. Hence the entire apparatus of the colonial state has been designed to maintain and reproduce the dominance of white supremacy over the black masses of Azania. The white settler bourgeoisie and their imperialist masters may differ as to the mechanics of how to exploit Black workers but there is no dispute over the maintenance and reproduction of white settler Supremacy, Colonialism and Capitalism.

This is not to say however, that there are no contradictions between the white settler ruling class and the white workers; contradictions exist but these have been subordinated to the long standing interests of white workers to enlarge the enormous chasm that separates their relative affluence and privilege wages from the starvation wages of the black workers.

The struggle in Azania is therefore the struggle for national liberation, of which the BCM is a crucial component, from white settler colonialism. It is therefore not a socialist struggle, for in a colonial situation the struggle for the colonised can only take the form of a national liberation. But embodied and empregnated in this struggle is the class struggle, "for in a struggle which is national in character the class struggle takes the form of national struggle, which demonstrates the identity between the two. On the other hand, for a given historical period the political and economic demands

of the various classes must not be such as to disrupt co-operation. On the other hand, the demands of the national struggle should be the point of departure for the class struggle." (Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works Vol. II p215)

The convergence of the national struggle and class struggle in Azania is expressed and popularised by the Black Consciousness Movement and this has radically transformed the political content of the national liberation struggle. In our view this is the only correct interpretation of the nature, complexion of the struggle in Azania and the political strategies required to liberate our fatherland. We therefore do not agree with those who claim that the problem in Azania is "internal colonialism or colonialism of a special type". Nor do we agree with the liberal view that the problem is the lack of civil rights for blacks. The theory of internal colonialism of a special type posits that a white racial group is oppressing and exploiting other racial groups and that the end of apartheid will be the birth of a multi-racial democracy. Such a philistine conceptual construction and analysis disregards the fact that colonialism is the root of racial discrimination and that imperialism has maintained white settler colonialism in Azania. And in our view, what we are contending with is "normal" colonialism with all the attributes of colonialism as it existed and exists anywhere else in the world.

There is therefore no justification to call it internal or special except by those who would like to meddle in the Black liberation politics. But as indicated earlier, the correct approach is the one which views Azania as a colonial possession and to see the struggle as a struggle for national liberation. And because it is a struggle for national liberation, it excludes all forms of coalition between the members from the colonisers' camp and those from the colonised. Hence the rejection by the BCM of all forms of political coalitions which ignore the nature of the struggle. But the leadership of this national struggle must be in the hands of the Black working class of Azania assisted by those Black intellectuals, students and other members of the petty bourgeois class who have chosen to commit class suicide, and throw their lot with

the Black proletariat. And the guiding ideology must be the proletarian ideology. Thus Black intellectuals, students, etc., only serve as catalysts rather than vanguards of the struggle. And this is our stand-point both theoretically and politically, i.e. the BCM sees itself as a catalyst, a yeast to set in the process of political fermentation for it believes that workers, all over the world, left on their own, tend to be economic, i.e. tend to be concerned with the immediate material needs. Thus revolutionary class and political consciousness must be brought without. To posit otherwise is to display political ignorance and philistine opportunism.

### CLASS, RACE AND BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS

One of the most persistent and vitriolic criticisms against the Black Consciousness Movement is that it is a racial movement and as such it is apartheid in reverse. These critics can be broadly broken into two groups. In the first place there is the old liberal group which maintains that the struggle is against apartheid and therefore all those who are opposed to apartheid must come together and form a non-racial and multi-racial coalition and marshal their resources against apartheid in order to establish a non-racial and multi-racial society. Implied in this assertion is that the elimination of apartheid will lead to the promised land in which competition will reign supreme with no racial fetters. In other words, this group does not challenge the existing colonial capitalism. In fact it is seeking to eliminate apartheid in order to create a veritable and fertile ground on which capitalism can grow luxuriously.

The second group is that which argues that the struggle in Azania is a 'pure class struggle'. The essence of the argument here is that race has no role to play in the struggle, for the struggle is a class struggle and as such it has nothing to do with race.

In our view both perspectives are incorrect for they seek to deny the connection between race and class. In our view it is neither a racial struggle nor a "pure" class struggle. In our opinion it is a national liberation struggle against colonialism and imperialism. And

in a situation in which oppression and exploitation are based on class, race and national oppression, the struggle takes a national liberation character because the principal contradiction is between the colonised and the colonisers. And in a struggle that is national in character the class struggle takes the form of national struggle. And so is the case also with race, for at a given stage in the historical development and maturation of the society, the relations of production are expressed through the relations of race and colour and to acknowledge this historical fact is not to suggest that the relations of production are contained within the structure of race, for the relations of production have their own logic and integrity but rather to suggest and posit that at a certain stage in the historical development of a society the superstructure may acquire some relative independence but this independence is however conditioned by the basic structure and superstructure in turn conditions the basic structure. This is elementary dialectical relationship between base and superstructure. To posit otherwise would be to posit a mechanical analysis and exposition of society as we know it, and the result will be a sterile, negative and useless analysis which will lead the black masses to a theoretical blind alley.

Thus a correct analysis of race and class is the one which sees the two dialectically linked as well as influencing one another. To deny this inter-relationship between base and superstructure, class and race is to advocate economic determinism in which the superstructure plays no role whatever other than a passive role. In other words, it is to posit that race in Azania plays no role at all.

The reality is that "political, judicial, racial etc. development is based on economic development. But all these react upon one another and also upon the economic base. It is not that the economic position is the cause and alone active, while everything else only has a passive effect. There is rather, interaction on the basis of the economic necessity, which ultimately always asserts itself". (Engels - Dynamics of Social Change, edited by H. Selsam et al, 1975 p75)

It is within this context that the relationship between

race, class, national consciousness and black consciousness should and must be understood. It is only those who want to derail the black struggle for liberation in Azania who would posit a mechanical and lifeless analysis of the socio-economic situation.

In our view neither a class nor a race analysis explains the historical and concrete specificity of the nature and essence of the problem in Azania, for the correct analysis is the one that accepts both a class and race analysis. It is therefore not a question of either/or, but rather of both. What is meant here is that the dialectical relationship between the two must be taken into account if a proper understanding of the situation is required and correct strategies for liberation formulated. But to accept the role of race in the struggle is not to suggest that it is the principal determinant of the nature of our society but rather to reject the view that race is inconsequential in our struggle. We can't think or wish away the existence of nationalism, national consciousness, religion etc. They all need to be explained, for they are formed and produced under concrete historical conditions and they in turn react upon these concrete historical conditions.

This is the essence of the struggle in Azania and the strategies that are required to prosecute it. We must therefore reject all artificial explanations whose hallmark is sophisticated hypocrisy and scholarsticism designed to dilute and delay the struggle for liberation.

Our struggle is a struggle for national liberation from white settler colonialism and it is a component of a socialist revolution. Its guiding ideology is a proletarian ideology. Its aim is to abolish Colonialism and Capitalism and replace it with a system in which there will be no exploitation of man by man.

There is no incompatibility between Black Consciousness and class struggle, for black consciousness as an ideology for national liberation is an essential component of the socialist struggle being waged by black workers and poor peasants in Azania today. But although this struggle does not eliminate class contradictions, it however prepares the way for a socialist revolution if it is guided by the proletarian ideology, for proletarian

ideology and hegemony creates conditions for continual development of the national revolution in a progressive direction towards a socialist revolution. This has clearly been illustrated in the Chinese revolution, Cuban revolution, Mozambican, Angolan and Zimbabwean revolutions. Their struggles were struggles for national liberation.

It has been asserted above that a struggle for national liberation is characterised by a coalition of different social classes of the colonised. In other words, the main feature of a coalition for national liberation is that it is made up of workers, peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie. This is necessary because the main focus of the struggle is colonialism and imperialism and as a result this coalition is an amalgamation of all the anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism forces which exist among the colonised. This means therefore by definition it excludes all sell-outs and quislings among the oppressed. In Azania the struggle is a coalition of workers, peasants, students and petty-bourgeois elements. But this coalition excludes all the black sell-outs in the Bantustans, Bantu Councils etc. for, by definition, our coalition is a coalition of all the anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism elements. Thus although this is a political and social mixed grille, it is a mixed grille based on political fastidiousness. The guiding ideology is the proletarian ideology, for the black working class is the centre of the struggle for national liberation. This proletarian liberation hegemony in the struggle for national liberation is not only essential but also crucial, for it fulfils the role of a motive force which ensures the continual development of the national liberation struggle i.e., the stage by stage transition to resolving more radical tasks and the creation of conducive conditions for advancing socialist goals. Thus the other social classes capable of fighting, and fighting for these proletarian goals group around the working class which is and must be the leader of the national liberation struggle. The alliance for national liberation is formed and must be formed in the anvil of the struggle and not after the struggle for, it is during the struggle that the sheep must be separated from the goats.



But what is the role and place of students and intellectuals in this struggle for national liberation? This is one issue that has bedevilled our struggle and it is the one issue that has been used as a criticism against the Black Consciousness Movement. Critics of the B.C.M. have always argued that the BCM is just an intellectual, chauvinist movement geared towards the advancement and actualisation of the class interests of the black intellectuals. The theoretical and political sterility of this thesis only reflects the inability of the critics to understand and appreciate the simple fact that an understanding of the political action of intellectuals cannot be understood on the basis of class background, "because the experiences ... and situations which intervene between childhood social attachments and adult political practices vitiate any effort to derive behavioural patterns from background... Equally fruitless and useless is any attempt to locate intellectuals in the class structure by virtue of their education, income or lifestyle. The economic, political and social activities of revolutionary intellectuals are not convertible into the formal roles they occupy in the social structure, emptied of the political content which they carry... (For us) the primary force providing a social identity for intellectuals and their involvement in the struggle for national liberation is their political membership in the working class movement. Their incorporation into the mass struggle for national liberation and the process through which this is achieved provides the basic ingredients for determining the class loyalty of the intellectuals". (J.Petras, New Left Review No. 3 1978 p.43) It is this kind of analysis rather than the biographical analysis, which enables us to understand how and why Karl Marx, Engels, Lenin etc. became the greatest revolutionaries, champions and comrades of the international working class struggle despite their social and intellectual backgrounds. And it is this type of analysis and perspective which helps us to understand and appreciate the place and role of black intellectuals in the Azanian struggle for national liberation. But in this struggle for national liberation as well as the struggle for socialist revolution, intellectuals play a secondary role for their role is that of a catalyst rather than the basic and motive force in the struggle

for, that is the monopoly and prerogative of the working class. Intellectuals play the role of keeping the struggle within the revolutionary proletarian ideology for history demonstrates that left on their own, workers tend to lapse into economism i.e. the struggle for immediate material needs. Thus revolutionary class and political consciousness must be inculcated into the working class from outside. This is elementary revolutionary political knowledge. The criticism against BCM is only a reflection of the political and theoretical ignorance of its critics whose only aim is to mystify the nature and complexion of the struggle. For, seen in a proper perspective, black intellectuals and students in the BCM see and have always seen themselves as catalysts. It is only political nihilists who would argue otherwise in order to create artificial obstacles to the march of the Azanian struggle for national liberation. Genuine revolutionaries have always been able to comprehend the place and role of the intellectuals and students in the struggle. Fortunately, the flood of revolution has always been able to sweep away this kind of political debris. The same will be true of the political opportunists who populate the political arena of AZANIA. The march of history and the dimension of the Azanian revolution will trample them, for no man can stem the tide of revolution. In conclusion, it must be emphasised that the struggle will not be won by adopting the false theoretical and ideological positions but rather by a courageous acceptance of the social reality of our situation. The true understanding of this requires and demands a scientific study of the concrete revolutionary situations in which this struggle is being waged. This is necessary in order to establish basic principles. "Pure" theory will not do. And the concrete situation in Azania is characterised by white settler colonialism and as such the initial struggle is the national liberation struggle against white settler colonialism. Abstract and metaphysical theorising can't and will not eliminate it nor will artificial experimentation as to whether Blacks and whites can prosecute the struggle together add any substance and momentum to the struggle. If anything, they cloud and mystify the real issues. The basic requirement for understanding the nature of the liberation struggle in Azania is the ability to conceptualise from the concrete histori-

cal situation for if the theory of revolutionary struggle is to have any meaning, relevance and applicability, it must emerge from the concrete historical situation. This is essential because practice, and practice only, is the essential womb within which theory must be conceived and from which it must emerge. Hence theory must prove its usefulness in practice.

Once we have grasped this basic fact we have begun on the correct road to an understanding of the nature of the struggle and the strategies required to prosecute it. But this simple fact is not understood by everybody, otherwise how would we explain the mysticism that has characterised those who persist in attempting to impose their theoretical explanations of the character and nature of our struggle and the strategies required to pursue it.

---

#### SELF RELIANCE - ONLY WAY TO VICTORY

"Self reliance is a question of political line ... that relying on one's own efforts is primary and decisive, while outside aid is secondary ... reliance on outside support opens the door wide ... to undue pressure and interference and paves the way to dependence. What is more dangerous, it encourages isolation from the masses, indifference to their needs and attitudes ... Self reliance assures the active role and participation of the masses, develops their self-confidence and guarantees that they become and remain masters of their revolution and country". (Liberation, Vol. 6, No. 6, pp. 7-8)

#### DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

(1) The National Democratic Revolution is based upon the *minimum demands* of the oppressed masses of Azania, namely, the reconquest of *all our land and its resources* and the attainment of full democratic rights.

(2) The *Black Consciousness Movement* recognises that the national oppression of our people is a direct result of *capitalism and imperialism* and thus our struggle is both anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist.

(3) The *Black Consciousness Movement* consequently adopts the theory and practice of *scientific socialism* to guide it in the struggle.

(4) However, because of the structural and institutionalised nature of racism in the South African social system, the class struggle continues and will continue to manifest itself in colour terms, and for this reason, we continue to believe in the mobilising role of Black Consciousness in the struggle in which the black people rally against their common oppression.

(5) In response to the popular struggles of the masses for political, social and economic emancipation the current strategy of imperialism as represented by the South African regime is shifting emphasis from expressing itself in purely

race terms to a sharper class content, as witnessed by its overtures to the black middle class. This underscores the class essence of the struggle against national oppression.

(6) The *Black Consciousness Movement of Azania* recognises that the black workers are the most oppressed and exploited section of our society, and, therefore, constitute the major force in our struggle. Thus the strategy for the revolution should be based on the historical, political and organisational *experience of the black working class*.

(7) Organisationally, the *Black Consciousness Movement* will be guided in its functions and conduct of the struggle, by a form of *discipline*, which develops out of a consciousness which itself is a product of internalised revolutionary principles: *criticism and self-criticism; democratic centralism; collective leadership; the principles of recall and active participation*.

(8) In order to advance the Azanian struggle against imperialism on a global scale, the *Black Consciousness Movement* will seek to establish and maintain fraternal links internationally with progressive and revolutionary forces, governments, liberation movements and solidarity groups.