

ARMAG-Inketh-10-3-3

VOL. 2 No. 7
AUGUST 1979

INKATHA

INTRODUCTION

When people are hungry they speak about that hunger. When they are cold they speak about that too. The people know what they want to talk about. The black peasants and workers of South Africa have the kind of wisdom which is born in the reality of their suffering. It is a kind of wisdom which does not theorise, does not play with words, and above many other things does not posture to appease anybody or any organisation. It is a shrewd wisdom which knows that a snake bites and that a fire burns. The wisdom of the people does not allow them to leave realism behind as they march on in the struggle for liberation. A sense of logistics makes them discard empty ideals. It makes them search always for that which can be done.

Academics may debate this political form or that political form. Theorists may dispute amongst each other about capitalism, socialism or Marxism. The black worker and peasant may not hold their own in these rarified word games. They do, however, know how to hold their own when it comes to the best way of feeding their hungry children in the terrible circumstances that surround them in their daily lives. They do know what will work and what will fail. They keep on talking to each other, sounding each other out about the effectiveness of strike action, economic boycotts, the armed struggle and a host of things. They know each other and they know what can be done and they also know what can not be done.

Inkatha is the largest mass organisation South Africa has ever produced. The people, the workers and the peasants, have elected to make Inkatha their instrument of liberation inside South Africa. Inkatha's language, its arguments, its opinions, reflect the language, the arguments and the opinions common among its grass roots support.

Those who enter into dispute with Inkatha dispute with the people themselves. Those who oppose Inkatha, oppose the people.

Inkatha does not pretend to pronounce with final wisdom in these days of turbulent flux and change. Inkatha's language is a living language. Its strategies and tactics are designed to meet the demands of today. It looks for a new tomorrow in every day, and it searches for things close at hand with which to lay the foundations of tomorrow. In its participatory democracy it plans the best utility for the employment of today and the things which are real and are to hand.

One thing which Black South Africa has come to realise is that black South Africans have their destiny in their hands and no man, organisation or nation will help them where they fail. We in this country write our history ourselves. We do so in the context first of South Africa, secondly in the context of Southern Africa, thirdly in the context of Africa, and then only in the context of the international community.

I have accepted the responsibility of articulating a people's wisdom. In many ways South African politics have made the voice of the masses the dissenting voice. Early colonialists did this, later colonialists did this, white rulers today do this, and so do many self-styled black leaders. There is a hunger for real leadership amongst our black rank and file. Each searches for his or her place where a contribution can be made. Each knows that clapping hands in false euphoria produced by the politics of unrealism is a contribution which lasts only as long as it takes for teargas and police dogs to disperse crowds.

I sanction the publication of some of the things I have said because their roots are among the people I serve. I may in the future say some things differently and I may say new things. I will at all times be ready to listen to the people.

If there are those who wish to dispute that which I say, let he or she do so in front of my people, and let my people be the arbiters of what shall stand and what should be changed.

These extracts of my speeches should provide the guidelines for discussion of Inkatha's position. Those who speak and teach should make themselves acquainted with the contents of this series of Inkatha Bulletins. If they wish to speak or teach differently, let them get a mandate from the people themselves before they do so.

Inkatha cannot tolerate babble of divisive voices. Internal discussion is encouraged by Inkatha's Constitution which provides for participatory democracy. We do not encourage strutting cockerels each scratching on their own little dunghill, and each posturing and crowing to out-perform the other.

We face a new future and prepare to do so in our own way by employing our own form of democracy. Let the people speak, for it is they who will live or die in our struggle.

uMntwana Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
President
Inkatha yeNkululeko yeSizwe

CONTENTS

	Page
The Lusaka Manifesto	1
Violence and the Armed Struggle	5
The Black Struggle	13
Black Liberation	19
Southern Africa	21
Afrocentric Future	23
A Black Perspective of History	27

THE LUSAKA MANIFESTO, 1969

In April 1969 fourteen East and Central African States issued a manifesto on the future of Southern Africa, the text of which appears below.

The objectives of the manifesto were adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the O.A.U. at its sixth ordinary session, 6-10 September 1969. On 20 November 1969 the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by forty-eight states which welcomed the manifesto and recommended it to the attention of all States and peoples: 113 votes in favour, 2 against (Portugal and South Africa), and 2 abstentions (Cuba and Malawi).

MANIFESTO ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

1. When the purpose and the basis of States' international policies are misunderstood, there is introduced into the world a new and unnecessary disharmony. Disagreements, conflicts of interest, or different assessments of human priorities, which already provoke an excess of tension in the world, and disastrously divide mankind at a time when united action is necessary to control modern technology and put it to the service of man. It is for this reason, that discovering widespread misapprehension of our attitudes and purposes in relation to southern Africa, we the leaders of East and Central African States meeting at Lusaka, 16th April, 1969, have agreed to issue this Manifesto.

2. By this Manifesto we wish to make clear, beyond all shadow of doubt, our acceptance of the belief that all men are equal, and have equal rights to human dignity and respect, regardless of colour, race, religion, or sex. We believe that all men have the right and the duty to participate, as equal members of the society, in their own government. We do not accept that any individual or group has any right to govern any other group of sane adults, without their consent, and we affirm that only the people of a society, acting together as equals, can determine what is, for them, a good society and a good social, economic, or political organization.

3. On the basis of these beliefs we do not accept that any one group within a society has the right to rule any society without the continuing consent of all the citizens. We recognize that at any one time there will be, within every society, failures in the implementation of these ideals. We recognize that for the sake of order in human affairs, there may be transitional arrangements while a transformation from group inequalities to individual equality is being effected. But we affirm that without an acceptance of these ideals — without a commitment to these principles of human equality and self-determination — there can be no basis for peace and justice in the world.

4. None of us would claim that within our own States we have achieved that perfect social, economic, and political organisation which would ensure a reasonable standard of living for all our people and establish individual security against avoidable hardship or miscarriage of justice. On the contrary, we acknowledge that within our own States the struggle towards human brotherhood and unchallenged human dignity is only beginning. It is on the basis of our commitment to human equality and human dignity, not on the basis of achieved perfection, that we take our stand of hostility towards the colonialism and racial discrimination which is being practised in Southern Africa. It is on the basis of their commitment to these universal principles that we appeal to other members of the human race for support.

5. If the commitment to these principles existed among the States holding power in Southern Africa, any disagreements we might have about the rate of implementation, or about isolated acts of policy, would be matters affecting only our individual relationships with the states concerned. If these commitments existed, our States would not be justified in the expressed and active hostility towards the regimes of Southern Africa such as we have proclaimed and continue to propagate.

6. The truth is, however, that in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, South-West Africa, and the Republic of South Africa, there is an open and continued denial of the principles of human equality and national self-determination. This is not a matter of failure in the implementation of accepted human principles. The effective Administrations in all these territories are not struggling towards these difficult goals. They are fighting the principles; they are deliberately organizing their societies so as to try to destroy the hold of these principles in the minds of men. It is for this reason that we believe the rest of the world must be interested. For the principle of human equality, and all that flows from it, is either universal or it does not exist. The dignity of all men is destroyed when the manhood of any human being is denied.

7. Our objectives in Southern Africa stem from our commitment to this principle of human equality. We

are not hostile to the Administrations of these States because they are manned and controlled by white people. We are hostile to them because they are systems of minority control which exist as a result of, and in the pursuance of, doctrines of human inequality. What we are working for is the right of self-determination for the people of those territories. We are working for a rule in those countries which is based on the will of all the people, and an acceptance of the equality of every citizen.

8. Our stand towards Southern Africa thus involves a rejection of racialism, not a reversal of the existing racial domination. We believe that all the peoples who have made their homes in the countries of Southern Africa are Africans, regardless of the colour of their skins: and we would oppose a racist majority government which adopted a philosophy of deliberate and permanent discrimination between its citizens on grounds of racial origin. We are not talking racialism when we reject the colonialism and apartheid policies now operating in those areas; we are demanding an opportunity for all the people of these States, working together as equal individual citizens to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of government under which they will, by general consent, live together and work together to build a harmonious society.

9. As an aftermath of the present policies, it is likely that different groups within these societies will be self-conscious and fearful. The initial political and economic organizations may well take account of these fears, and this group self-consciousness. But how this is to be done must be a matter exclusively for the peoples of the country concerned, working together. No other nation will have a right to interfere in such affairs. All that the rest of the world has a right to demand is just what we are now asserting — that the arrangements within any State which wishes to be accepted into the community of nations must be based on an acceptance of the principles of human dignity and equality.

10. To talk of the liberation of Africa is thus to say two things: First, that the peoples in the territories still under colonial rule shall be free to determine for themselves their own institutions of self-government. Secondly, that the individuals in Southern Africa shall be freed from an environment poisoned by the propaganda of racialism, and given an opportunity to be men — not white men, brown men, yellow men, or black men.

11. Thus the liberation of Africa for which we are struggling does not mean a reverse racialism. Nor is it an aspect of African Imperialism. As far as we are concerned the present boundaries of the States of Southern Africa are the boundaries of what will be free and independent African States. There is no question of our seeking or accepting any alterations to our own boundaries at the expense of these future free African nations.

12. On the objective of liberation as thus defined, we can neither surrender nor compromise. We have always preferred and we still prefer, to achieve it without physical violence. We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than kill. We do not advocate violence; we advocate an end to the violence against human dignity which is now being perpetrated by the oppressors of Africa. If peaceful progress to emancipation were possible, or if changed circumstances were to make it possible in the future, we would urge our brothers in the resistance movements to use peaceful methods of struggle even at the cost of some compromise on the timing of change. But while peaceful progress is blocked by actions of those at present in power in the States of Southern Africa, we have no choice but to give to the peoples of those territories all the support of which we are capable in their struggle against their oppressors. This is why the signatory states participate in the movement for the liberation of Africa, under the aegis of the Organization of African Unity. However, the obstacle to change is not the same in all the countries of Southern Africa, and it follows therefore, that the possibility of continuing the struggle through peaceful means varies from one country to another.

13. In *Mozambique* and *Angola*, and in so-called *Portuguese Guinea*, the basic problem is not racialism but a pretence that Portugal exists in Africa. Portugal is situated in Europe; the fact that it is a dictatorship is a matter for the Portuguese to settle. But no decree of the Portuguese dictator, nor legislation passed by any Parliament in Portugal, can make Africa part of Europe. The only thing which could convert a part of Africa into a constituent unit in a union which also includes a European State would be the freely expressed will of the people of that part of Africa. There is no such popular will in the Portuguese colonies. On the contrary, in the absence of any opportunity to negotiate a road to freedom, the peoples of all three territories have taken up arms against the colonial power. They have done this despite the heavy odds against them, and despite the great suffering they know to be involved.

14. Portugal, as a European State, has naturally its own allies in the context of the ideological conflict between West and East. However, in our context, the effect of this is that Portugal is enabled to use her resources to pursue the most heinous war and degradation of man in Africa. The present Manifesto must, therefore, lay bare the fact that the inhuman commitment of Portugal in Africa and her ruthless

subjugation of the people of Mozambique, Angola and the so-called Portuguese Guinea, is not only irrelevant to the ideological conflict of power-politics, but it is also diametrically opposed to the politics, the philosophies and the doctrines practised by her Allies in the conduct of their own affairs at home. The peoples of Mozambique, Angola, and Portuguese Guinea are not interested in Communism or Capitalism; they are interested in their freedom. They are demanding any acceptance of the principles of independence on the basis of majority rule, and for many years they called for discussions on this issue. Only when their demand for talks was continually ignored did they begin to fight. Even now, if Portugal should change her polity and accept the principle of self-determination, we would urge the Liberation Movements to desist from their armed struggle and to co-operate in the mechanics of a peaceful transfer of power from Portugal to the peoples of the African territories.

15. The fact that many Portuguese citizens have immigrated to these African countries does not affect this issue. Future immigration policy will be a matter for the independent Governments when these are established. In the meantime we would urge the Liberation Movements to reiterate their statements that all those Portuguese people who have made their homes in Mozambique, Angola, or Portuguese Guinea, and who are willing to give their future loyalty to those States, will be accepted as citizens. And an independent Mozambique, Angola, or Portuguese Guinea may choose to be as friendly with Portugal as Brazil is. That would be the free choice of a free people.

16. In *Rhodesia* the situation is different in so far as the metropolitan power has acknowledged the colonial status of the territory. Unfortunately, however, it has failed to take adequate measures to reassert its authority against the minority which has seized power with the declared intention of maintaining white domination. The matter cannot rest there. Rhodesia, like the rest of Africa, must be free, and its independence must be on the basis of majority rule. If the colonial power is unwilling or unable to effect such a transfer of power to the people, then the people themselves will have no alternative but to capture it as and when they can. And Africa has no alternative but to support them. The question which remains in Rhodesia is therefore whether Britain will reassert her authority in Rhodesia and then negotiate the peaceful progress to majority rule before independence. In so far as Britain is willing to make this second commitment, Africa will co-operate in her attempts to reassert her authority. This is the method of progress which we would prefer; it would involve less suffering for all the people of Rhodesia, both black and white. But until there is some firm evidence that Britain accepts the principle of independence on the basis of majority rule and is prepared to take whatever steps are necessary to make it a reality, then Africa has no choice but to support the struggle for the people's freedom by whatever means are open.

17. Just as a settlement of the Rhodesian problem with a minimum of violence is a British responsibility, so a settlement in *South West Africa* with a minimum of violence is a United Nations responsibility. By every canon of international law, and by every precedent, South West Africa should by now have been a sovereign, independent State with a Government based on majority rule. South West Africa was a German colony until 1919, just as Tanganyika, Rwanda and Burundi, Togoland, and Cameroon were German colonies.

It was a matter of European politics that when the Mandatory System was established after Germany had been defeated, the administration of South West Africa was given to the white minority Government of South Africa, while the other ex-German colonies in Africa were put into the hand of the British, Belgian, or French Governments. After the Second World War every mandated territory except South West Africa was converted into a Trusteeship Territory and has subsequently gained independence. South Africa, on the other hand, has persistently refused to honour even the international obligation it accepted in 1919, and has increasingly applied to South West Africa the inhuman doctrines and organization of apartheid.

18. The United Nations General Assembly has ruled against this action and in 1966 terminated the Mandate under which South Africa had a legal basis for its occupation and domination of South West Africa. The General Assembly declared that the territory is now the direct responsibility of the United Nations and set up an *ad hoc* Committee to recommend practical means by which South West Africa would be administered, and the people enabled to exercise self-determination and to achieve independence.

19. Nothing could be clearer than this decision — which no permanent member of the Security Council voted against. Yet, since that time no effective measures have been taken to enforce it. South West Africa remains in the clutches of the most ruthless minority government in Africa. Its people continue to be oppressed and those who advocate even peaceful progress to independence continue to be persecuted. The world has an obligation to use its strength to enforce the decision which all the countries co-operated in making. If they do this there is hope that the change can be effected without great violence. If they fail,

then sooner or later the people of South West Africa will take the law into their own hands. The people have been patient beyond belief, but one day their patience will be exhausted. Africa, at least, will then be unable to deny their call for help.

20. *The Republic of South Africa* is itself an independent Sovereign state and a member of the United Nations. It is more highly developed and richer than any other nation in Africa. On every legal basis its internal affairs are a matter exclusively for the people of South Africa. Yet the purpose of law is people and we assert that the actions of the South African Government are such that the rest of the world has a responsibility to take some action in defence of humanity.

21. There is one thing about South African oppression which distinguishes it from other oppressive regimes. The *apartheid* policy adopted by its Government, and supported to a greater or lesser extent by almost all its white citizens, is based on a rejection of man's humanity. A position of privilege or the experience of oppression in the South African society depends on the one thing which it is beyond the power of any man to change. It depends upon a man's colour, his parentage, and his ancestors. If you are black you cannot escape this categorization; nor can you escape it if you are white. If you are a black millionaire and a brilliant political scientist, you are still subject to the pass laws and still excluded from political activity. If you are white, even protests against the system and an attempt to reject segregation, will lead you only to the segregation and the comparative comfort of a white jail. Beliefs, abilities, and behaviour are all irrelevant to a man's status; everything depends upon race. Manhood is irrelevant. The whole system of government and society in South Africa is based on the denial of human equality. And the system is maintained by a ruthless denial of the human rights of the majority of the population and thus, inevitably of all.

22. These things are known and are regularly condemned in the Councils of the United Nations and elsewhere. But it appears that to many countries international law takes precedence over humanity; therefore no action follows the words. Yet even if international law is held to exclude active assistance to the South African opponents of *apartheid* it does not demand that the comfort and support of human and commercial intercourse should be given to a government which rejects the manhood of most of humanity. South Africa should be excluded from the United Nations Agencies, and even from the United Nations itself. It should be ostracized by the world community. It should be isolated from world trade patterns and left to be self-sufficient if it can. The South African Government cannot be allowed both to reject the very concept of mankind's unity, and to benefit by the strength given through friendly international relations. And certainly Africa cannot acquiesce in the maintenance of the present policies against people of African descent.

23. The signatories of this Manifesto assert that the validity of the principles of human equality and dignity extend to the Republic of South Africa just as they extend to the colonial territories of Southern Africa. Before a basis for peaceful development can be established in this continent, these principles must be acknowledged by every nation, and in every State there must be a deliberate attempt to implement them.

24. We re-affirm our commitment to these principles of human equality and human dignity, and to the doctrines of self-determination and non-racialism. We shall work for their extension within our own nations and throughout the continent of Africa.

VIOLENCE AND THE ARMED STRUGGLE

INKATHA YOUTH BRIGADE 2ND ORDINARY CONFERENCE, ULUNDI, 24TH MARCH 1979

Violence and bloodshed have been, and are, an undeniable reality in South and Southern Africa.

It is completely unnecessary for us as blacks to quarrel over the issue of bloodshed. Bloodshed has been with us ever since the first white man set his foot on our land. Black people have never hesitated to stake their lives in defence of their heritage. Thousands of black lives have been lost over many generations. We are men amongst men, and no men worth their salt can hesitate to stake their lives whenever they are faced with a just war in defence of their heritage.

We all came from a brave stock of black people. These are men who in 1879 faced the mightiest army in the world with bare hands. The same happened in 1906. Something nearly similar happened in 1960, when peaceful demonstrators were mowed down with guns. We have watched something worse during 1976/1977 when the children's peaceful demonstration in Soweto resulted in a volley of bullets from the riot squad police. This was followed by the exchange of bullets with stones.

We are therefore living in a situation of violence all the time. The whole status quo in South Africa is structured on violence. The whole status quo in this land is maintained through violence. We have in all these years resisted this violence unarmed. Violence is therefore, not an academic issue for us at all. Violence is the very guts of the reality in which we exist in this land.

We have seen in the past few years some of our brothers in Mozambique and Angola emancipating themselves through the armed struggle. The fact that they have liberated themselves through the armed struggle has caused this whole debate on violence and non-violence to hot up even more. As soon as Mozambique and Angola were emancipated through the armed struggle, the view that only violence can be used to change the status quo here grew in credibility. The fact that we blacks have never hesitated to meet violence with violence whenever the situation demanded this of us has been forgotten in the wake of the triumph of revolutionary forces in Mozambique and Angola.

It has been argued that the Portuguese have been in these territories — Mozambique and Angola — for a good five hundred years of colonialism and yet they have been ousted now through the armed struggle. This proves, it is argued, that the white oppressor in South Africa can also be ousted very easily, having had his jackboot on our necks for a shorter period of time than the Portuguese had his on the necks of our Angolan and Mozambican brothers.

The triumph of our brothers in Mozambique and Angola has popularised the view that only the armed struggle can result in liberation. This has added a few of our brothers to swell the numbers of our brothers who have been exiled since Sharpeville. Some minor ructions resulting from this debate have been seen even within this Movement of ours in the past six months or so. This is one reason why I think we can no longer afford not to debate it in full and face up to its implications, not only just for the sake of ourselves but for the sake of the whole liberation struggle in Southern Africa. The result of all this is that in certain quarters within our black community 'negotiation' and 'peaceful change', to which we in Inkatha are committed, have almost become swear words.

I therefore cannot see how we can afford not to face up to this dichotomy at a Conference of our Youth Brigade on this last year of the seventies, 1979. This is almost 20 years after Sharpeville, when our two banned organisations, the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress decided on the armed struggle. This is three years since we heard the crackle of the last shot in Soweto.

The fact that there is an armed struggle going on in Namibia and Zimbabwe has added more fuel to the fire of this debate on whether in South Africa we should opt for violence or non-violence.

I think I must now invite you to look with me at the situation in these unfree parts of Southern Africa. It should never be forgotten by us that the West, which is now so vociferous in blaming those of us who are committed to peaceful change was responsible for the situation in which blacks find themselves in all the unliberated parts of Southern Africa.

For us in South Africa, it was Britain that abandoned us to the wiles of their former countrymen and those of the descendants of the Voortrekkers when the Union was formed in 1910, in which black people were excluded from participation in decision-making. By the Statute of Westminster Britain put the last seal to her 1910 treachery. South Africa has been built into the mighty force it is through western vested interests. That is why the West talks with both corners of their mouths when it comes to South Africa. The West condemns apartheid in one breath, and in the next breath maintains good relations and have, in fact, diplomatic ties with South Africa, and consulates in most major cities.

When the African National Congress decided to operate in exile, most western countries bluntly

refused to assist them, arguing that they were not committed to violence and would not under any circumstances support violent change in South Africa. And yet South Africa has built an arsenal of armaments with the full assistance of the West. The Western people through their mass media, visiting politicians and representatives at the United Nations buy respectability for themselves within the world community by trumpeting the view that they do not want to be seen to be supporting apartheid by giving blacks, who are fighting apartheid within this country, any assistance, — not even humanitarian aid. They claim to recognise the African National Congress as the true representative of the oppressed people and to some extent also the Pan-Africanist Congress. And yet these two organisations get hardly any assistance from most of the western countries. Russia and China have respectively assisted these organisations with arms. The Nordic countries, particularly Sweden, have given them humanitarian aid.

Rhodesia has only a population of 200 000 whites who have oppressed more than six million blacks with the connivance of western countries, Britain again having the lion's share of the blame even there. Sanctions have been advocated, but Rhodesia has survived all the sound and fury from the West on sanctions and arms embargo for the last 12 years.

I must come back to answer the question of why it has not been easy to topple the South African regime through the armed struggle which has been going on now for nearly 20 years. South Africa is the only country in Africa which has a white population of 4 million whites, who have become as indigeneous to South Africa as Americans to America, and Australians to Australia. In other words these whites have no home country any more. We do, of course, observe that the West has not played ball as far as crushing apartheid is concerned, as blood is thicker than water. But some people will say that the Portuguese in Mozambique and Angola were in those countries for 500 years, as compared with 300 years of white presence in South Africa. The difference is that the Portuguese still regarded Mozambique and Angola as colonies of Portugal, and still looked to Portugal as their mother country. The South African whites no longer have a mother country, just like Americans, Canadians and Australians.

So they are here for keeps, and in the clashes that are taking place they are prepared to fight to the bitter end. South Africa has become the best armed country in Africa; that is why they hit at military targets in independent black countries such as Angola with such impunity. The Lusaka Manifesto recognised that South African whites were no longer regarded by frontline states as just settlers, a view that was endorsed by the Organisation of African Unity, when it adopted the Lusaka Manifesto as an OAU document.

Quite apart from our philosophy of non-violence, at the moment it is not even a practical consideration to challenge South Africa militarily. Only two years ago H. E. President Julius Nyerere conceded to me, and also in a Time Magazine article, that at present there is no country in Africa or even a combination of African countries, which can challenge South Africa militarily. This is just a bitter truth. When the former Prime Minister Mr B. J. Vorster stated a few years ago that South Africa could lick up Zambia before breakfast, this again was a bitter truth. That is why South Africa uses Angola these days as her playground for military exercises, ostensibly on the hot pursuit principle.

This is also an exercise in flaunting her military strength. She knows that for the moment no African country can challenge her militarily. No neighbouring African State so far is prepared to allow its territory to be used as a base for launching military attacks on South Africa, let alone the West. Forget the West completely as far as that is concerned.

Those of us who are committed to peaceful change accept that despite her military might South Africa is still vulnerable. She is vulnerable because the majority of black people who are rejected as fellow citizens by white South Africa will never be prepared to die in defence of South Africa. This is not because black South Africans are not prepared, like all good patriots, to die for their country. This is because no true black patriot is prepared to die in defence of apartheid society. This brings you as youth face to face with a great dilemma. At present the South African Defence Force has launched a big recruitment campaign amongst blacks. Unlike in the past, they now want blacks to fight and die with them in defence of apartheid society. The KwaZulu Government has stated to the defence authorities that we are not prepared to assist defence in anyway to recruit Zulus into the South African army. We have stated clearly that if we did so, our people would think that we were implying that they must go and die in defence of apartheid and also for foreign status which Pretoria is busy foisting on blacks on the basis of the so-called independence à la Pretoria. I repeated this view to the Prime Minister in our discussion on the 22 January this year. We have at the same time stated that we have no legal right to say to those blacks who wish to join the army that they must not do so. This is a decision of each and every individual who is confronted with this issue.

So even from a pragmatic point of view we cannot see how blacks can pull off violence with all the forces arrayed against them. But we do not mean that the existence of guerillas as such serves no purpose

in the liberation struggle. Just as our policy is that of working for peaceful change, we have not stopped anyone who feels that he or she will serve the cause of black liberation by skipping the country and joining the armed struggle. Ian Smith could never have gone for an internal settlement if it was not for black guerillas.

I recall that there are those amongst you who never quite like it when I make an analysis of this sort. At the Youth camp, this view was expressed through a question, when I detailed the extent of white militarisation. This question was whether by this analysis of white military strength I was frightening my audience. I am not at all doing so. I do not even believe that whites are invincible in this struggle, inspite of their military strength. Military strength is not everything.

If it were so I would not be doing all the things I am doing every hour of the day in the cause of the black liberation struggle.

I have already indicated that it may well be that ultimately we will face a violent confrontation in South Africa in the form of a race war. But this war has not yet materialised to the extent to which it is seen in Zimbabwe. I do believe that we dare not abandon what we are doing in this struggle merely because we accept the inevitability of a full scale race war some day.

I realise that the struggle we face is still going to be hard and long. I believe that we have quite an enormous task before us. That task is to do all we can to get white South Africa to go to the Conference table with blacks before it is too late. We should perform that task in such a way that if and when a race war takes place, none of us alive today should be unable to say that he or she did his best to prevent such a destructive holocaust. We should also be so dedicated in all the things we do to bring about meaningful change that if and when that holocaust overtakes us, our efforts now should be such that they should minimise the scale of the destruction that will result from such a race war.

There is nothing wrong with debates on the methods we wish to use to liberate ourselves. Such differences however should never be allowed to develop into black internicine strifes. We have seen civil wars in some parts of Southern Africa. Such black civil wars if they ever erupt here will result in more self-lacerating destructive conflict between us. That is why I have warned over and over again that black solidarity is the key in our liberation struggle. The more we indulge in acrimonious recriminations, the more we are building foundations for such a civil conflict in which all blacks will be the losers.

VIOLENCE AND THE ARMED STRUGGLE

YOUTH LEADERSHIP TRAINING COURSE, MAHLABATINI, 27TH JUNE 1978

Even though Inkatha understands the impatience of youth and the fact that others had no option but to choose the armed struggle, the Movement believes that constituency politics and the mobilisation of people will bring about change. White South Africa's defence and security measures indicate that she is being prepared for the gathering storm.

We realise that we have almost reached the eleventh hour, which means we may in fact not be far from that threshold when the weight of violence and armed struggle will be greater than the weight of democratic opposition. But before that happens, it is sheer stupidity to suggest that we should abandon the democratic opposition which, stripped of trappings, means the mobilisation of our people before the final battle takes place. I think it is wise to continue this democratic opposition in South Africa for as long as possible.

This struggle did not begin just when we were born. It is a struggle which our people have fought physically for decades, and although there are many battles they lost, blacks cannot lose this war for their human rights. This struggle must continue. By continuing the struggle we mean doing all in our power to crush apartheid, and making certain that we will not give our oppressors a chance to eliminate most of us with bullets before we reach the winning post. This struggle must continue this year, and next year and the year after, to the best of our abilities within the reality of what is possible. The racist regime has not left members of Inkatha untouched. There has been harassment. There are informers in this very tent.

These are people who have been sent here to listen to what you discuss and to all our discussions. There are also agents-provocateurs, who are planted by the regime amongst you. There are many people who will talk blood and thunder during this course in an attempt to break down our Inkatha strategy to make it easier for the racist regime to take steps against us. About this you should not be fooled. I have been in the struggle for many decades.

Be aware of people who talk glib of violence and actions. This is very often the language of the agents of the Secret Police who are baiting you into putting one foot wrong to make the task of eliminating Inkatha easier for the regime.

I think I have a duty to warn you as our youth to be careful, and to make a distinction between real bravery, and foolish bravado. We all admire and praise our brothers and sisters who died in jail. But we have to admit that although their deaths were not in vain, we have achieved very little by their supreme sacrifices. We therefore cannot pursue this as a deliberate strategy.

I must warn our youth against purveyors of quick solutions, and instant remedies for our South African body politic. These people are dangerous to our struggle in that they breed false hopes within our community. Apart from the agents, there are those who adopt this attitude as a result of the frustrations we are all subjected to. We must be aware all the time of the fact that frustrations have a tendency to cloud the mind. That is why when some people are jilted by their lovers they will sometimes because of resultant frustrations act on the spur of the moment and commit suicide. Frustrations also have a tendency of rendering impotent the leadership. These are danger signs about which I must warn you most seriously.

There will be uprisings similar to Soweto in South Africa even in future. There will be uprisings in South Africa similar to the 1973 strikes by black workers in Durban. These are inevitable in an explosive situation such as we are in, in South Africa. But you must understand quite clearly that a series of revolts do not amount to revolution . . . I accept that some of you will find the gravity of runaway violence irresistible. I am on record as having said that I quite appreciate that my brothers who are involved in the armed struggle had no option, since their organisations were banned, and once they were out of this country. While my stance is non-violence, I think it would in the circumstances be presumptuous for me to judge them for their strategy of violence. At the same time, I expect those who have adopted the stance of violence to appreciate that I cannot abandon my strategy of non-violence just because their Hobson's choice has prescribed violence for them as the method of bringing about change.

I cannot see us bringing about change by going on the rampage. I cannot see us bringing about fundamental changes by sporadic and uncoordinated acts of counter-violence. That is why to me constituency politics, and mobilisation of people is a necessary preparation, regardless of which of the two stances one pursues. Our people fought wars and they prepared themselves for such wars. That is why those who have chosen the armed struggle go to other countries to train for it. We should not commit suicide by thinking that the match-stick and the stone are a match for saracens and machine guns.

For those who are overwhelmed by our frustrations to the extent that they see no other way as a solution

except war, let me remind them of a few sobering thoughts. White South Africa is at present the best armed country in Africa. Last year in my discussions with President Nyerere, he told me that at the moment there was no African country or a combination of African countries which can take on South Africa militarily. That is why I said recently that there are many White South Africans whose fingers are literally itching to mow our people with guns. We should not play into their hands. If there are any who doubt this, let me remind you of what happened to our children who were demonstrating peacefully in Soweto on the 16th June 1976. Just look with me at an article by the Financial Mail dated 23 June, 1978:

The March of Militarism

'A bakery in central Johannesburg displays in its window a birthday cake in the shape of an army tank. A few blocks away a toy shop reports that sales of 'war games,' bearing names like Attack on Moscow, have jumped fivefold in the past year. A recent Defence Force appeal to the public to give dogs to the army for border-patrol duty elicited more than 200 offers.

Psychologically, and in practice, SA is being prepared for the gathering storm. Gone are the heady days of détente and the outward-looking policy. In their stead, world hostility to apartheid is mounting ineluctably. With the days of minority rule in Rhodesia and South West Africa rapidly drawing to a close, SA is now digging in for the White Man's Last Stand — defiantly, tragically suicidally.

The surge in defence spending — from less than R500m five years ago to R1 500m in 1978/79 — has provided the means for Pretoria to expand its military machine and to rake a growing number of businessmen, students, housewives, and even school children into the war effort.

Our rulers' control of radio and television has enabled them not only to step up programmes beamed into our homes, but also to make sure we get the kind of news they think we ought to hear.

The military has become one of SA's biggest employers. Nearly 60 000 civilians were called up for military duty in 1977, while applications to join the permanent force have leapt by 80% in the past three years. In the first two weeks of January, 1 000 people applied, compared with 6 900 recruits during the whole of 1976 and 8 000 last year. Armscor and its subsidiaries employ over 13 000 workers.

The whites joining up are not only men. Since the army women's college opened in George seven years ago, about 150 girls a year have been trained there. In January last year the annual intake was more than trebled to 500. And this year, for the first time, women have registered at the military academy at Saldanha Bay.

Although women are not yet in the fighting forces, they do many jobs that used to be only for men — parade-ground instructors and signallers, for instance.

More disturbing is the increasing militarisation of schools. Defence Minister P. W. Botha declared last year that the number of school cadets would be doubled from the existing 150 000.

Cadet groups are being affiliated to permanent and citizen force regiments. Many boys already undergo cadet training during school holidays, and there is talk of further improving cadets' "preparedness" by sending them on "adventure camps".

Likewise, to brush up the skills of their instructors, it was announced last month that young teachers are to be called up annually in the January holidays for training as commando officers.

Increasing numbers of blacks (coloured people, Indians and Africans) are also falling in, partly no doubt because of fewer openings in commerce and industry. Blacks make up 15%-20% of the forces on the SWA border. Compulsory military service for coloured youths and men is envisaged within five years, and the SADF also plans a big recruiting drive among Africans.

As the number of soldiers, sailors and airmen grows, so they are becoming a more and more visible class of their own, treated differently in many ways from the rest of the population.

Fighting Citizens

At least one newspaper now publishes weekly "forces news" supplements. Radio request programmes for the men in uniform take up almost seven hours of broadcasting time each week, compared with just one hour a few years back.

National servicemen are now generally indemnified by law against being sued for debt during their spell in uniform. Johannesburg offers soldiers free use of public transport, while many hotels give special discounts to wounded men and their families.

"Operation Safe Ride", a plan to make hitchhiking safer for soldiers, is getting into gear. Motorists will be indemnified against claims by military passengers; servicemen will be provided with special accident cover; and plans are afoot to build special pick-up points along routes from army camps.

The mushrooming of the security forces is one side of the coin. The other is the growing involvement of civilians in the war effort.

"There has been an upsurge in public interest in civil defence," notes civil defence director Brigadier

Chris Muller. Last December there were 664 civil defence organisations throughout the country. Now there are 692. Muller points out that local authorities are compelled to form civil defence units, whereas this was voluntary in the past. "More private sector organisations approach us to speak at symposiums and conferences," he adds.

People are also dipping deeper into their pockets to help the defence effort. The Southern Cross Fund, which gives financial assistance to needy dependants of servicemen and sends comforts to the men on the border, has raised R5m since its creation 10 years ago. Over R3m has been collected in the past three years.

The fund has 250 branches, all staffed by volunteers. Recent response to its fund-raising efforts has been "Absolutely fantastic", according to national secretary Audrey van Vuuren. Referring to the fund's one Indian and two coloured branches, she asserts that support comes "from all races and religions".

Then there are the defence bonds. National defence bonds, launched in July 1976, have scooped in a whopping R240m so far. Businesses, universities, municipalities, sports clubs, and individuals have all invested sizeable sums.

Defence bonus bond sales are also gathering steam after a slow start last October. Purchases to April 30th totalled R33,6m . . . A big publicity drive is about to be launched.

Perhaps the most alarming manifestation of SA's growing concern with defence and security is the boom in gun sales. Up to the end of last year, 723 529 South Africans were licensed to own firearms. Of these, almost 150 000 were registered in 1977.

And John Immelman, manager of a toy shop in Johannesburg reports "a strong demand" for toy machine-guns and model tanks and helicopters. Many of the children buying them will no doubt want the real thing when they're older.

But against whom is SA arming itself? If some of the propagandists are to be believed, we'd have no problems if only Jimmy Carter would chuck the Russians and the Cubans out of Africa. In their heart of hearts, most whites know better: the opinion survey prepared for the conference in Freiburg, West Germany, last week, found that 65% of them feared there might ultimately be a black insurrection in SA.

Are we then arming ourselves against the day when we might be fighting our own people on the border?

This does not mean that Whites of South Africa are invincible. But we must be careful in our plans for a strategy that will lead to the liberation of South Africa. I do not mean that violence will not escalate. It is inevitable that violence will in fact escalate. But I think we still have a duty to do all we can to minimise the scale of the violence which we face every day as Blacks, the people at the receiving end. We have a responsibility to ensure that if not us, then future generations of Blacks must be alive to enjoy the freedom we are battling to win in South Africa.

I want to be frank. Inkatha has no intention of changing its strategy to accommodate the frustrations and ambitions of fools and rabble-rousers who carry on rabble-rousing and who display the false bravado even when it leads to deaths of other innocent souls other than themselves.

Inkatha's greatest strength is its discipline. We intend to strengthen the development of that discipline, because it is that discipline which will play a key role in the struggle, regardless of in which direction it ultimately develops. Inkatha is not an amorphous body in which a motley of ambitious people, each one of whom wants to do his own thing, can find a political home. We jealously guard our strategy because we are aware all the time of possible infiltrations by those who may want to get into Inkatha with the hope of manipulating us into other strategies than the one we have chosen. Those who do not think as we do, have no reason to remain in Inkatha. If they are uncomfortable and feel strait-jacketed by our strategy, let them seek other strategies of their liking in those organisations, which pursue those strategies, here and abroad.

I am a leader of my organisation on the basis of the democratic principle of persuasion. I have presented my philosophy to the black public of South Africa. Those who accept it, then join the movement I lead, because they prescribe to our philosophy and to the constitution of the movement. That is the contract on the basis of which membership of the movement takes place. We are not a monolith; we will talk and debate issues and differ. All these things however have to take place within the four corners of our constitution and philosophy of non-violence. That is the beauty of the democratic principle. People join on their own volition. They can cease to be members when they no longer want to continue their membership. Inkatha has no place for pressure groups. We do not operate on the basis of dragooning anyone to a point of view, but on the basis of the democratic principle of persuasion and of one's point of view being accepted by others of their own free will.

Black South Africa will not be inactive if whites start shooting at blacks in a race war situation; and Africans must appreciate that the world does not consist of black angels and white devils.

The best thing that can possibly happen is if we, as black and white South Africans resolve our problems ourselves within South Africa. If there are any pressures that need to be exerted on us, they should be aimed at forcing us as South Africans to get around the conference table. The white people who want to go on a shooting spree of blacks are inviting other parties to the fray. I must warn that black Africa will not fold arms and be spectators if and when unarmed blacks are shot at by whites as if they were just vermin. What is more, black Africa has indicated this clearly, if one is to judge by remarks from a press interview President Nyerere gave to Lee Griggs of 'Time Magazine', in March. I read the interview on the 8th of March 1977 in 'The Daily News' of DAR ES SALAAM, when I stopped there to see the President in March this year. I quote from this interview:

Lee Griggs: If in fact there should in future be a Cuban involvement in the Rhodesian struggle, do you mean to say that you would support this involvement just as you would oppose the West arming South Africa?

Mwalimu (President Nyerere): I say if there is South African involvement in that war we have the right to ask for support from anywhere else. The West is arming South Africa and if the West is arming South Africa in order to prevent Southern Africa becoming free, then we shall also seek support from anywhere, from bigger powers than Cuba even.'

Although the discussion of a possible conventional war here was done within the context of the Zimbabwean situation, it is clear that this applies equally to a race war situation, if and when it develops here. So that the whites whose fingers are itching for their triggers to shoot blacks must think very deeply about the consequences of such actions. No one will gain anything, least of all we South Africans of whatever shade.

ANGLO-ZULU WAR CENTENARY 1879-1979, ULUNDI, 26TH MAY 1979

Parents have sons fighting on both sides of the border who do not want to see their children die either for apartheid or to see them live through another generation of iniquity.

I am particularly aware that many brave sons of our soil are beyond our borders in military camps training to kill. I am aware that in those who remain, there is on the one hand an underlying deep anger and a refusal to fight and die for an apartheid system. We are all impassioned people who are preparing to die with sons who may now be on both sides of the border. Young husbands, young fathers, young lovers, have steel in their hands there, and I think we must remember that the coldness of steel drives out the warmth in human hearts. White and black youth has been mobilised and trained to fight. The spectres of evil forces are increasingly displayed for whites in newspapers and television screens. South Africa is becoming increasingly polarised and we have had convincing demonstrations of the impatience of black youth. Their presence on the other side of the border speaks for itself. We do not as parents want our children to die either in the defence of apartheid, or to see them live through another generation in iniquity in our social, political and economic systems. We do not want to see a young generation of our countrymen trained as animals of war. When youth, both black and white, have learnt to solve problems through violence, the chances are great that violence will continue to contaminate society beyond the need for its presence.

ANGLO-ZULU WAR CENTENARY 1879-1979, ULUNDI, 26TH MAY 1979

The same issues and options are being faced today as those that the Zulus faced 100 years ago.

Those of us who are South Africans of Zulu extraction have got a vital historical role to play for every member of every community in this country. Our role is today as vital as it was one hundred years ago. We are facing the same issues and we are facing the same options. Apartheid started with the colonial division of South Africa. Had we submitted to the exploitative intention of Britain a hundred years ago and surrendered the heart of our land we love so much to others, there would have been no Anglo-Zulu War. In the length and breadth of South Africa in all its history, no section of the population fought us valiantly and struggled so determinedly as we did to avoid political, economic and social enslavement. We are proud of the determination of our forefathers, and that determination lives in us still today. We lost most of our land and were left with these bits and pieces which white arrogance chose first to label as 'Reserves' and now 'Homelands' or 'Bantustans'. I would like to repeat again that the throwing around of these derogatory terms to describe what remained in our hands after we were conquered in a war, by both the white right wing and the left wing, tends to mask this brave history of black resistance put up by our people. It is because of that resistance that we stand tall today, because although they were conquered through superior arms, this did not mask their bravery in facing the mightiest army in the world with virtually their bare hands.

INKATHA GENERAL CONFERENCE, ULUNDI, 14TH JULY 1977

Though Blacks will yet have to endure greater suffering, the liberation of South Africa will be achieved.

Hear me when I say that for us the liberation of South Africa is assured. Hear me when I say our children and their children will know a new South Africa. This knowledge, this sure knowledge for us in Inkatha, is a source of great courage and a source of steadfast determination. In struggling for liberation we believe in the rightness of what we are doing and we believe in the eventual outcome of what we are doing.

But you must also hear me, and you must hear me with your hearts and with your minds and with your strength, that between now and the final victory, there is a dark road we have to walk and there is a great deal more suffering we yet have to endure, and there will be many burdens yet to be picked up and carried with courage. I say this because I have grave fears that before the whites can embrace us in brotherhood they will walk the valley of fear and death. Yes, we are still heading for that dark valley where there will be a lot of crying and gnashing of teeth.

ANGLO-ZULU WAR CENTENARY 1879-1979, ULUNDI, 26TH MAY 1979

The Struggle for liberation is a struggle for all mankind.

Let me pause here and dwell on the concept of liberation and that which gives our struggle for liberation life and death issues. White South Africa as yet does not recognise that we are struggling for liberation. They must close their eyes to that principle because if they open them, they will see their dirtied and bloodied hands. There is no other word I can use. We do struggle for our liberation. It is a struggle and we are *not* liberated. Every black man knows what I mean when I mention the struggle.

I object in the strongest possible terms when a white board of censors says that the term 'struggle for liberation' is communistically inspired, serving the interests of forces of destruction beyond our borders. The struggle for liberation is the most meaningful thing in this country for black and white alike, and the struggle is born in everlasting values dearer than life. That struggle has a social purity in our national life. That struggle is shaping the minds and souls of people who take their place in a new society where all shall be free, all shall be equal. The black struggle for liberation in this country nurtures civilised values.

I will continue calling it by that name. I will encourage that concept to grow in the hearts and minds of my people, I will continue to appeal to the international community I now address to identify with the emergence in this corner of the world of the values of which all men can be proud.

Our struggle for liberation is a struggle for all mankind. The fruits of our struggle cannot be bought cheaply with empty sentiments and high sounding resolutions. We know here in this country that nobody can fight our battles for us. We do not want to ride on the backs of other people's resolutions and commitment to high ideals. The struggle for liberation is something which the people themselves must conduct. We must suffer for it and strive for it. Nobody else can do this for us. But this does not mean that

we need no man. We struggle in the context of Southern Africa, Africa and the international community. The forces ranged against darkness must focus here on our soil.

DIOCESAN CONFERENCE, NATAL, 8TH OCTOBER 1977

The real issues to be faced are not reformist in nature but are revolutionary; they are people issues and not institutional issues.

The real questions facing us are not how to preserve a South African way of life as it has evolved up to the present point. The real issues facing South Africa relate rather to a people's force at work demanding the demolition of the instruments of injustice and oppression.

One has only to look at the instability of the South African situation to realise that we in South Africa have built into our society forces which will tear it apart. The real issues we face are revolutionary issues and not reformist issues. The instability of our society at all levels precludes the possibility of our South African way of life enduring in perpetuity. Indeed, it precludes its continuation even through the foreseeable future. The outward stability to which government spokesmen have up to recently referred to is made possible only by the fact that the torture of prisoners takes place behind closed walls where no eyes see, and by the intimidation of people in their daily walks of life which is an almost secret thing; and the fact that blacks have participated seemingly willingly in the most abhorrent of discriminatory practices in the economy, designed to protect the privileges of our white minority.

People go to jail at the point of a gun and they remain there because the doors are locked; and people go to work because they are at the point of starvation and they remain there because there is nothing else for them to do.

The fact that we have in South Africa what is in all probability an unparalleled range of discriminatory social practices and the most formidable range of oppressive laws, orchestrated by an administration which is jack-boot in its nature, accounts for the on-going way of life in South Africa.

The basis of our society in South Africa is not of God, and this very pertinent fact adds in a very particular way to the instability of that which is around us. Justice and truth are in a very real sense the allies of the poor and the oppressed. The privileged in this country can only fight for their privileges which are bought by a great deal of suffering on the part of the under-privileged. The defence of those privileges against the just claims of the underprivileged is not of God.

The real issues of South Africa are people issues and not institutional issues. The poor and oppressed in South Africa have awakened to be a force of change which is irresistible and which will continue mounting up pressure that must and will break through the barriers of change. The poor and oppressed are very well aware of this fact. They have a consciousness of themselves as people whose ultimate destiny is in their own hands. Black consciousness is in part this — an awareness of being men and women enough to control their own destinies.

There is in the poor and oppressed two diametrically opposed dimensions. The one is a destructive anger where men search to put a stone in their hand or a gun in their hand, or where they search for the match, participate in the mob and are indiscriminate in their anger. The other dimension is of togetherness. The human experience which is giving rise to the phenomenon of an emerging communalism has in its dimension a new set of attitudes and values in the making which put the spiritual and the human above the material.

If I had to enumerate the one issue which we were facing that was more important than all other issues, it is the issue of whether or not anger and violence will prevail over humility and the spirit of communalism.

NQUTHU, 20TH AUGUST 1977

Joining Inkatha means a readiness to accept hardships and to make sacrifices.

Inkatha is not a bed of roses. Joining Inkatha in fact is choosing a bed of thorns. Know from today that you can never rest until that day of freedom dawns. If we can sacrifice even to bring this about, we should be satisfied. We must know that not all of us will see that day. Moses of the Old Testament who did so much to persuade Pharaoh to let his people go, did not reach Canaan. Yet who can say that his labours were in vain?

Even if we in Inkatha are committed to non-violence, we know that the liberation struggle, even through non-violence, means being engaged in some bloodless war of liberation. This entails hardship and

sacrifices.

It is easy to shut one's mouth and go about one's job and enjoy a quiet life with one's family than to nail one's colours to the mast. Joining Inkatha is the same as announcing: 'There I am; come and face me, for I am determined to fight this battle against you until my people are free.' Our political enemies have a lot of money. They are armed to the teeth. They have jails. They ban people. They jail people, and people they detain 'commit' phony suicides. In the case of the late Joseph Mdluli even Judges of the Supreme Court have admitted that he does not appear to have committed suicide. These are all very ugly things. All these are terrifying things. All or some of these things are things you must expect to happen to you if you are loyal to our cause. This is what the struggle is about.

It is no use thinking that when we have been together at such rallies as this one, and we have shouted: 'Amandla Ngawethu' together that we have discharged our duties as members of Inkatha. Being a member of Inkatha means that you are challenging the status quo whatever the cost may be. It means that you accept that you may even be killed for what you stand for.

INKATHA YOUTH BRIGADE TRAINING COURSE. MAHLABATINI, 5TH JULY, 1977

The youth are to be greatly thanked for their peaceful resistance during 1966 and 1967, despite great provocation; and all must remember those who have sacrificed their lives in the struggle for liberation.

I will be failing in my duty if I did not take this opportunity to thank the youth for managing to maintain a balance, despite the political traumas of 1976 and 1977. I am proud of your commitment to the struggle for liberation. I have nothing but praise for you for identifying yourselves with the peaceful resistance of our youth in the Transvaal against police onslaughts. I know that you fully identified yourselves with their peaceful struggle. The fact that you did not resort to acts of arson, except for the University of Zululand incident, does not mean that you did not identify with our brothers and sisters in that struggle. I know just what kind of pressures you were subjected to in attempts to persuade you to indulge in acts of violence. I know how many pressures you are under even at this moment to do so. I know how some fire-eaters amongst our loquacious self-acclaimed revolutionaries denigrate you.

Our people have suffered a lot as a result of the unrest. Hundreds of our people lost their lives. We owe them a debt to struggle for all the things for which they lost their lives. This is one of the tragic phases of our struggle. It is one of a series which began in the last century. Just like Sharpeville in 1960, the callous murders of our people in the Transvaal, Western Cape, and Eastern Cape in 1976 mark yet another phase in our struggle.

Lest we lose our perspectives we must remember that our people participated in the so-called 'Kaffir Wars' in the Cape in the last century. Lest we forget, we must remember the Zulu War of 1879. Lest we forget we must remember the resistance put up by King Moshoeshoe of Lesotho, and the resistance put up by King Cetshwayo and King Dinzululu, and all our people who formed the regiments that fought those wars, and many others. These things are known to most of you. But unless we want to risk losing our perspectives we must keep reminding ourselves of these sacrifices which amount to thousands of lives lost in the struggle. We should never forget the last armed struggle in South Africa led by Chief Bambata Zondi in this province, which cost King Dinuzulu his second banishment, and known in history books as the Bambata Rebellion of 1906.

Let us keep in mind the efforts of the founding fathers of the African National Congress and of their successors. These struggles cannot be said to have been in vain merely because we are up to now still a bonded people. We can never resign ourselves to this form of bondage.

All our efforts to liberate ourselves must be seen as a continuation of a long and bitter struggle. We must at all times remember that the struggle is not beginning with us today. We must never delude ourselves into thinking that our people have not tried hard enough to remove this yoke of oppression.

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND, 8TH MAY 1976

Brothers in a family stand together for their own good and while the struggle for liberation is being waged, there is much to do before that goal is reached in the knowledge that the destruction of apartheid alone will not ensure the emergence of a just society.

I would like to add the wisdom of one of our greatest leaders on the continent of Africa on the issue of fratricidal conflicts. Talking at a banquet in the Ivory Coast on the 26th February 1968, His Excellency, Dr Julius Nyerere, the President of Tanzania had the following to say:

'To be a member of a tribe does not automatically mean hostility to the nation of which one is a sovereign nation in Africa and does not preclude a loyalty to Africa and its growing unity. . . . Brothers in a family stand together for their common good, in preference to working with outsiders, when a choice has to be made between the two. In cases of conflict with other members of the society, brothers stand together. And when there are family quarrels they settle them among themselves, fiercely resenting the intervention of others'.

Our position is most difficult as far as what a University education can do for our struggle for liberation, both before liberation, and after. In this connection, I wish to quote one of the greatest African political scientists the late Frantz Fanon who in his celebrated work states:

'The mobilization of the masses when it arises out of the war of liberation, introduces into each man's consciousness the ideas of a common cause, of a national destiny and a collective history. In the same way the second phase, that of building-up of the nation, is helped on by the existence of this cement which has been mixed with blood and anger. Thus we come to a fuller appreciation of the originality of the words used in these underdeveloped countries. During the colonial period the people are called upon to fight against poverty, illiteracy and underdevelopment. The struggle they say goes on. The people realize that life is an unending contest'.

We Blacks in the South African situation are placed in a very invidious position by our peculiar circumstances. We are in the last bastion of white supremacy, and we represent a part of Africa which is yet unliberated. We have to struggle for our liberation and at the same time we cannot postpone tackling now some of the problems of our post liberation era when it does eventually arrive, as it will certainly do. We cannot confine our struggle only to rhetoric and acts of activism. We cannot divorce ourselves from our people who, even if unliberated, are struggling with problems of poverty, illiteracy and underdevelopment. Let me stress on this day once again that it would be extremely naive of us to believe that the mere destruction of the apartheid system would in itself ensure the emergence of a just society. Even when that day which we are all awaiting arrives, when skin colour will cease to be a determinant of one's future and one's station in life, we can not guarantee now that a radical distribution of wealth, power and opportunity will take place in South Africa within a meaningfully short period of time. For example, the gap between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' might even widen. We cannot project now that the productive capacity of the land and its industries could easily keep pace with a population which is growing with a predictable rate. So that whatever we do now with our people in all their circumstances, should be the very life-blood of our new society in South Africa. If, for instance, in our democratic opposition we merely succeeded in giving a few blacks the opportunity to join the few whites in their exploitation of the masses, we could hardly call this a real liberation of a people. Democratic opposition has of necessity to challenge an existing way of life, an existing direction in social, economic and political development with demands for a better way of life and a new social direction. It is quite clear that where a nation controls its own university education, its universities should spear-head the various developments mentioned here, and do a major job in the orientation of university graduates for their role in the development of themselves and their people.

WINDHOEK, 25TH SEPTEMBER 1976

The experience of the African National Congress of their constitutional rejection was only part of a wider rejection, which forced them to abandon their democratic struggle. Blacks still now have no faith in the ability of whites to make political concessions.

While we blacks have not been involved in the whites-only democratic process, we have been its objects. We have been held on bondage by that process. We no longer aspire to participate in a process which we see as an élitist system protecting élitist interests.

One has only to examine the thinking within the African National Congress in South Africa as it changed over the decades to find proof of what I am saying.

At the inception of the ANC, the vital issue was the British betrayal of the blacks of South Africa in their acceptance of the Act of Union. This Act excluded the majority of the inhabitants of the country from involvement in the government of the newly founded Union.

During the 1910's and 1920's, the ANC persistently knocked at the whites-only democratic door. They sought the opportunity to participate in White men's politics in order to prove that they were capable of doing so. Those in the forefront were the educated élitists who were prepared to accept a qualified franchise to give the black men and women of South Africa the opportunity of limited participation in

municipal provincial and national politics. I am here stating just the history of the African and should not be interpreted as judgemental on how these leaders went about their political business then.

They were, of course, not afforded this opportunity. Instead, they witnessed the continuing erosion of the limited rights provided within the Cape liberal tradition.

Their experience also taught them over the decades that their constitutional rejection was only part of their wider rejection.

Black workers sought to identify with white workers in the trade union movement. They found, however, that their 'poor-white' colleagues were embarrassed by them, and even in the Labour Party and the Communist Party they found white vested interests dominating over their own interests.

The experience of black men over many decades has taught them the bitter lesson that there is no point in seeking acceptance in white institutions and organisations.

During the 1950's the ANC turned its back finally on attempts to gain limited entry into white institutional life.

For a brief period, the ANC did, however, continue to struggle democratically for black political involvement. That brief phase was terminated by the successive actions of first the Smuts Government and then the Malan Government, and subsequent Nationale Party governments.

Democratic opposition was rewarded with jail sentences, baton blows and dog bites. Finally the ANC was declared a prohibited organisation and a significant part of the struggle for liberation was forced underground.

Blacks at large, however, continued their democratic struggle. The visible struggle on the part of blacks has not been inconsiderable. Many have died because of their involvement; hundreds have suffered the imposition of banning orders and thousands have been jailed.

The collective experience of the black man within status quo politics has taught him that political systems stage-managed by elitism cannot be made to serve the interests of down-trodden masses.

I confidently predict that we blacks will yet be seen to have finally turned our backs on the kind of political system which has produced this collective experience.

The multi-party system of government which makes possible domination by elitist elements, I think is rejected by the majority of blacks in South Africa. They have suffered too much within the system for them to retain any confidence in it.

Not only is the possibility of the Westminster model surviving black acquisition of formal political power precluded by black experience, it is also precluded on the grounds of political realism.

The only way in which the system could be presented seductively would be for whites to prorogue parliament and only reconvene it after a free election based on universal adult suffrage.

This degree of political sanity is only mentioned in seminar environments such as this. There is absolutely no evidence that the whites in South Africa entertain this as one of their political options.

Whites may yet attempt to make political concessions but they are likely to be of such a nature that they will be totally unacceptable. We blacks see whites as politically pathetic as we watch them struggle to open theatre doors and take down whites-only signs on park benches. What hope is there in this pathetic behaviour for meaningful inclusion of blacks in the government of our country?

INKATHA GENERAL CONFERENCE, ULUNDI, JULY 1977

There is a long tradition of struggle against oppression and we are aware that it was the South African government who threw down the gauntlet when they banned the African National Congress.

You represent today the biggest ever black constituency that has emerged in South Africa. The loyalty of you in Inkatha to the aims of Inkatha is assured by the fact that Inkatha is a collective personalisation of the traditional struggle against apartheid. We are aware that the struggle against oppression began over a century ago. We are aware of the many who died in that struggle. We have in Inkatha a long tradition of struggling against oppression and we in Inkatha will never cede victory to the evil powers of oppression. We have a collective wisdom born out of more than a century of struggling against oppression, and the agonising experience of those who died and were jailed because they opposed oppression and colonialism, lives in our spirit. It is infused into the very fibre of our beings.

We have never been ashamed of our exiled brothers and sisters and we mourn for our banned organisations. I have repeatedly stated, both within the country and beyond its borders, that the South African government threw down a gauntlet when they banned the African National Congress. It is illegal to further the interests of the ANC but no law, no pressure, no injunctions, no harassment, no torture, no bribery will ever stop the blacks of South Africa picking up the gauntlet which was thrown down when the

African National Congress was banned. That gauntlet was not thrown down to the ANC so much as it was thrown down to the whole of black South Africa. We are men enough to pick up that gauntlet. We will respond to that challenge. We will carry on the struggle. Nothing will deter us ever.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE, AFRICAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AFRICA, DURBAN, 17TH JANUARY 1979

We will not be fulfilled as a people unless we identify with people at all levels.

In all these things it is quite clear that our complete identification with our own people at all levels, and in all their circumstances, is an absolute priority. The days are gone when intellectuals imagined that they could by themselves pull off black liberation, without joining their efforts with those of the ordinary workers, and those of the ordinary peasants. This is of course not peculiar to us as you can see from the following excerpt from one of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's writings. Speaking about his own youth Chairman Mao stated in 1942:

'I began life as a student and at school acquired the ways of a student; I then used to feel it undignified to do even a little manual labour, such as carrying my own luggage in the presence of my fellow students, who were incapable of carrying anything either on their shoulder or in their hands. At that time I felt that intellectuals were the only clean people in the World, while in comparison workers and peasants were dirty. I did not mind wearing the clothes of other intellectuals, believing them clean, but I would not put on clothes belonging to a worker or peasant believing them dirty. But after I became a revolutionary and lived with workers and peasants and with soldiers of the revolutionary army, I gradually came to know them well, and they gradually came to know me well too. It was then, and only then, that I fundamentally changed the bourgeois and petty bourgeois feelings implanted in me in the bourgeois schools. I came to feel that compared with the workers and peasants the unremoulded intellectuals were not clean and that in the last analysis, the workers and peasants were the cleanest people and, even though their hands were soiled and their feet smeared with cow-dung, they were really cleaner than the bourgeois and petty bourgeois intellectuals.'

I cannot see us getting off the ground in our struggle for fulfillment as a people, unless we learn to identify with our people at all levels. I cannot see us succeeding in our struggle unless we learn to respect the dignity of our people particularly those who are less fortunate than ourselves.

Our culture must be interpreted as we know and understand it, and not as others see it.

In Inkatha we see self-help and self-reliance as the twin pillars of our development as we struggle for self-fulfillment. Culture is an important vehicle in all this. Not our culture as interpreted by others, but our culture as only we ourselves know and understand it. At last year's Seminar in Maputo, the Rector of the Eduardo Mondlane University, Fernando Ganhao, stated:

'A new education, an education to form the new man, a new mentality. But this does not signify just the education of a new generation. It means the education of the whole people once they are out of reach of colonial domination. It is the revolutionary transformation of everyone. It is the transformation of the whole liberated zone of our country into a new school. This has been a major concern of Frelimo since its foundation in 1962. The programme of Frelimo's first Congress outlined these tasks in relation to education and culture:

1. The liquidation of colonial and imperialist education and culture; reform of existing education; energetic and rapid combating of illiteracy.
2. Development of instruction, education, and culture to serve the liberation and peaceful progress of the Mozambican people'.

Later on in the same paper which Fernando Ganhao read on 'The Struggle Continues: Mozambique's Revolutionary Experience in Education', he stated:

'We learned the history of other oppressed peoples; we sang of their struggles; we knew what it was to be an internationalist. We were forming the new man in Mozambique.'

The development of the Mozambican personality required strong emphasis on the cultural formation of Mozambican people; creative initiatives sprang up spontaneously. Poems and songs composed by the students appeared in all the schools, and plays were written and acted. Some spoke of our struggle and our victories, others exposed enemy infiltration. Through culture we were spreading the political line. We were mobilizing, we were developing vigilance, and we were teaching how the enemy used our weaknesses to infiltrate into our midst. We were criticizing vices, deviations, and reactionary traditions; we were creating a revolution within culture and a culture within the revolution.'

Any action by the people to alleviate their suffering turns them towards the struggle for liberation.

Liberation for a people who have suffered oppression for generations must start with the knowledge that they have sufficient human stature to be liberators and conquerors of evil social, economic and political systems. People must believe in themselves before they can liberate themselves.

We blacks in South Africa are but human beings. We were overwhelmed by a white-owned technology beyond our reach as the whites invaded southern Africa with their guns, their machines, their technological advantages and their trade links with the West. We were subjected to the debasing misuse of power by which we were made subservient in the name of civilisation and religion.

It was drummed into us that we were God-ordained hewers of wood and drawers of water. We were told that we were not yet fit for the fruits of civilisation. 'Yes baas, no baas, anything you say baas', was the formula for survival. Compliance with the wishes of the baas kept you out of jail and kept you from being thrashed.

It was of course not all like that. We did meet the exceptional whites in whom we recognised compassion, love and a sense of justice. For generation after generation, however, we learned that these exceptions did not promise changes in legislation, nor did they promise our inclusion in the political decision-making of the country which we know to be fundamental to the ordinary things we aspire to — equality before the law, fundamental human rights and equality of opportunity.

The subservient mentality which apartheid tries to instil can best be broken through activity by the people to alleviate their lot. No matter how insignificant their actions may seem, doing something for yourself, doing anything for yourself, turns your face towards the struggle for liberation.

Self-help schemes in which the 'give me' mentality is replaced by the 'I will do' mentality are vital kindergartens for a liberation army.

THE 1977 EDGAR BROOKES ACADEMIC AND HUMAN FREEDOM LECTURE, PIETERMARITZBURG,
25TH MAY 1977

To be successful, black liberation must have the backing of the masses.

If there are any lessons we should learn from black politics of past decades, it is that no one can hope to be part of the spearhead of black liberation unless he has the backing of the masses. Convincing intellectual arguments in the drawing rooms of white suburbs cannot liberate blacks. Backing by white liberals amongst press corps without the backing of the masses cannot result in black liberation. Black denigration of black for the entertainment of whites cannot and will not result in the liberation of South Africa. The fanning of the flames of black anger without giving it content and form can only set back the clock of black liberation by several decades. No amount of cheap talk about black solidarity, can result in black solidarity, without the actual hard work of organising people into constituencies which can take stands when mass action is called for. It is not ideology which will win the day. We in Inkatha believe in a multi-strategy approach and we cannot therefore treat with disdain any attempts by other South Africans, black or white aimed at the destruction of racism in our land. The problem is racism and we are not in this for the game of political one-upmanship. Ideological purity alone cannot liberate blacks. It can never be a substitute for that which can and must be done.

CONFERENCE OF KWAZULU INSPECTORS AND PRINCIPALS, ULUNDI, 4TH NOVEMBER 1978

Blacks are well aware of civil wars in Europe as well as those in Africa where the centre of the black struggle from white bondage now lies.

Southern Africa is now the centre of the black struggle for black emancipation from white bondage. There are today oppressors who, when we talk about their oppressing us, sneer at the idea. They respond by saying that we blacks were killing each other before whites came here, and we were saved by white conquest from destroying each other. A finger is also pointed at some of the unfortunate incidents of civil war and bloodshed in certain parts of the continent, to show what blood-thirsty thugs we blacks are. It is not remembered that we also know about the bloody wars between whites in Europe not only during the last century, but even twice in this very century during the lifetime of many of us. The very Huguenots who fled into South Africa during the time of the reformation were running away from a war situation. I, however, think that one of the greatest leaders I have ever had the privilege to meet, the late Tom Mboya, sums up this situation very well in these words:

'Too many journalists and sensational writers . . . have interpreted Africa as a continent of violence and bloodshed. Being patient and unusually good-humoured people, we are amused that this should be the view of white men who have started two world wars and burned up thousands of civilians with atomic bombs, and even now crouch in terror lest their opponents in the East or West may loose their huge nuclear armouries in their direction. Is this what they call freedom?'

If it was not a question of loss of human life, the whole argument that we blacks are by nature blood-thirsty thugs, would be laughable. The old saying that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones suffices here.

To get things in real perspective here in Southern Africa lives are lost every day in the name of black liberation. The escalation of violence has now become a pattern of which we in South Africa are a part. There is institutionalised violence used by those who oppress blacks to maintain the status quo. There is now counter-violence used by guerillas who have decided to embark on what they see as their armed struggle. So as more violence is met with counter-violence none of us will emerge out of this conflict unscathed.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, NIGERIA, 26TH OCTOBER 1976

Events have shown that unless it is fully recognised that the people inside South Africa are an explosive political force, and unless it is recognised that that force wants leadership and not dictation, the very same powers which will destroy apartheid will create a situation of ungovernability in post-apartheid South Africa.

I want to take advantage of the privilege of being here to emphasise that Africa must never be a party in the fanning of the flames of division between brothers. Southern Africa has seen the tragic results of divisiveness within a struggle in the whirlwind that has been reaped in Angola. Southern Africa has seen how retarding to the whole struggle such divisiveness is, as evidenced in the Zimbabwean struggle for liberation.

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG, 27TH SEPTEMBER 1976

The liberation of neighbouring states, with whom blacks desire to identify, is not complete without the liberation of South Africa.

South Africa has been alienated from other Southern African states as it has been alienated from Africa generally. Indeed, one could go as far as to say that South Africa has been alienated from four-fifths of mankind.

The majority of blacks in this country are aware of South Africa's alienated position. They resent their country's alienated position. They desire to remedy that position and they will do so in time.

We blacks in South Africa want to identify politically with our black brothers in neighbouring states. Our liberation at home means friends abroad. We want both the liberation for its own sake and also for the sake of our neighbours. Their liberation will not be completed until the blacks in South Africa are liberated.

In a very real sense neighbouring black states are confident that they would be better off once South Africa is liberated. Their assistance in the process of liberation is therefore motivated not only by moral reasons but by economic and political reasons as well.

INKATHA GENERAL CONFERENCE, ULUNDI, 14TH JULY 1977

Inkatha identifies with Africa and does not regard the West as an ally.

We do not want the West to prescribe in our country and on our behalf and for our so-called benefit. We are convinced that the West plays the role of an ally to the powers which maintain the circumstances of our sub-human rights. This feeling we have precludes us from regarding them as allies of the blacks.

As things now stand, the West can at best hope in the future for a non-aligned neutrality from us and even that will be hoping for a great deal indeed if there is not a real change in attitude on the part of the western powers. I emphasized this point many times in my speeches on the West Coast of the United States early this year.

What is good for the goose is good for the gander. If one section of the population of South Africa has chosen its allies then the other section of the population has by the same token the right to choose its allies. One message I bring to you is that we in Inkatha identify with Africa. We are Africans and when we sing Nkosi Sikeleli'Africa, we pray God's blessing on Africa — the great continent of Africa where we belong. We do not sing Nkosi Sikeleli, South Africa.

The founding fathers of our first liberation Movement were not parochial, and we cannot start being parochial so late in the day. For this reason we see only an Afrocentric future unfolding before our eyes. My message to you therefore is that our identity as an integral part of Africa bound up with the future of Africa should dominate our thinking, our feeling, and the strategies we employ in bringing about liberation. Inkatha's Constitution is a participation in something which is particularly African. My message to you is that we no longer seek to establish representation in a parliamentary system based on a Westminster model. We seek to establish African democracy. So there is a great divide which is the inevitable consequences of our exclusion from the parliamentary life of our country, and is an inevitable consequence of the fact that Whites deny the value of our common patriotism. We are of Africa, and while the final hour of South Africa draws near there are claims that whites in South Africa regard themselves as of Africa, we see no evidence that the white powers-that-be, ally themselves to Africa and move into the harmony of an African spirit and an African continent . . . Our task is to work with others to liberate South Africa from the bondages of apartheid and to do so by strengthening our ties with Africa.

My brothers and sisters, hear me when I tell you that in addition to this task, our task is so to work with others for the liberation of South Africa that not only do we strengthen our identity in Africa and unions in Africa, our spiritual-at-oneness with the rest of Africa, but we do it in such a way that we bring the whites with us. We have a responsibility to them. They are dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries who need to be saved from themselves. They cannot liberate themselves; they will resist our role of liberating not only ourselves but the whole of South Africa. I will not tolerate anything which perpetuates racialism and all the untold human indignity that that brings with it. As difficult as it may seem, our task is to liberate with others in South Africa — the whole of South Africa, and every man, woman and child who lives in it. But we must be realistic, and when I draw attention to the fact that the great divide in South Africa results in whites and blacks having different allies in the outside world, I am not advocating an international racialism as being

beneficial to us. Our task therefore is to liberate South Africa with others not only in such a way that we make whites Africans, but in such a way that the West becomes aligned to the emergence of truth and justice and peace.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE, AFRICAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION OF SA, 17TH JANUARY 1979, DURBAN

Inkatha has enshrined the Ubuntu-Botho ideal in its Constitution.

We in Inkatha realise that we blacks have great treasures which we embrace in our UBUNTU-BOTHO ideal. This UBUNTU-BOTHO ideal should be the golden thread of our curriculum wherever we have reached a stage, where we have a final say on the kind of curriculum that our schools should follow. In our Inkatha preamble we have enshrined this ideal in the following words: Clause 2 of the preamble to our Constitution states:

Accepting the fact that we have many things to copy from the Western economic, political and educational patterns of development and striving for the promotion of African patterns of thought and the achievement of African Humanism, otherwise known in Nguni languages as UBUNTU and in Sotho languages as BOTHO.

We in Southern Africa should of course streamline our system in accordance with the demands of the struggle now being waged in the sub-continent. In this connection I found it most interesting to read some contributions that were made at a Seminar on Educational alternatives for Southern Africa in MAPUTO, Mozambique from the 17th to the 28th of April, 1978. The Seminar was organised by the Ministry of Education and Culture in the People's Republic of Mozambique. Looking at the system of education in Mozambique H. E. Graca Machel, the Minister of Education and Culture, stated among other things that:

'In the Peoples Republic of Mozambique, education is being developed in a manner that links it closely with the concrete necessities of our socio-economic development. Education is closely linked to the demands of the new society, the socialist society that we want to build. We understand that it is practice which determines consciousness and not consciousness which determines practice. This has led us to apply as a principle of revolutionary education the linking of the school with the work place, study with production. Thus since the time of the armed struggle, we have followed the watchwords 'Study, Produce, Combat', in all our education centres'

The objective is essentially political. Transform the mentality, transform the students into producers who identify with the worker and peasant classes, who identify with their aspirations, interests and struggles. We are making efforts to create close links between the schools and the centres of production, making the production centres into schools, in a manner in which the teaching has a very practical character. If the school is not linked with the community, it can no longer be an agent of change in the society, nor can the community influence the school.

If we forge a close link between the school and community, school and production, we can ensure a permanent link between theory and practice, between intelligence and the hand, one of the basic principles of our educational policy.

On the other hand the efforts we are making towards bringing education to the mass of our people would not be possible economically without the education centres' struggling towards furnishing their own needs thus lessening the burden on the State.

In this fashion, we are combating elitism, contempt for the working masses, disdain for manual work and rooting the school in society.'

THE 1977 EDGAR BROOKES ACADEMIC AND HUMAN FREEDOM LECTURE, PIETERMARITZBURG, 25TH MAY 1977

We must work towards a black/white future which is Afrocentric.

The black majority alliances must be Afrocentric. This is the politics in which we blacks are involved in today. We are not engaged in the politics of reformism. We are engaged in the politics of liberating ourselves. We blacks refuse to be custodians of western vested interests. The black majority view is the view of liberationists who made it their business to reject apartheid, and who envisage a future state of affairs which is Afrocentric. The question which we need to address ourselves to is the question of how in these circumstances we can effect a partnership between black and white, to ensure a black-white future

in which all our peoples will feel secure. . . .

We are concerned with post-liberation stability. Whites have a place in that post liberation stability. They can serve the vested interests which are to be found in stability after change. This they have to decide soon. It is important to stress that these things can only take place after change. There can be no real economic stability, no human freedom, no human rights until these radical changes in our society take place. I am concerned about the future of all South Africans, in that post-liberation era which is imminent, in spite of attempts by racists to dig in their heels in attempts to perpetuate the present apartheid society. These radical changes are essential not only for the sake of those of us who have suffered decades of oppression, but these changes are necessary for the sake of humanity. One of the slogans that were coined by the founder of the banned African National Congress Youth League, Anton Mziwakhe Lembodo of which I was a member before it was banned, sums this attitude of mine well:

'Africa for Africans
Africans for Humanity
And Humanity For God'

That is all Africans. That connotation of Africans embraces all those who by conduct and commitment see an Afrocentric future which awaits us on this African Continent.

A BLACK PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORY

THE ANGLO-ZULU WAR — A CENTENNIAL REAPPRAISAL — 1879-1979 "THE BIAS OF HISTORICAL ANALYSIS" UNIVERSITY OF NATAL, DURBAN, 7 FEBRUARY 1979

I thank Professor Duminy, the Associate Professor of History at this university, for inviting me to come here to open this historic conference. This is an historic event in more than one sense. So that participating in it is, in fact, participation in the current history of our times, and in doing so one is compelled, willy-nilly to look at history and its interpretation by both past and modern historians.

In participating in this exercise by my performance of this opening, I am quite aware that I am, in fact, participating in what is aimed to be an academic exercise by Academics of repute. I am immediately aware of that fact that I am not an academic historian, nor am I a professional philosopher. I am basically a peasant with a royal ancestry which I trace back to the actors in the moving events in Natal which have, in 1979, resulted in this Conference, events which historians write about so authoritatively and so prolifically.

So that what I am going to contribute this afternoon is a perspective of one whose families and forefathers on both sides are written about. It is also the perspective of one whose birth and ancestry places him in a position of being the custodian for the people of the ideals and statesmanship of the early Zulu Kings and early Zulu nobility. Their blood is my blood, and their flesh is my flesh, and my people were put together as a people, by them.

The King of the Zulus, who is the central figure in this history of Zulu annihilation, was King Cetshwayo. He was the son of King Mpande, a half brother of King Shaka and King Dingane. His mother, Queen Ngqumbazi, was a daughter of a Zulu noble, Chief Tshana Zungu of Mahlabathini district. King Cetshwayo was the father of King Dinuzulu, another Zulu King who suffered persecution and degradation in the cause of his father and his people. King Dinuzulu was the father of King Solomon Maphumzana, otherwise known as UNKAYISHANA. King Solomon was the father of King Cyprian Bhekuzulu Nyangayezizwe, the father of our present Monarch, King Zwelithini Goodwill. King Solomon's full sister is Princess Magogo Sibile Constance. She is my mother. King Cetshwayo is, therefore, my mother's grandfather and my great grandfather, on my mother's side.

On my paternal line, the Prime Minister of the Zulu Kingdom, at the time of its destruction, was Chief Mnyamana Buthelezi. He was my late father's grandfather and, therefore, my own great grandfather. He was the Commander-in-Chief of the entire Zulu army at the time of the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879. Zulu Generals such as Ntshingwayo Khoza, Zibhebhu kaMaphitha, Prince Dabulamanzi and many others were all under his command and acted in whatever they did on his instructions. He planned Zulu strategy from the beginning. Zulus use the same word 'UKUPHAKA' for dishing or serving out food as well as for disposing or posting out divisions of the army. Mnyamana Buthelezi did not only 'phaka' the Zulu army, but also led some Zulu forces under his personal command, as, for example, at Kambula and Hlobane. And yet the white perspectives differ so much from our black perspectives, that in every history book, our history of this time is presented in every white-written history book as if King Cetshwayo, our Monarch, directed his army personally, against Lord Chelmsford and other British Generals. And yet nowhere is it ever suggested that Queen Victoria led her forces, merely because the British regiments which invaded King Cetshwayo's Kingdom were part of the Queen's army. As we Zulus see it, we see in this an attempt to lower King Cetshwayo's status to that of such generals as Lord Chelmsford. It was Chief Mnyamana Buthelezi who, at the time of conquest, collected cattle in an attempt to make peace with Sir Garnet Wolsely and to work out the terms of peace between the British and the Zulus. He further asked Sir Garnet Wolsely to arrest him rather than arrest King Cetshwayo, stating that he was the one who had personally led the Zulu forces and not the King.

This and the things many records distort and omit cause me quite a great deal of dismay. When, in this perspective, I look at the world around me and read about the world of yester-year as it is recorded by historians, I am moved. I am moved by the tragedy of a people so little understood and I am also moved by the tragedy of a tradition among historians which is so blind to the blindness of those who did not understand my forefathers, their people, in our history of yester-year, and who continue up to this day to not to understand me and my people within the current political scene.

In one sense this should not surprise us. Black and white have lived their lives quite apart, in two different worlds. White and black continue to live quite apart, each group in its own separate world up to now.

Apart from these problems, I am always torn apart by contributions to Zulu folklore by such writers as

Dr A. T. Bryant who are the main source for most Zulu history writers. I want to concede that Dr Bryant chronicled quite a lot of important things for the Zulu people. But his contempt for the Zulu people for example, quite apart from some apocryphal things which are taken at present as gospel truth, since he wrote them, is enough to underscore my point about the different people, black and white, who were in conflict, and who remain in conflict up to this day. Let no one misunderstand me that my observation on this situation in any way fails to acknowledge the contributions such people as Dr Bryant made, in spite of their sins of commission and omission during the course of making their records of Zulu history. I know that some people will say that Missionaries were not involved, and were not part of the process of empire-building. That in this sense then, Bryant was not involved. In response to those who feel this way, I think the words which were uttered by King Cetshwayo himself have a lot to say in this connection, viz.: 'First came the trader, then the missionary, then the red soldier.'

This is so in spite of the fact that Sobantu or Bishop Colenso, the odd man out as far as the Empire-builders of the day were concerned, did to buy time through his Christian witness for the Church. Bishop Colenso was an exception and remains even by today's standards one of the few exceptions to the rule, who have bought by their true Christian commitment and witness a measure of respectability for the Christian gospel and the Church.

What further compounds the problem is that from some of the writings of a few contemporary historians and writers, it is quite obvious that not much Zulu history is written from the all black perspectives of the Zulu people themselves. There are, furthermore, quite some revelations from some current writings which show that some of the past authorities, who are main sources for most writers on Zulu history, were dishonest and that they fabricated quite a lot to dramatise and justify the rape of Zulu land. I would like, at this point, to cite some of the things Brian Roberts in the 'Zulu Kings' observes, for example: Nathaniel Isaacs, for example, tells the story of King Shaka cruelly beating up his ageing mother, the Queen-Mother Nandi. This is contrary to anything we Zulus know from our oral tradition and from some records about King Shaka's deep affection and respect for his mother. Brian Roberts observes, for example, that: Isaacs never lost an opportunity to describe Shaka's sadism in the most lurid detail. He more than supports King's theory. 'I am not aware that history', he repeats, 'either ancient or modern can produce so horrible and detestable a savage. He has deluged his country with innocent blood; he has forgotten the most sacred ties of affection and, by a double murder as it were, compelled the agonising father to be the executioner of his own son, and the son to become an inhuman mutilator of his own mother.'

Roberts goes on to state: 'But Isaacs was a sensitive soul. He claims that the only reason that he steeled himself to give such horrid details was to enable "my readers to draw their own conclusions".'

He certainly knew his readers. Anyone wishing to present a lively picture of the Monster Shaka can find plenty of material in 'Travels and Adventures in Eastern Africa' by Nathaniel Isaacs. He quotes many examples, but that suffices to illustrate the kind of complication I referred to which compounds our problem as far as white and black perspectives of Zulu history are concerned. Amongst modern historians who fall into this category is Professor Davenport in so far as he displays woeful ignorance of the overall picture of current black political trends, which he grossly misanalyses in his recent History of South Africa. The problem is that what he states is taken for granted because he is Professor Davenport. His academic status gives respectability and authenticity to his analysis of our current history. The tragedy is that his misanalysis will be read as true and correct history by future generations, without any question.

At the same time I do applaud the appearance of some young historians who are trying to put themselves in the black man's shoes. On the other hand people are always wondering why there are no up and coming black historians. Ever since my days as a student at the University of Fort Hare, I have been aware of insurmountable problems which any young black historian has in pursuing a career as a historian in a country like South Africa. I remember certain young people I know who had Honours degrees in history, but who could not proceed with their Masters' thesis because their viewpoint was not accepted by some sponsors, as the latter invariably wanted them to fall in line with the published viewpoints on certain aspects of black history. After doing some research, these young people found that the traditional view of historic events did not tally with the black version of certain happenings and events.

For someone like myself who is playing a leadership role within a people who are struggling for liberation, my today's function is, as a result, rendered very difficult. This is because the main issues in the white-black conflict which led to the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 have up to 1979 not been resolved. When looking at parts of a letter which John Dunn, at the time of the Zulu War, wrote to the Aborigines Protection Society, to which Bishop Colenso had also petitioned on behalf of Langaibalele, I am

convinced beyond any shadow of doubt that the main issues have not changed after 100 years. This was before John Dunn defected to his own white race. This letter was on the advice of Dunn's friend, a lawyer who was also well-disposed to the Zulus, Harry Escombe, not sent to England. It reads as follows:

'I would not now address your honourable Society if it were not that I have noticed a very strong, wrong and arbitrary feeling gaining ground against the Zulu nation on the side of the white population in this part of South Africa. A strong feeling of colour and jealousy I cannot understand, unless it is on account of the independency of the Zulu race, a feeling taken up without any just case, and that feeling is now on the verge of breaking out on the pretext of a false claim of land boundary, a claim pretended to being upheld for the Dutch Boers, who are no friend of the English race, and are well known in this part of South Africa for their encroaching propensities, on any land belonging to the natives of this country, to evade English laws, on the pretext of getting permission to graze cattle, on the grass becoming scarce upon their own farms, and afterwards claiming the land. In this claim the Natal Government have always upheld the Zulus, and now, since the annexation of the Transvaal the head of the Government there, who professed to side with the Zulus whilst he was in Natal, has turned round and claimed for the Dutch a country thickly inhabited by Zulus.

'I write this for the information of your Honourable Society, in the hope that you will try and put a stop to proceedings which will, if carried out, be the cause of bloodshed in an unjust cause, as I can assure you that nothing but the grossest acts of encroachment and oppression will cause the Zulus to take up arms against the English race, who wish to live at peace with them, not being ripe enough for civilisation or civilised laws.

'The standard rule that is gone by against the black races in this part of South Africa is the AmaXosa or Cape Frontier Kafir, who is not to be compared with the Zulu. Nothing but forced Christianity or civilisation will spoil the Zulus, and the class of foreign missionaries we have in the country does more injury than good to them. Let them say what they like in their reports to the Societies, they make no converts to their faith, beyond the pretended ones or vagabonds who imagine that by being clothed and under the garb of Christianity they will be exempt from all the king's service and laws of the country, and be allowed to roam about and do as they please.

'The Zulu nation, judiciously dealt with, would remain a firm ally and friend to the English, and it would be a shame for any false notions of power on the English side to take advantage of such power, and destroy the Zulu race, which would undoubtedly be the case if they were overwhelmed. They would then become a lot of bold rogues and eventually give much trouble.

'One of the unfair features in the case is this, that the head of the Transvaal Government (Sir Theophilus Shepstone) has always advised Cetshwayo to remain quiet, and not to go to war with the Boers in disputing the boundary, promising to see him righted, when, if it had been left to the Zulus and Boers themselves I am sure the Boers would have got the worst of it. He now turns round and is prepared to fight himself, backed up by England, for the Dutch, England not knowing the real facts.

'The Zulu acknowledge no individual title to land, permission only being given to squat, the land being looked on as belonging to the squatter only so long as he occupies it.'

The following conversation which is supposed to have taken place between Harry Escombe and John Dunn about this letter is also rather illuminating as far as how the whole tragic situation developed:

Escombe shook his head: 'You can't stop the intentions of the English Government,' he said. 'They're bent on disarming once and for all time the native tribes. Frere has told them in Downing Street that they cannot make any confederation move without that security first. I am afraid you'd look very foolish Mister Dunn if this got printed.'

'D'you think the Zulus will allow themselves to be disarmed without a fight?'

'No, I don't. But I presume they are making provision for that. The British Army with its modern weapons will make short work of them.'

'All for the sake of a bit of territory which rightfully belongs to the Zulus.'

'Bits of territory and bits of paper are always changing hands. History-making is a series of squabbles over bits of land and paper.'

There you are ladies and gentlemen. Has that situation changed today as far as our contemporary scene is concerned? As I see it the answer is a big 'NO'.

Even when King Cetshwayo after the war appealed in vain to Lord Kimberley for permission to return to his kingdom, he was allowed to do so under impossible conditions, one of which forced him to bow down to the ceding of his own personal estate around Gingindlovu and Mtunzini, a gift from his father, King Mpande, which he gave to him when he was still the Crown Prince. One of the conditions was that this area was to be occupied by Chiefs and people who no longer wanted to be under King Cetshwayo. King

Cetshwayo died in humiliating circumstances as a fugitive in Eshowe district, where he had been driven by one of Sir Garnet Wolseley's thirteen Kinglets, which were set up to fragment the Zulus as one nation and one people.

King Dinuzulu, his heir, suffered a worse fate than his father. During his short and tragic reign, which cost him two banishments, one on the island of St Helena and another in the Transvaal, in Middelburg, where he died, the emasculation of the Zulu people which had commenced in 1879 was completed.

There can be no longer any doubt that future historians will trace the emergence of what will be a new South Africa through actions, attitudes, resilience and determination of the ordinary black worker and the ordinary black peasant. It is their immutable numbers and the futility of one attempt after another on the part of whites to deal with them that writes the history which will be recorded in the future. There is a similarity in what we face today with what our Kings and people faced in 1879 up to the turn of the century.

The futility of white attempts to deal with blacks, must be seen to have two refrains to it. The one refrain is that whites never had a sufficiently strong internal power base to justify tackling the objectives they did tackle in South Africa. The other refrain is that the nature of man and society is such that domination and economic discrimination of a majority by a minority must be self-defeating. It is a matter of sheer common sense that such a situation can never ever last forever.

White leaders in South Africa are like a long line of bankrupt businessmen whose one business after another failed because they were under-capitalised and who nevertheless persisted in spite of the situation in marketing a product which the general public would not buy. Indirect rule, segregation, Christian trusteeship, apartheid, differentiation, separate freedoms, call it what you will, is a product which is not saleable to blacks. While South Africa is politically under-capitalised and apartheid in these many forms and guises, it has assumed over many generations, can be peddled as much as the peddlers of this stinking product are trying to sell it, but it will never be bought by the majority of black people. This was so from the very beginning.

The Dutch East India Company was over-extended by the time they established a base in the Cape. Not only were they impoverished, but they came from a country which did not justify such bold adventures as were undertaken. Holland did not have enough wisdom with which to manage the responsibilities the settlement of the Cape incurred. It was in fact an act of desperation by a country whose own circumstances mattered more than the destiny of the people they found in South Africa.

The very objectives they set themselves were futile. The best that can be said is that they were wheeling and dealing for short term gains because the market they were operating in was too sophisticated or costly for them. If you see them as sincere men pursuing objectives they believed in, you make them fools. The tragedy of Emgungundlovu which culminated in the death of Piet Retief and the Voortrekkers he led, in 1838, 41 years before 1879, was, in the words of Harry Escombe, a question of 'bits of territory and bits of paper.'

Where the Voortrekkers failed, the British stepped in. What for me epitomizes the undercapitalized state the British were in is the pathetic exploration of Captain Owen. He was sent many tens of thousands miles for many months to see what he could find on the cheap. A sort of sea-going scavenger proudly dressed up in the bright new union jack he could still afford.

One British Governor after another pursued one exercise after another in futile attempts to do the impossible on the cheap. The Kaffir Wars in the Cape were characterised by shoe-string budgets and the lack of logistic support, and their objectives were to gain as much for as little as possible.

Early English Governors were not only poor in money, arms and men, they were also poor in the backing of a consistent policy from Westminster. Most of all, they were poor in human stature. Not one of them had the calibre to match his colonial ambitions and his responsibilities to the people he governed. And not one of them had stature enough to divert Britain from its path of colonial destruction. The indirect rule attempt by Britain was an insolvency tactic which was necessitated by too much grab and too little cash. Such was the calibre and circumstances of men like Sir Theophilus Shepstone, Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Garnet Wolseley.

In Natal every time the British extended their sphere of influence, they bit off more than they could chew. In doing so, they were forced to compromise every principle of sound government. It was always a case of expecting frontier settlers to behave responsibly without efficient means of ensuring that they did so and employing sanctions against them when they did not do so.

The pomp and splendour of early British figures in Natal is pathetic against the background of the economic and political poverty of their imperial headquarters. The very language used in their impressive sounding proclamations as they gobbled up one piece of Natal after another would be ridiculous, if it were not so tragic. Anyone who has gone through some of the government blue books as I have tried to

do, would know what I mean.

There was no honesty in the intentions of these proclamations and the very tone of them was as hypocritical as they were deceiving. When I see some of them I am reminded of that famous line — 'A story told by a fool — full of sound and fury but signifying nothing.'

So we could go on and on about the British. We could talk of the creation of the poverty-stricken areas of Swaziland, Lesotho and Botswana where one British fool after another attempted to make a dream come true that would forever remain a dream. We could go further north to the British failure in Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Kenya — to other parts of the world. There can be no end to it, once we attempt to point at each and every one of these British Imperial fiascos.

The grandiose schemes of, first, the Dutch and then the British rubbed off on the settlers and the white frontiersmen. Pathetic men setting out with ox-wagons and blunderbusses trying to claim new empires they could see like mirages rising in the heat of the shimmering veld. They did not have value systems on which nations and empires could be built. Were it not for the discovery of gold and diamonds, they would have been obliterated by the indigenous people of South Africa. Before the man to man test of strength and resolution could run its full course, gold and diamonds produced a hive of white activity. Tens of thousands of whites arrived, each bringing with them a gun and the backing of colonial power. Each new mine and each new industry that went with it created western vested interests which conflicted with colonial responsibilities to the indigenous people of South Africa. It was not long before whites began disputing among themselves and going to war against each other. A veritable case of squabbling over the question of who should have the spoils of black conquest.

Then it all got too much for Britain. She abdicated her responsibility in the Act of Union in 1910, and finally with that Statute of Westminster. There was not one single political ideal the British cherished in the name that was left as a heritage for us. When I look at the situation in South Africa at the time of this scramble for our land, against British abdication of her responsibilities to the indigenous people, and compare this with what is going on in Zimbabwe at present, then I understand quite clearly what is meant by the British saying that 'Blood is thicker than water.'

She abandoned us to the mercy of those who raped our land. She set in motion a series of events which she now so sanctimoniously opposes. Again watch her actions in Rhodesia. She agreed to make us voiceless in the land of our birth. She agreed to white exclusivity in the exploitation of the wealth of our land. She agreed to a division of land between black and white which made us ragged inhabitants of barren lands and ghettos. She abandoned us to social, economic and political discrimination. She abandoned us to the wiles of men who had trekked from British rule in the Cape because they were vehemently opposed to the idea that there is any equality amongst men transcending colour lines. She abandoned us to the wiles of men she must have known had little regard for the British rule of law when it came to men of colour.

She could not do otherwise. It was the final bankruptcy which followed decade after decade in which she pursued the impossible with a singular lack of analytical political purpose, and she did so with the splendour of the Union Jack and pompous proclamations which could not be logistically backed.

Then came the decades of one white settler scheme after another — each one doomed to failure and each one more grand by half, than resources and political sense warranted.

This century has nothing politically new from the whites. During this century we have had no more than the pursuit of voortrekker objectives in a sophisticated industrialised setting. We have the same basic ingredient of white failure. The lack of men of stature, the lack of a system of values on which we could build a nation, the shortage of cash and men equal to the demands of grand schemes. It is the Dutch East India Company plot in the same tragic play but with changed stage props and different actors.

As stupid as the 1936 Land Act was, there was not enough cash around to make it become real. As stupid as Baasskap was, there were not enough police and machine guns to make it work. As stupid as the Homeland scheme is, there is not enough money and men to create the separate facilities so glibly talked about. As stupid as the Homeland policy is, there are not enough jobs, there is insufficient economic infrastructure, there is insufficient training facilities for blacks, there is insufficient money to support something artificially which doesn't work in practice.

The tragedy of all this was that it is not only white foolishness for which whites will suffer. It is a kind of foolishness enforced on us. The Bible talks of the sins of parents being visited upon their children. In our case, it is the sins of the baas visited upon his bantu. We are bearing the brunt as blacks, of the political stupidity of other people.

We carry the burden of the white man's foolishness. As each bit of white bravado follows one upon another, so our burden increases.

We went through our dark days of despair; we experienced hopelessness, but we survived to believe in a new South Africa. We learned that no policy the whites could enunciate could last against the wishes of the majority of the people. We learned that no oppression could be complete enough to destroy yearnings for freedom. We learned that the white endeavours had soft underbellies and we learned the waiting game. Our black experience has bequeathed to us a certain kind of wisdom, born out of our peculiar black experience.

When I look at the history of oppression in this country, I see the growth of oppressive legislation and the tightening of constitutional strait-jackets. I also see, however, the growth of black opposition which necessitates ever stronger repressive measures.

If one traced the nature of legislation which changed and changed for the worse, one could trace an ever rising black opposition which demanded ever increasing draconian powers to contain it.

Blackness is invincibly the shaper of history in South Africa. Blacks are now aware of this but whites will not yet give it recognition. Whites would rather accept the destruction not only of themselves, but of all of us and our country than accept the fact of black invincibility in this liberation game. That is the measure of white intransigence. Again in the words of Harry Escombe, which he said of the British in 1879, whites in South Africa believe that as long as they are armed to the teeth as they are now, that 'with their modern weapons they will make short work' of blacks.

An important difference between a black and a white perspective of South African history is that a white perspective looks at yesterday as it leads to today. In the black perspective we see yesterday and today leading to tomorrow.

Approaches to the 1936 Land Act illustrate what I mean. This Act has its roots in the 1913 Act. That bit of history for whites is at variance with today's circumstances. A Commission has been appointed to re-examine the 1936 Act in an attempt to solve a white problem of today. The black man does not share this problem. The 1936 Land Act is not a problem to the black man — it is for him simply brutal and oppressive. Again 'territory and bits of paper' which have made millions of our people landless serfs of white South Africa.

The 1936 Land Act is a rack on which the white man put the black man. It is important in humanitarian terms to encourage whites to adjust a screw here or there to provide that little bit of relief. That is why we should not pooh-pooh the idea of adding any fraction of a hectare to black land. It is a measure of certain black political bankruptcy, and ignorance of the real plight of thousands of landless blacks in rural areas, for certain black false political prophets on the Reef to dismiss any attempt to pass on even a fraction of land to suffering blacks out of hand. It is political stupidity which fails to recognise that blacks have to survive quite a few years of the liberation struggle and land returned to the dispossessed is not something to scoff at if one knows the importance of black survival while the struggle is being waged. In liberation terms, however, it is important to dismantle the bloody machine. People fight wars for land; they die for land. As we have seen in the words of Harry Escombe — 'Bits of territory and bits of paper are always changing hands. History-making is a series of squabbles over bits of land and paper.' Land and the right to live on it is one of the most fundamental elements in political identities, policies and ideologies.

The history of South Africa is a history of people alienated in their land of birth and it is a history of their struggle for the right to walk with their feet on that bit of Mother Earth where they belong.

Blacks have a great love of their land. They see their land as part of Africa. They love Africa and they identify with Africa. We long fervently for that day when we can play a meaningful role in furthering African ideals. We know the poverty of Africa. We have tasted it in our own mouths, and we have felt the burden of it on our own backs. We are not afraid of tackling our own poverty. We pray for the opportunity to do so. We are not afraid of the poverty of Africa — that too we want to tackle. We are not ashamed of Africa. With all its vagrancies and all its faults, it is all we have as a wider something which belongs somewhere deep down in our souls. This gives us a particular dimension, and it is part of our historical perspective.

As I made it clear in my preambuling remarks, historians who have written about South Africa have not captured the idiom of our history. And I am talking here of an idiom which is not simply a view. I am talking of an idiom which moves our country to an end which that idiom has appointed.

We read history as something which is the end product only of those who can read, write, understand and argue policies academically. We experience history as a product of the immovable and non-negotiables in the soul of the black man.

History departments at our universities will become anachronisms unless they can talk history with us in the idiom, and language of our souls. I am not saying that academics 'should' doctor history. What I am trying to say is that without a black input how can we really hope that an academic analysis of our history

can ever be comprehensive and meaningful to the majority of the people of South Africa?

Let me refer to a concept — detribalisation. A white perspective is that detribalisation has taken place among we blacks. Whites see old value systems changing. They see customary law falling into disuse. They see kinship systems changing and becoming dysfunctional. It is a 'we' — 'they' view. It is an ingroup — outgroup phenomenon. The historians do not see these dimensions in white society, and if they do they do not make them central analytical points.

We blacks do not talk about ourselves as being detribalised. Tribalism is an epithet which has its origins in white thinking. Yes, there is a phenomenon which is the referent of the word tribalism. There is something real in man's experience which is referred to when the word tribalism is used. What that something is, is either clouded or elucidated by perspectives. The use of detribalisation in white literature clouds the understanding of that which is real. The white perspective sees a tribal system as breaking down in favour of a superimposed system of western values.

Those who talk about tribes — talk about people as other kinds of people and they confuse issues. The subjects of this talk experience only adaptation to the needs of interpersonal relationships and the relationship of man to his environment. In pre-white times, adaptation was positive as it made for an existence as orderly as possible. The drive for an ordered existence underlies tribalism. That drive increases as external forces disrupt ordered communities. Changes take place as man grapples with difficulties. On this issue Dr Herbert Vilakazi, an African academic living in exile in the United States, makes the following observation:

The term tribe is a Colonial-racist term and should be discarded along with 'kaffir' 'coolie' and 'nigger'.

With regard to all people in the world, except Africans and American Indians, a population with a common language, more or less the same customs and religions, is referred to as an ethnic group.

However, to continue with my argument, let me say that no tribal system has ever been static. What is seen as detribalisation is simply an ongoing adaptation to circumstances.

Whites talk about detribalisation in value laden terms. The poor detribalised person in whites' eyes has lost something — he becomes a lesser person, a person to be ashamed of. We see the rural black and the urban black each in their own way are adapting to circumstances and we experience unifying brotherhood in our shared experience which white laws and administrators do not obliterate.

When we speak of tribal systems we recognise that there is that which is co-ordinated by a localised tradition, a localised kin structure, a localised system of land tenure, a localised participation in ancestral worship, and a localised political structure relating people to each other, and people to localised natural resources. A tribe is a group of people in which there is a relatively large degree of this co-ordination. We also recognise that there is a systematic way in which the localised tribal centre relates to and interacts with other localised tribal centres.

Analytically speaking, the process of detribalisation so-called is a positive thing in which new ways of relating man to man and man to his environment are formed.

There are no detribalised people. There are only the poor, the disenfranchised, the disowned who struggle heroically to survive in the short term. In medium and long term they seek a world in which once more they have wider social, political and economic structures in which to work. One way of looking at it is to say people have lost their old values to create new political idioms for a new outreach to levels beyond so-called tribal levels.

There could be a lot of discussion about this perspective. Let me ask you to consider, for instance, why a City Councillor or a Provincial Councillor would be described as obstructive where he is obstructive but only a Chief would be described as tribal and backward when he is obstructive.

In a small localised unit, the system which co-ordinates and orders is as relevant as it is immediate. In a larger scale system which relates one localised unit to another, relevance decreases with decreasing immediacy.

As physical and social distance increases between people, their individual joint participation in the ritual economic and political co-ordination machinery becomes less frequent and less immediate. That system of beliefs which forms a wider mythological charter is thus vulnerable.

This same tribalism which is regarded as an anachronism by so many is that which will rally the people into rejecting the present homeland policy. Tribesmen have not accepted independence so-called anywhere at any time. Any black leader who put the question of independence to tribesmen would hear its total rejection in the very language of the urban black. Another of these divisive white myths which I think only promotes artificial divisions between blacks is that of fragmenting into urban and rural units. This mystifies us when we consider that whites have never been fragmented into urban and rural whites.

This is where Inkatha stands. Inkatha is the servant of both the so-called tribal and urban black

nationality. Inkatha provides the mythological charter which is unifying those who struggle to find each other in black national unity.

Tribal rationality sees the need for tackling national issues as a healing balm. This is not the place to explain fully the role of Inkatha in national unity. I am talking here about the question of white biases in history. I am doing no more than saying that white history writes about blacks as South African outsiders. Those people 'out there' which had to be handled by white politicians and administrators. Whites see tribalism as something which stands in the way of progress — as a vulnerable something and the so-called detribalised person as a lost and lesser person — as a person who falls between two stools.

For me they are my people exercising a rational influence on the South African political situation. I will take up cudgels against anyone — black or white — who is ashamed of them. No son of our soil should ever be ashamed of tribesmen. A black consciousness which adopts a holier than thou position in relation to their rural brothers can only produce false prophets. Where the so-called tribal people live in a political vacuum, they are aware of that vacuum. Their demands on Inkatha are that Inkatha gives them an outreach to provincial and national levels. Inkatha is at base as sophisticated as the demands of workers. Peasants and workers are one people, all seeking one South Africa and they have nominated Inkatha to be an instrument of continuum, building in the past and reaching into the future.

At the same time certain young white academics and thinkers who would like to see themselves having around them an aura of imaginary and false radicalism, have a tendency to attack white politics in such a way as to leave the impression that blacks have been reduced to economic vassals. While it is true that whites have subjected blacks to degrading and dehumanised beings, there is a resurgence of real and lasting human values among blacks. Inkatha is rich in human wisdom instilled in my people by their suffering. Perhaps this is an aspect of current reality which the magazine 'REALITY' could do well to recognise.

History as I grasp it will show Inkatha to be an integrative force at national level. That is where both tribal people, so-called, and the urban people, so-called, want it to be. No political movement which does not provide a national structure within the traditions of the South African struggle for liberation has a snowball's hope in hell, of surviving. The black political scene is strewn with many political skeletons, of aspirants who attempted to get on the track of this tradition of struggle.

South African history is the history of the majority of the people of this country biding their time — waiting in their massive strength for the right historical moment to act effectively and decisively. In the meanwhile, they survive; they are rational in their limitations and they do not have a suicidal tendency. They wait and wait but they will not wait in vain.

The history of King Shaka, the founder of what was the mightiest nation in Southern Africa, is the history of the expansion of the individual's perceptions of what is socially, economically and politically relevant to him. It is the history of expanding horizons. It is the history of the unification of people in ever widening circles. It is the history of laying foundations for a Southern Africa becoming increasingly integrated. This people's history was rudely interrupted by bullets from guns held by land-hungry aggressors.

King Shaka's network of influence lies intact in the hearts and souls of the people. We will yet rediscover the greatness of King Shaka's vision for the black man of Southern Africa.

Detribalisation is, if anything, that which King Shaka embarked upon. It is not simply a product of old things found wanting and losing their utility for individuals. True, blacks have been besieged. They were battered by armies, by administrators, by technology in the hands of power élites. Blacks have been battered by colonial forces and are still being battered by all these things. They are battered, but they are not subdued. Every experiment in the sordid history of oppression in this country has failed. The whites-only mentality has been as ingenious as it has been disruptive and evil. But it has not been successful.

It is true that King Shaka conquered. It is true that his hand was a hard hand. But it is equally true that he conquered and he ruled with a hard hand to make people one people.

Had early white settlers conquered to identify with the conquered; had the early frontiersmen overcome to live within a new people; had the whites shared the spoils of war with those they conquered, we in this country would be a mighty force in our contemporary world and not the pariah of all men, as we stand today.

The history of this country will prove one day to be the history of us becoming one people as in King Shaka's dream.

When I travel the length and breadth of Natal, and even in other Provinces, I am struck again and again by the solidarity in the support I enjoy. Where King Shaka went before me, I find one people. Natal has a de jure population of over five million. They are with me. They justify what early Zulu Kings did. Had King

Shaka been the tyrant white historians make him out to be, blacks in Natal would have seen whites as liberators. They have never done so. They do not do so now. Many white historians try to portray the view that white aggressors were in fact our liberators. This is preposterous!

The fundamental point I made at the outset that whites see history as that which led to present problems, whereas blacks see the past and the present leading to a glorious future, is pertinent here. I have a historical past on which I can build. I am locked into a continuum. I move ever more closely to the heart of history where the determinants of the future lie. That is why I and my people resent so much any idea that my role within the black community in Southern Africa is a creation of the so-called Homelands policy. This is to deliberately misread the history of my forebears such as King Shaka, King Cetshwayo, Chief Mnyamana Buthelezi and others, and also my own, in Southern Africa. It is in fact an insult to my illustrious lineage to create the impression that I am a product of the Homelands policy.

Let me break here with the train of thought I have been tracking. I am not an idealist, nor am I a racist. I see racism as evil — whether it is black/white racism, or Zulu/Swazi racism, or whether it is Pedi/Sotho racism. I see the process of unification in South Africa as peculiarly my responsibility.

There is no such thing as history. There are only events which historians order after their traditional fashion. It may well be that a standard history as taught in our schools orders some events in a useful way. This standard history is certainly a useful recording of the story of oppression.

It is a useful documentation of colonial expansionism. But for me it lacks one essential ingredient in a history that excites me. It lacks a perspective in which the laying of the foundations for a new South Africa is recorded.

I am not saying that that which went before must be obliterated in order to get a new South Africa. There are many things which will remain realities in a just society. What I miss is the human perspective. The spirit of a new man has been born in the suffering we blacks have endured. That is an historical event which has already taken place.

This new man has a duality about him which the spear so aptly symbolises. Its origins were probably more in its utility in times of peace than they were in war. It was an implement of peace, of hunting food, of slaughtering, of rituals. When, however, the time came, it was shortened and turned into a fighting weapon. It is a precious symbol to us. It fits our hand for whatever purpose. It demonstrated our two sides. It still does so, even today. It remains that powerful symbol which inspires us in the long and winding road leading towards the liberation of our land.

In looking at the contemporary scene in 1979, I must inevitably look at my own role. As I look at my own role, I become increasingly aware that history in my understanding of it may yet face me with cruel choices. I have dedicated myself to bringing about radical changes through peaceful means. The irony of my situation is that I know that the blacks of South Africa are prepared to die for our vision of a just society, where all have such opportunity as they are capable of responding to. I also admire black wisdom which while acknowledging black preparedness to die for freedom if necessary, but which also says that we blacks are not prepared to die futilely for no purpose, but only as cannon fodder for the western man's war machinery. There are many people I encounter here and abroad who, in their quest for false bravado and imaginary radicalism, think that everything that is done to bring about change peacefully amounts to cowardice or to a lack of appreciation of the white man's reluctance to share power with the black man. Blood River, which did not involve the entire Zulu nation, but which involved loss of hundreds of lives, was not the end of the story. Zulu conquest at Ulundi on the 4th of July 1879 was not the end of the story. King Cetshwayo, and King Dinuzulu did not give up. King Dinuzulu was the Patron of the now banned African National Congress in 1913 when he died. It was a liberation movement which his son-in-law, Dr Pixley Kalsaka Seme, had founded. There is a continuum which no one can dispute or deny in the black man's struggle in Southern Africa.

The irony of my situation is that the people I lead may again shorten the handle of the spear if I fail to bring about meaningful changes. In accepting the challenges of bringing about changes through peaceful means, one has also to accept the consequences of failure. Those black men and white men who often ridicule me for seeking a peaceful solution must know that I am very much aware of these consequences.

I return, in conclusion, to remarks I made about the concept of detribalisation. We will never again see the kind of 'tribalism' which people have in mind when they talk of detribalisation. There has been an ongoing process of adaptation to constantly changing circumstances. In this process the adaptation was so effective that our mere presence — empty-handed and barefooted as that presence was — constituted a grave threat to white separatists.

To keep the ordinary peasant and worker at bay, whites armed themselves with a hideous arsenal of

oppressive laws and developed a philosophy of police responsibility which constantly hungered after yet greater oppressive laws.

My people are these peasants and workers. I can only make life meaningful to the tribesmen by giving a non-ethnic outreach to national goals of liberation. The course that King Shaka chose and which King Cetshwayo was also following, has taken great bounds since the mid 19th century. He united the Ngunis of this region into a nation. What King Shaka did for this Region, I continue to do in the traditions of others, for the whole of South Africa. This is the progression which they initiated.

King Shaka did much more than just this. He dominated the whole Southern African scene of the 19th century, as we see so clearly in Professor J. D. Omar-Cooper's 'Zulu Aftermath' (sub-titled as A Nineteenth Century Revolution in Bantu Africa). One can never tell the history of his contribution to African unity without looking beyond the borders of South Africa. If we look at Malawi, Zimbabwe or Mozambique or East Africa, we see the trail of this great African military strategist. Wherever I travel in these regions, I find a sense of kinship, a sense of affinity, and an awareness of historical connections.

It has been a good thing for a conference of this nature to be held. It gives all of us an opportunity to look at our perspectives in reading or writing the history of our land. I make bold to say today that Professor Omar-Cooper's perspective, for example, needs to be further explored and developed. It is important at this stage in the history of our liberation struggle for historians to examine the issue of whether they are in fact writing for posterity or just for some future dusty bookshelf.

It is also part of the unpleasant heritage of King Shaka's, King Dingane's, King Mpande's and King Cetshwayo's prowess that many groups of people, white and black, in South Africa tend always to dismiss any black initiative from here as evidence that the Zulu imperium is once again rearing its ugly head. I see no merit in Zulu imperialism. I see only merit in the employment of Zulu experience and the insights they have gained in the struggle for the liberation of South Africa as a whole. That experience and that insight was gained in one corner of South Africa where events each in their turn were events in South African History. No black initiative ceases to be such merely because it is born in what is a Zulu Region. Zulus are also Blacks.

The Zulu rejection of Pretoria-styled independence is now history — and it is South African history. It is a history which will lead to new alliances, new tactics and strategies in ever widening circles.

First the horse hooves and then the jackboot; first the foorlaier and then the sten gun; first the so-called treaty and then the so-called Homelands; first the poll tax and then the dompass; first the trader then the 'baas'. All these disrupted wider social, political and economic relationships in black South Africa. They can now only be repaired at the national level. At this level, all have equal stakes — Xhosa, Zulu, Pedi, Shangaan, Sotho, Swazi, Tswana, English, Afrikaans, Coloured and Indian. We are cultural groups, but what is more we are one people in one land, in spite of our cultural ties as single groups within the South African Nation.

Deficiencies in tribal society can only be remedied at a national multi-ethnic level. That is where I see my task, That is where history is taking us. That is the future which will arise out of the past and the present. That is why I am here today. That is why we are also participating in the forthcoming commemoration ceremonies. I cannot wish away any group amongst those South African people I have mentioned. My commitment to negotiation forces me to look at these things together with other groups as a South African. The fact that others are descendants of the conquerors and others of the conquered, makes no difference. We are here together for keeps. It is up to us whether after the failures of 100 years to find accommodation, we can, in fact, find such accommodation in 1979.

Blood is flowing in many corners of Southern Africa as a result of the people's quest for liberation. We cannot understand the mistakes of yesteryear, unless we look at the events of yesteryear together, rather than in isolation. The fact that we have hurt each other so much in the past, is the very reason why we should get together to see whether it is really in our common interest and in the interest of our common survival to continue hurting each other after a hundred years.

These are reasons for my involvement. I am not involved in order to cover up anything. I want us to look at these events squarely in the face together. This is in the interests of an unbiased historical analysis. But more than that, it is in the interest of our future survival on this tip of Africa.

It is my privilege to declare this Centennial Re-appraisal Conference officially open.

REFERENCES:

1. Brian Roberts: The Zulu Kings.
2. Oliver Walker: Proud Zulu.
3. Shula Marks: Reluctant Rebellion.
4. J. D. Omar-Cooper: The Zulu Aftermath.
5. Herbert Vilakazi: South Africa Yesterday Today and Tomorrow, (Essex Country College (New Jersey)).
6. Blue Books.