

NELSON MANDELA AND THE WIND OF CHANGE

(The Origin, Struggles and Hopeful Victory
Over Apartheid In South Africa)



G.L. BURYA

NC
DT
1757
.B975

NELSON MANDELA AND THE WIND OF CHANGE

(The Origin, Struggles and
Hopeful Victory Over Apartheid
Policy in South Africa)

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF NIGERIA
BRANCH..... #7 Lagos
CALL NO.....
ACC. NO..... 503202
DATE RECEIVED..... 6/10/97

By

GABRIEL LOHODEDOO BURYA



Copyright 1993 Gabriel Lohodedoo Burya

All right reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means or stored in a data base or retrieval system without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Printed by Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited
P.M.B. 1094, Zaria, Nigeria

ISBN 978 125 116 6

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Nigeria's first Military President, General Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida, CFR, FSS, mni, whose unalloyed patriotism for our country - Nigeria, struck me, when on February 13, 1976 he dared the bullets of the seemingly mentally deranged coup d'etat planners and executors, to abort what would have been one of Nigeria's most senseless and bloody military coups d'etat in the seventies.

This work is dedicated to President Ibrahim B. Babangida in appreciation of his conscious and concerted attempts to harness almost all available natural and human resources of Nigeria towards putting the country on the map of sound economic management after the country had passed through the meshes of inglorious social, political and economic doldrums.

Furthermore, the work is an appreciation of the President's systematic approach to institutionalize democracy in the country via a meticulously planned and executed transition to Nigeria's Third Republic.

Also, this book is dedicated to President Ibrahim B. Babangida as a mark of appreciation and honour for the role Nigeria and Nigerians under various governments in the past had played in the elimination of apartheid policy. The role Nigeria and Nigerians under President Ibrahim Babangida have played in hopefully bringing to an end the obnoxious policy of apartheid, and the fact that President Babangida, of all Nigerian leaders, had been destined by Almighty God, not only to witness the imminent collapse of apartheid policy, manifested in the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela from Twenty Seven years of imprisonment, but also to host the latter as Nigeria's august visitor, while on his official visit of appreciation to Nigeria in May, 1990.

Finally, the work is dedicated to our President because he is the most experimental leader Nigeria has ever produced with a tract record of achievement.

This humble work is dedicated to the BCC Lions International Football Club of Gboko, Benue State of Nigeria, for having won the distinguished prestigious and highly coveted CAF Mandela Cup to symbolically crown Nigeria's spirited fight to dismantle the apartheid policy of the white minority government of South Africa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page.....	i
Copy right.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Table of contents.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Preface.....	ix
Chapter 1	
The Wind of Change.....	1
Chapter 2	
The Origins, Definition, Establishment and Growth of Apartheid Policy in South Africa.....	4
Chapter 3	
The Struggle Against South Africa Apartheid Policy.....	22
Chapter 4	
The Impact of External Forces on the Struggle.....	33
Chapter 5	
Mandela: A Strong-Willed Nationalist.....	35
Chapter 6	
Internal Cracks in Apartheid South Africa.....	38
Chapter 7	
Sustaining the Struggle Against Apartheid Policy in South Africa.....	47
Chapter 8	
Nelson Mandela Visits Nigeria.....	54

Chapter 9	
Our Prayer.....	56
Chapter 10	
Dr. Nelson Mandela's visit to Nigeria as reported by Jonah Ajiga of Sunday Voice and Dare Babarinsa of the Newswatch.....	57
Chapter 11	
Conclusion: Our Message.....	69
Appendix I	
Bibliography.....	89
The Author's Biography.....	91

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I am most grateful to the Almighty God for making this work a reality.

I wish to express my profound gratitude to the following people who gave me tremendous assistance in the pursuit of this work: Patrick Ityohegh of Nigerian Television Authority, Lagos, Honourable Benjamin Akaai Chaha, former Speaker in the House of Representatives during Nigeria's Second Republic; Professor Daniel Iyorkegh Saror, Vice-Chancellor, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Jimin Sokpo, Iyorkohol Gberkon, Professor Erastus Gyang, Associate Professor Iyortange Igoil, Dr. O.A. Bamidele of A.B.U. Zaria and Mr. Peter Orgen. Others are Dr. Ijir, Jonathan Biam, Paulinus Iyortyer, Alhaji Yahaya Bawa; Engineer Kitchener, who sponsored many of my journeys to Lagos and Abuja in pursuit of this work, and Christopher Adi all of Benue Cement Company, Tse-Kutchu, Benue State, Nigeria.

Alhaji Aliyu Mohammed, Secretary to the Government of the Federation, the indefatigable friend of the Tiv, inspite of his crowded schedule, made it possible for this book to receive an august attention at the Nigerian Presidency and the subsequent approval for its publication. I wish to humbly register my unreserved heart-felt gratitude to him.

In a related development, I am also very grateful to Mustapha Tor Waya for his wonderful concern and co-operation at the Presidency on this book.

My gratitude to the Nigeria Presidency which finally aided me with funds to publish this book cannot be fully expressed in this short space and time.

I owe a lot of gratitude to the Governor of Benue State, the Reverend Father Moses Orshio Adasu, the scholarly, unrelenting and pragmatic governor and his government who, based on the recommendation of the State Ministry of Education Headquarters, made a financial donation to me in pursuit of this work.

Mention must be made of my teachers, Mr. Daniel Humbe and Mrs. Taylor who taught me the gruesome evils of apartheid in my secondary schools days. I can not leave out the marvelous contribution of my lecturers at the Universities of Ibadan and Jos, who radically nursed me from the crawling stage to the walking age intellectually and academically. Some of these include the late Professor B.J. Dudley, Essien Udom, Obaro Ikime, Bolaji Akinyemi, Augustus Adebayo, Omafume Onoge, Bode Onimode etc.

I am proud to mention here with emphasis that I am greatly

indebted to Dr. Iyorchia Ayu of the University Jos, (whom at the time of this publication has been elected to the Senate) whose revolutionary essays inspired me and have been extensively referred to in this text in order to substantiate some of my assertions.

My warm acknowledgement goes to Messrs Jonah Ajigah of *The Voice Newspaper* and Dare Babarinsa of the *NewsWatch* news magazine whose articles I have caused to be published as Chapter Ten of this work. Mr. Jonah Ajigah's article entitled "Mandela: *The man and His Mission: Recollections of a Hero's Visit to Nigeria*" forms Chapter 10(a). It was published in the *Sunday Voice Newspaper* of May 20, 1990, while Dare Babarinsa's article entitled, "*Red Carpet for Mandela*" was published in the *NewsWatch* news magazine of May 28, 1990 and forms Chapter 10(b) of this work. Seye Kehinde's article entitled "*Portrait of An Activist*", published in *This Week* news magazine has been reproduced in Chapter 5 of the book. I am grateful to him.

Some Nigerians have, through their philanthropic works done a lot to redeem our wretched masses from their down-trodden status, especially the black race. I have been greatly inspired by these people to write this book which aims at contributing to the downfall of apartheid in South Africa - apartheid being a veritable instrument for permanent denigration of the black race. These people include among others Chief M.K.O. Abiola, Alhaji Aminu Dantata, Alhaji Mai Deribe, Chief Emmanuel Iwuanyanwu etc.

I am grateful to my mother, Terundu who toiled day and night and almost went naked to ensure that I acquired western education. In a related development, I am also grateful to the late Evangelist Wanima Ami, Nenger Undu, Andrew Baja, Ezekiel Akiga, Paul Unongo, Pever Ge, etc. Serumun, my son, kept on challenging me that he would live to write this book I salute him for his courage to challenge me, the latter which kept me on the beat.

Mr. Elias Ozioko did the original draft typing of this work, while Iorfa Gbir did the final typing. Their secretarial excellence is hereby deeply acknowledged.

Finally, I lack the words to express my appreciation to Dr. George Obiozor, the Director General, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs. He meticulously went through the manuscript and made some useful corrections. His face to face discussion of this manuscript with me at the Institute and final recommendation to the Office of the President that my work was a "publishable material" coupled with his marvelous reception and hospitality, make me feel that Nigeria possesses men of high intellectual and social status who can tolerate the struggles of the down-trodden but persevering and determined up-coming citizens in their

various endeavours.

I am grateful to Mrs. Comfort Ahur for her persistently good, soul-touching advice and encouragement. Mercy, my dear hard working and encouraging wife has been a great source of inspiration to me, while I worked on this book. She deserves a big "thank you". Mr. Mathias Alaa's contribution by way of typing the corrected scripts is also acknowledged.

Finally, my thanks go to my publishers, the Ahmadu Bello University Press, Zaria, whose immense co-operation I have received in publishing this book at short notice to enable me achieve my purpose, which in the words of Walter Rodney,

"has been to try to reach Africans who wish to explore further the nature of their exploitation, rather than to satisfy the standards' set by our oppressors and their spokesmen in the academic world".

Gabriel Lohodoodoo Burya
B.Sc. (Pol. Sc.) (Ibadan)
M.P.A. (Jos)
Registrar,
College of Education,
Katsina-Ala,
Benue State,
Nigeria.

March 31, 1991.

PREFACE

In 1690, John Locke, a western philosopher wrote his second treatise for the purpose of justifying the English revolution of 1688. According to John Locke, men had once lived unrelated lives in a state of nature. At a certain state of development, they entered into a social contract with one another thereby creating both a society and a government. By the terms of contract, each individual surrendered part of his natural rights, and in return, received protection and other advantages of organized government. He therefore argued that

the acts of government must be in accordance with the moral principles, what is right or what is wrong being determined by the will of the majority. If a government seriously threatens the interests of society, the people may pull it down and substitute another government for it.

In the Union of South African Republic, some 200 Dutch settlers established themselves in 1652 through the leadership of Jan Van Riebeeck. With the increase in the number of Boers (Dutch) and the settlements, the policy of separation (apartheid) has become the political dogma based on the fear by the minority whites that the majority Africans will one day dominate them, unless they (Africans) were perpetually held in check. The policy of apartheid which the former South African Prime Minister H.F. Verwood particularly developed, originates from an Afrikaans (Dutch) word meaning "Separateness" or "segregation".

Apartheid, since its establishment has grown in power, status and modus operandi. It can be observed that John Locke correctly believes that, any government that fails to act in accordance with the moral principles, i.e. what is wrong or right as determined by the will of the majority, should be pulled down. Any government that threatens the interest of society should be pulled down and substituted with another government. The various governments that have come into being in South Africa can not be said to be established by the will of the majority of the people. This forms an even more fundamental deviation from the principles of social contract. The majority Africans have not even been allowed to participate in the formation of government in a land which is naturally their own. To worsen matters, the minority whites who erroneously believe that they have a birth right to rule over the majority blacks have over many years established governments which have been the exclusive preserve of the whites. These governments, apart from not being formed by the majority South Africa (blacks) have, through the

policy of apartheid, failed to act in accordance with the normal principles and have by so doing "threatened seriously" the interests of the South African society. They have unwittingly laid a solid foundation for the present day anti-apartheid struggles. One of the leading fighters in the struggle is Dr. Nelson Mandela. The aim of the struggle is first and foremost to pull down the apartheid policy, following which a democratically elected government involving all (enfranchised) citizens of South Africa, irrespective of racial origin would be established.

In order to fight apartheid policy of South African white minority government, nationalists movements emerged in that country as early as the policy of apartheid itself. One of such movements was the African National Congress (ANC). Dr. Nelson Mandela joined the movement and was one of the co-founders of African National Congress, Youth League. He was later voted as the President of the ANC Transvaal Branch in 1952 before he was banned by the racist South African regime.

Organized fighting against apartheid was strongly waged by the ANC and other black nationalists movements. For Mandela, the racists white South African government could not tolerate any longer his uncompromising stand. They thus framed up a charge that he had planned treason, i.e. to overthrow the government of South Africa. Thus,

"between 1956 and 1961, he was put on trial for treason and in 1961, he was acquitted. Later, in 1962, Dr. Mandela was arrested and sentenced to five years imprisonment. Thereafter, he was put on trial for further charges and sentenced to life imprisonment in June, 1964".

Dr. Mandela on his part, in spite of numerous physical and psychological tortures, refused to yield to the humiliations and calls of the white South African Government that he renounced violence against the South African Government so that he could be released. The world community with conscience also continued to fight against apartheid and for Mandela's release from prison. On February 11, 1990, the South African white minority government could not stand both internal and external anti-apartheid pressures it released Dr. Mandela from prison after he had spent 27 years there.

On Saturday, May 12, 1990, the Weekend Concord reported that, Dr. Mandela would start his visit to Nigeria on Sunday, May 13, 1990. This writer who has been a strong but silent anti-apartheid supporter felt that the time had come for him to do something which would leave indelible marks on the sands of history, as regards Nigeria's fervent anti-apartheid policy and struggle, i.e. to write a little book which would mark Dr. Mandela's visit to Nigeria. Thus, the writer hurriedly gathered some materials, bent down and has been able to publish this little book.

Due to logistic problems, the book has not been published as early as the writer would wish.

The handwritten work was completed in late May, 1990, and was typed. The writer, however, felt that it would be more proper to include some accounts of the visit for consumption of those who could not watch the memorable visit of this giant nationalist to Nigeria and that has been done. Furthermore, a few post-Mandela visit events have been touched in the conclusion in order to make our value judgement and message clearer. As at the time of publishing, many events may have rendered some of the references and assertions outdated. This is normal and should be noted accordingly.

This little piece of work is thus divided into the following chapters: Chapter One deals with the Wind which is currently blowing across the world including South Africa, where Dr. Mandela had to be released under such a wind of change or the South African racist minority government would be left to face the torment of the torrents of change.

Chapter Two deals with the Origins, Definitions and Growth of Apartheid Policy. Chapter Three deals with the fight against apartheid policy. Chapter Four is a brief reference to the external forces that influenced the fight against apartheid policy. Chapter Five treats very briefly Dr. Nelson Mandela as a very strong-willed nationalist.

Chapter Six talks about the eventual internal cracks in the racist white minority government that finally gave way for the release of Dr. Mandela. Chapter Seven, talks about the release of Mandela as just the beginning of a revolution and how the revolutionary fight could be sustained - a suggestion being that African Nationalists among other guiding stars, should look at the Nicaraguan revolution. Chapter Eight brings reports about Dr. Mandela's impending visit to Nigeria. Chapter Nine contains our Prayers for Dr. Nelson Mandela. Chapter Ten, is the visit of Dr. Mandela as reported by Jonah Ajiga, the Editor of *Sunday Voice*, a Makurdi based publication of the Benue Printing and Publishing Corporation (BPPC) owned by the Benue State Government and by Dare Babarinsa of the *Newswatch*, a Lagos based News magazine.

Finally, chapter eleven is the Conclusion, which carries our message.

This piece of work is neither a claim to excellence on apartheid nor is it intended to be master piece on Dr. Mandela.

It is just a token appreciation of Dr. Mandela's acknowledgement of the role being played by Nigeria in the fight against apartheid generally, and the fight which she (Nigeria) fought specifically for his release. The acknowledgement on the part of Mandela has been

demonstrated through a visit to Nigeria within the first half a year of his breathing the air of freedom, following twenty-seven years of incarceration in South African prisons.

Finally, the writer wishes to conclude this preface with the words of one of his highly admired and respected intellectual giants and one of the world's Marxist ideological lodestars, the late Dr. Walter Rodney, who has correctly stated that

but contrary to the fashion in most prefaces, I will not add 'all mistakes and shortcomings are entirely my responsibility'. That is sheer bourgeois subjectivism. Responsibility in matters of these sorts is always collective, especially with regard to remedying shortcoming.

Gabriel Lohodedoo Burya
B.Sc. (Pol. Sc. (Ibadan));
M.P.A. (Jos)
Registrar,
College of Education,
Katsina-Ala,
Benue State,
Nigeria.

March 31, 1991.

"....only pressure and shouts of war
..... can change the attitude of the Boers".

General Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida
CFR, FSS, MNI, President and
Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces
of Nigeria at a Conference
on Apartheid in Lagos, *Africa*
Concord, November 28, 1988.

"Those who make peaceful reforms impossible
make violent revolutions inevitable".

J.F. Kennedy,
Former President of the
United States of America.

"During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle
of the African people. I have fought against white
domination, and I have fought against black domination. I
have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in
which all persons live together in harmony and with equal
opportunities. It is an ideal which I do hope to live for and
to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am
prepared to die".

Nelson Mandela,
Imprisoned Leader of
A.N.C.

CHAPTER ONE

The Wind of Change

To men and women all over the world, big or small, intellectuals and non-intellectuals who hold tenaciously to ideological dogmatism, the year 1990 and beyond seemingly promised to be a period of incontrovertibly shattered dreams. The year 1990 and the years beyond seem to be on the vent of being directed by a ferociously uncontrollable wind of change. To christians, it would appear as if the Lord Jesus Christ is at the door steps to perform his divinely sanctioned second coming to judge the world.

Today, the "Iron Curtain" has been torn by social, political and economic blitzkriegs. The Warsaw Pact is wearing a glorified garb. The Berlin Wall has crumbled and the two "Germanys" are eventually going to be united. Perestroika is dealing irrecoverable blows to the socio-political and economic system of one of the world's super-powers, the Soviet Union. Azerbaijan is seeking for a political independence from the Soviet Union. Other fall-outs of Gorbachev's unprecedented reforms are that Lithuania is asking for her rightful place in the comity of nations. It is the same with Czechoslovakia, Romania, etc. The students of China took to the streets in demand for democratic reforms in June, 1989. The Chinese armed forces mowed them down. This promises to be only a temporary solution. The grand design of protest is still smouldering in China. India is not ready to take nonsense from Pakistan over Kashmir. The Latin American States (small as some of them are) are not ready to be cowed by the dictates of the world acclaimed numero uno imperialist, the United States of America. The charge of imperialism against the United States of America is grievous and needs substantiating. Instances of imperialist drives on the part of the United States of America can easily be cited with a quotation from Dr. Iyorchia Ayu's book titled "Essays in Popular Struggles".

Generally, American attacks are defined as counter revolutions, which Dr. Kissinger once defended by saying: I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people.

Dr. Ayu has contended correctly that

Kissinger's belligerent pronouncement is simply an old philosophy in a new bottle. Even before official declaration by Monroe in 1823, the United States constituted itself into an organized terror squad for Latin

American countries. Interventions around the world are legend. Puerto Rico (1898); Cuba (1898) Honduras (1905); Panama (1908); Mexico (1910); Guatemala (1954); Cuba again (1961); Dominican Republic (1965); Chile (1973); and most recently, Grenada (1983). others include, Korea, Vietnam, Iran, Angola, the Philippines, Lebanon, etc. In Nicaragua alone, American marines have come for surgical operations against regimes in 1908, 1912 and through the period 1925-1933.

In Africa, America terrorized Libya in 1986 and supported terrorist organizations such as UNITA under Jonas Savimbi in Angola, etc. and terrorist regimes such as the apartheid government of South Africa through Reagan's policy of "Constructive Engagement" which Dr. Ayu defines correctly as:

euphemism for active support for apartheid South Africa.

France has abandoned her hitherto uncompromising stand and determination to emerge and appear as the world leader of European nations. Rather, the European nation states are currently working towards establishing a European Community - the linkage effects of which are bound to have adverse effect on the third world, especially Africa. Japan is on the way of pulling-off her closely guarded international behavioural garment which America adorned her with, since the end of world war two. In the Middle East, some Jews in Israel, today, truly feel that in as much as they are the sons of Abraham with Sarah through Isaac, the Arabs too are the sons of Abraham with Hagar through Ishmael and that there should be at least a little compromise over the fight for Palestine in order to enable the Palestinian Arabs to settle down permanently. And most recently, the South African government, yielding to both internal and international social, political and economic pressure, has released Dr. Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela, 72, the world's acclaimed longest serving political prisoner, through the handiwork of history marker, President of the Republic of South African Union, Mr. F.W. de Klerk.

Dr. Mandela was released on Sunday, 11th February, 1990 at 3.00 p.m. Nigerian time from his prison camp in Cape Town, after serving 27 years in prison for a concocted charge of treasonable felony - a plan to topple the racist apartheid government of South Africa.

The release of Dr. Mandela is just one of the positive results of the historical revolutionary struggles of the South African oppressed people against imperialism, the latter which is manifested in the repressive, oppressive and racist government of South Africa. Robert Nisber (1982) defines revolution as something which is fundamentally political in character, concerned with the calculated overthrow of some political order, using as much force as deemed necessary to effect

changes in men's moral, economic, social and intellectual lives. He goes on to say that, the modern revolutionary mentality has required above all else, conviction of the sanctified nature of political power when directed to chosen moral and social ends. Revolution, he says as used in western history, is first and last political revolution, its ends and means alike conceived as political in the first instance, whatever may be its vision of human society. The progressive world hopes and believes that the release of Dr. Mandela from South African prison which is just a tip of the iceberg in terms of achievement of the revolutionary struggles of the incarcerated people of South Africa, is the genesis of a gargantuan and multi-dimensional outcome of the unyielding and historical revolutionary battles pitched by the forces of progress against those of reaction, specifically in South Africa and in general terms, the whole world.

Once the current superstructure of South Africa is dismantled, then, a free flow of the currents of moral, social, economic, intellectual, liberation will naturally follow as is the case with revolutions all over the world. In order to understand the present happenings in South Africa, however, one needs to go, albeit briefly, into the history of European settlement, take over of South Africa by the whites, marginalization of Africans, introduction of apartheid policy and eventual record-setting imprisonment of Dr. Nelson Mandela. The next chapter is therefore titled: "The Origin, Definition, Establishment and Growth of Apartheid Policy in South Africa".

CHAPTER TWO

The Origin, Definition, Establishment and Growth of Apartheid Policy in South Africa

As the writer has stated elsewhere, the apartheid policy-originated trouble in South Africa started in 1652 when Jan Van Riebeeck of the Dutch East Indies company landed with his group of 200 (Dutch) and initiated a permanent settlement in South Africa at the Cape of Good Hope. Wilson and Thompson (1969:187) have, however, reported that Jan Van Riebeeck went ashore with ninety men. They said that

on 20th March, 1651 the seventeen approved a proposal discussed for twenty months in various committees that 'to provide that East India ships, to and from Batavia may.... (procure).... herbs, flesh, water, and other needful refreshments - and by this means restore health of their sick a general rendezvous be formed' at the Cape of Good Hope. On 07th April, 1652, an expedition of about ninety men, under Jan Van Riebeeck, went ashore at Table Bay.

A ship named Haerlem had wrecked at the Table Bay in March, 1647. The survivors reportedly were compelled to remain there until March, 1648. When they discovered that the Table Valley was made up of

fertile, well-watered soil, where a very great variety of vegetables could be grown, including citrus, known to be effective against scurvy (diseased state of the blood caused, especially among sailors in former times, by eating too much salt, meat and not enough fresh vegetables and fruits). The Remonstrance, (another ship of Dutch sailors which followed the wreck of the Haerlem) recommended making a garden at Table Bay, which would become a compulsory stop for VOC ships to and from batavia. The consequent prevention of sickness, the reduced provisions necessary on board, and the shorter voyage involved in bypassing St. Helena would entail great savings. Fresh water could be obtained more easily by building pipes or a pier, and accidents prevented by those on shore guiding ships into harbour. The Remonstrance (ship) denied the assertion that the natives were cannibals (as earlier reported by other Dutch sailors). They responded to kindness, learnt Dutch easily, and might become servants and be taught christianity. Finally, the Remonstrance warned the VOC that, if the Cape was not occupied by the Dutch, it might be used by or public enemies Spanish and Portuguese' as a base for attacking Dutch ships.

Furthermore, another report by Boxer has shown that one of the greatest merits or advantages of the Cape was that:

it was a temperate area, without tropical diseases, where Europeans could safely grow fruit and vegetables effectively in preventing shipboard diseases like scurvy" (Wilson et. al. 1969:188).

The scourge of scurvy was eminent and high, producing invalids, who often lay at the hospital at Batavia for months without engaging in any activities "but drawing wages notwithstanding". It was in the light of the scurvy harassment coupled with other "hazards on voyages normally lasting five-and-a-half to seven months or more", that the VOC occupied the Cape as a refreshment station. Van Riebeeck was ordered "to build a lodge and fort near a fresh-water stream running into the harbour, and to select suitable land for gardens, pasture, and cattle breeding". Van Riebeeck complied and the establishment of white settlement in South Africa, the origin of today's apartheid policy, became a reality. It is reported that the unhesitating compliance of Van Riebeeck with this directive stemmed partially from the fact that, he "was trying to reinstate himself in his first VOC post since his dismissal in 1648 for private trading".

It is significant to note that the setting up of a Dutch out-post at the Table Bay to serve an economic purpose was accompanied by the concept of racism. The Dutch, right from their metropolitan Netherlands had conceived and were also taught by Pseudo-European scientists to believe that they belonged to one of the superior races on earth. This belief was transplanted to South Africa. As we have stated elsewhere, the present abhorrent apartheid policy of South Africa derives its unfortunate origin and strength from the ungodly concept of racism. Leon Baradat (1979:272) has stated that, the tradition of racism which "began in pre-history was passed through Fichte, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche Gobineau, Wagner, and Chamberlain and was finally adopted by Hitler as a basis of his insane political theory". Gobineau, for one had stated that, "indeed, there was only one area left in which the Aryan blood was pure enough to offer hope for revival of human civilization. Extending across northern eastern Europe, Gobineau's Aryan heaven included Ireland, England, Northern France, the Benelux countries and Scandinavia. The ancient Gaul, the Franks, a Teutonic people had conquered the inferior celts and had become the ruling nobility. This according to Gobineau's Pseudo-scientific theory the French nobility's Aryan ancestry justified its continued rule". (Baradat op cit, page 270).

From the foregoing, it can be deduced that, the Dutch considered themselves among the world's superior races since they came from the

Netherlands (which constitutes one of the Benelux countries). This is the unfortunate feeling of racial superiority with which the Dutch arrived and settled in South Africa. It was only a matter of time for them to manifest their racism in their dealings with the black Africans, beginning with the Khoikhoi whom they first encountered at the Table Bay. It was therefore no wonder that

racial commingling had reached the point within sixteen years of the founding of the colony where intimacy between the whites and non-whites was denounced as a 'disgrace to the Netherlands and other Christian nations'. In 1685, inter-marriage was forbidden officially between whites and freed slave women, (Legum 1969: 483).

Thus, the seeds of apartheid had been sown. All that was needed was for the seeds to germinate so as to be nurtured to growth. The seeds actually germinated and the social political and economic plant was nomenclatured "apartheid policy".

Subsequently, with the increase in the number of Boers or Dutch settlers and settlements, the policy of separation between the whites and blacks, i.e. apartheid gradually became deep-rooted. Apartheid policy, we now confirm, was initiated by the Boer (Dutch) settlers in South Africa. From that time on, apartheid (separation) has become a political dogma based on the fear by the minority whites that the majority Africans (blacks) will one day dominate them (whites), unless they (Africans) were kept in perpetual check. The policy of apartheid which the former South African Prime Minister, H.F. Verwoerd particularly developed originates from an Afrikaans (Boer) word meaning separateness" or "segregation". Apartheid is the political policy of the ruling Nationalist Party in South Africa which states that whites and non-whites in South Africa should develop separately. It states that, Africans should be allowed political and economic rights only in the Bantustans (African Homelands).

Elliot says apartheid is an Afrikaans word (literally 'apart-hood') meaning racial segregation as practiced by the National Party which came to power in South Africa in 1948. According to Elliot, apartheid has existed in South Africa since the mid-seventeenth century when European colonization began, adding that

but the National Party introduced measures affecting nearly all aspects of the life of the non-whites, who form over 80 percent of the population. The policy involves racial purity and segregation, and white paramouncy (baskap). Ideally it means that, the races should be given separate and equal opportunities, but, supporters and opponents alike agree that this is almost impossible.

Surprisingly enough, apartheid was advocated by both intellectuals and churchmen before it became an official policy of government in 1948, following the formation of government in South Africa by the Nationalist Party. The churchmen supported apartheid with quotations from the Bible among which is Genesis 1:4 which states that God separated darkness from light. That is the basis for separating the blacks from the whites, they contended. Colin Legum (1969:482-483) says that, apartheid which is also regarded as the establishment of white aristocracy in South Africa was evolved in the early decades of white settlement in the middle of the seventeenth century. He says apartheid was not created by the Dutch East Indies Company but by the (Dutch) settlers themselves. He reveals further that, the Dutch Reformed Church did not encourage or recognize the policy of apartheid until 1857 when "the races were separated in the Dutch Reformed Church". Colin Legums (1969: 482-483) has this to say:

(apartheid) was evolved in the early decades of white settlement in the middle of the seventeenth century. It was the creation not of the Dutch East Indies Company but, of the settlers themselves. Official and church policy tried hard at fist to draw the social line, not between the races, but between 'christians and barbarians'. Van Riebeeck held this to be the proper distinction between civilized and uncivilized peoples. And, indeed, for two centuries, the Dutch Reformed Church upheld the principles of the oneness of all christians. 'The issue was not what a man's colour was, but whether he was a member of the christian church'. It was not until 1857 that the races were separated in the Dutch Reformed Church.

Going by the above quotation, one can safely contend that the leaders/members of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa, might have abandoned their search for spiritual guide on the vexing issue of white aristocracy and consequently succumbed to the supreme wishes and pressure of the world, i.e. the diehard originators and practitioners of the apartheid policy. It is sad to observe that apartheid, a veritably inhuman policy which began its journey in the middle of the seventeenth century in South Africa, was serviced by the white South African intellectuals and was finally refuelled for a hitch-free journey in the social, poetical and economic life of South Africa by christianity of the South African type.

Writing on the origin of apartheid policy, Leonard M. Thompson of the University of California, in *Encyclopedia Americana*, International Edition, 1981, says:

Apartheid is an Afrikaans word meaning apartness. It is the official designation for the racial policies of South Africa. The term was coined

as a political slogan of the Afrikaner National Party in the early 1940s, but, the policies themselves have roots going back to the beginnings of the white settlement in 1652. Since 1948, when the Nationalist came to power, apartheid has become intensified and systematized. More recently the government has tended to substitute the slogan 'separate development' for 'apartheid'.

In order to understand the policy of apartheid, it would be necessary to study, albeit briefly, the cardinal principles or the key features of the apartheid policy.

Racial segregation is one of the cardinal principles of the devilish system of apartheid. Colin Legum (1969: 482-483) refers to this as the establishment of white aristocracy:

in which all whites - irrespective of origin, religion or accomplishment - are entitled to share fully, and from which all non-whites - irrespective of their accomplishments or qualifications are virtually excluded.

Leonard M. Thompson (1981) says that racial segregation is the first cardinal principle of apartheid policy. He adds that:

such segregation rests on sociological and theological assumptions that the races are the fundamental divisions of mankind and that each race has its own peculiar culture and destiny, which cannot be fulfilled if races intermingle in a common society. From these premises, it is argued that a country like South Africa - where whites form 19 per cent of the population, Africans 68 per cent Asians 3 percent) 10 percent - should separate its races into distinct territories each of which ultimately should become an autonomous, unracial state.

Commenting on the racial segregation, principle of apartheid Elliot says:

the policy involves racial purity and segregation and white paramourcy (baaskap).

Sixteen years after the founding of the South African colony, the idea of whites and blacks living together was considered a social anathema by the white racists and they called for a separation of races in order to avoid exposing their home country, the Netherlands to international disgrace. Legum (1969: 483) aptly puts it this way:

racial commingling had reached the point within sixteen years of the founding of the colony where intimacy between whites and non-whites was denounced as a 'disgrace to the Netherlands and other christian nations'. In 1685, inter-marriage was forbidden officially between whites and freed slave women.

From the foregoing quotation, it can be crystal clearly seen how the white Boers of South Africa had began to lay the foundations for the establishment of a society lacking in pluralism, i.e. a decision making process in which the people's interests are represented by various pressure groups; (and) governmental policy is a compromise between the competing interests and those groups. It must be stressed here that people whom the whites Boers wanted to be separated from in South Africa are the hundreds of tribes of Africans found in that country, whom Legum (1969: 489) has classified into four major linguistic groups, namely the Nguni (Zulu and Xhosa), the Sotho (Basuto and Bechuana); the Venda and the Tonga. Broadly speaking, these are the tribal groups that have come under the unrelenting hammer of white South Africa on grounds of racism, by whites, especially the Boers (Africaners).

Peter Calvocoressi confirms the establishment of white supremacy (especially Afrikaner Nationalism) over the blacks, when he says:

The Afrikaners had to resort to increasingly stringent measures and extreme ideologies in order to preserve and justify their newly won supremacy, and by the middle of the century South Africa had become an oligarchy ruled by a particular racial group without the consent of the majority of the governed who - to make matters worse - were a different colour.

Jack Watson (1984: 408) also confirms that the basis of apartheid policy was racial segregation in the Union of South Africa Republic. He says:

apartheid was intended to strengthen the separation of non-white from white and to reinforce baaskap, white supremacy.

Judging from the foregoing few sources we have referred to, it can be categorically established that one of the cardinal principles of apartheid policy has been racial segregation between the 'superior' whites (mostly Boers) on one hand and the African blacks and coloured on the other hand.

While it is not possible to enumerate all aspects of the implementation of the cardinal principle of racial segregation in this short space, it is pertinent to mention that in practical terms, the principle has been upheld in the following manner. First and foremost, the Nationalist Party introduced laws which, in the words of Elliot:

affected the political rights of non-whites, and their rights of movement, choice of residence, property, worship, choice of occupation and marriage. Other laws have established separate non-white territorial units, known as Bantustans. In 1953, it was made a crime for a native

worker to participate in, or instigate a strike, regulations as to the mixing of races were altered after a court decision that facilities must be equal, so that segregation became valid whether the facilities were equal or not; and the responsibility for native education was transferred from the Provinces to the Ministry for Native Affairs, who in introducing the law stated that the teachers who believed in equality were not desirable teachers for the natives.

The principle of racial segregation gradually penetrated all nooks and crannies of South African social, political and economic life under the leadership of the Nationalist Party. For, Jack Watson, (1948: 409) reports that:

in 1956, coloured electors (of mixed race) were removed from the common register and the parliamentary system further purified in favour of the whites.

By later part of the sixties, the pre-war pass-laws were tightened and extended so that the movement without authority became impossible for non-whites. Identity cards recorded the owner's racial group and almost everywhere races were ruthlessly segregated. African children were educated separately from white children and at lower level. African housing was apart from white housing.

Watson (ibid page 409) further reveals that:

where possible, jobs especially those which carried responsibility, were transferred to whites and every effort made, as long as it did not damage the white man's property, to move the non whites into the reserves under the Group Areas Act. Asians, about 3 percent of South African population, were encouraged to return to India while the Nationalist Government shrugged off the protests of Indian government. An earlier Immorality Act was reinforced to prevent marriage and all sexual relations between the races. All resistance was dealt with ruthlessly, not least under the far-reaching suppression of Communism Act, and when the Nationalist found the counts unco-operative, they over-ruled them, creating a new and reliable High Court of Parliament.

Racial segregation reached such stages which included the visiting of post offices, etc. The whites claimed that, the standard of living of black Africans was higher and better than in other African states, stressing that apartheid was an immeasurable benefit to the blacks.

An analyst of apartheid policy has observed that, the "central feature of apartheid (racial segregation) was the creation of Bantustans by Verwoerd: eight regions which would eventually become self-governing were set aside for Africans", for example, Transkei, Pondoland, East Griqualand, Sekhukhuniland, Bahurutse Tembuland, Gcalekaland and Tsonga in the Northern Transvaal.

The policy of bantustans implies that, Africans can only own land in the "Bantu areas" and not in the "white areas". While the whites carry out local administration in the white provinces and municipal councils, the traditional chiefs administer the bantustans which constitute only a meager 12 percent of the land. It must be emphatically stated that in practice racial segregation is far from its utopian or make-believe idealism. This is because as Chompson (1981) has revealed:

over 63 percent of the Africans and virtually all Asians and colored inhabitants reside in white areas where the economy depends upon their labour.

A close study of the explanations given by the South African Minister of Bantu Administration for the establishment of Bantustans clearly manifests the emptiness and wholesale impracticability of the heinous and savage son called racial segregation and his demoniacal mother called white supremacy. In 1960, the Minister was reported in *South African Today* (Legum 1969: 495) as having said:

ethnically, the distribution of South Africa's 9.5 million Bantu population is as follows: Xhosa 2.8 million; Zulu, 2.5 million; Southern Sotho 1 million, Northern Sotho 1 million, Venda 0.2 million, Ndebele 0.2 million, other smaller groups 0.3 million. The Principle behind the policy of separate or autogenous development is that the less developed Bantu should be guided by their European guardian towards self-realizations and self-government within their own communities and in their own areas.... The policy therefore aims at providing the Bantu with his own institutions, and offering him ample scope in the service of his community. There he can develop as fast as his own inherent power can drive him. In time to come, the political, economic and social structure will be centred in their own national homelands" A time limit cannot be set for the spiritual emancipation of backward people.... The object of apartheid policy is to imbue the Bantu with a spirit of independence and self-help so that they can do things for themselves.... As the Bantu learns to govern himself, the European will gradually withdraw himself from his position as guardian.

Meanwhile, the government will be represented by Commissioners-General in the Bantu homelands whose main tasks will be to give guidance and advice.... Politically and territorially, the various Bantu units and the established European unit will move in the direction of a South African Commonwealth roughly on the British pattern.

One important principle of the apartheid policy is white supremacy. On one hand, one may argue that racism produced white supremacy. White supremacy produced apartheid, which is the separation of races in South Africa, especially between whites on one

hand and the blacks, the coloured and the Indians on the other. Viewed from another perspective, one may also state that racism was instrumental to the establishment of the apartheid policy in South Africa. Apartheid then gave birth to racial separation and white supremacy. Which ever way one views it, one important fact still remains that the gothic policy of apartheid policy derives its strength from the unsaintly concept of white supremacy. Thompson (1981) has clearly stated that, apartheid policy is more complex than mere separation of whites from the blacks. There is a feeling of white supremacy among the South African whites which has assumed a religious flavour. It is this unalloyed commitment to white supremacy that keeps apartheid on its barbarous and obnoxious beats. In what may be regarded as a rather mild language, Thompson (1981) has stated that:

apartheid involves more than separation. The white population in South Africa occupies a position of supremacy, based on history and custom and buttressed by law. The central government has sovereign powers over the entire country, including the Transkei (one of the eight Bantustans - black homelands). Only whites may be members of parliament and cabinet. Members of parliament are elected by white voters or appointed by the government except four, who are elected by coloured voters. African chiefs are paid by government and may be dismissed by the government. (The major organizations opposed to apartheid are banned, many individual opponents of the doctrine are imprisoned or otherwise silenced. African trade unions are not recognized in industrial bargaining. Only whites may possess firearms or be arms-carrying members of the military and police force.

While it is true that Thompson (1981) has clearly outlined some prominent features of white supremacy, it is also true that his language is too mild in describing a situation such as the so-called supremacy of one race over another. At any rate, that is his style. It is only hoped that his approach is not teleguided from the headquarters of whiteman's value judgement. Secondly, it is our view that Thompson should at least have pointed out one or two examples to concretise his points. That is lacking. It is on this note that we wish to highlight, one, that is, the issue of dismissal of chiefs who voiced out against apartheid policy. For instance, Chief Luthuli who was a moderate and highly respected leader attempted to defy the segregation laws in 1952 and he was instantly

deprived of his chieftaincy and a new law was introduced to impose flogging on those who wilfully broke existing laws. (Watson 1984: 410).

The rise of apartheid has met with some form of resistance, except that government has taken a very stern stand against any form of

opposition to white supremacy in particular and apartheid policy in general. Thomspton (1981) has stated that, "the major organisations opposed to apartheid are banned". Which are these organizations? Before we come to mention the organizations that stand against apartheid, it is important to note in the words of Legum (1969: 498) that

opponents of apartheid can be classified in three categories; those who oppose Nationalist doctrines, but never-the-less uphold white supremacy (the conservative opposition); those who reject both apartheid and the aristocracy (the revolutionary opposition); and between the two a racial opposition which must be distinguished from each other.

The Conservative Opposition of United Party "rejects apartheid but uphold its segregation". The radical opposition broke away from the United Party in protest against lack of liberalism. The Black Sash is "a very militant and brave organization of women who care about human rights". There is the South African Institute of Race Relations, which is considered very liberal and known for "objective scientific inquiry that it produces and sponsors". The revolutionary oppositions which have faced the wrath of the South African Law are The Liberal Party, The Congress of Democrats, South African Congress of Trade unions, African National Congress, The Pan-African Congress and The Indian National Congress. Others are South African Communist Party, Mass Democratic Movement, United Democratic Front, the Council of Union of South Africa. There is the Inkhata Movement headed by Chief Buthelezi, which until recently was considered a conservative non-political party organization. The number of individual opponents of apartheid policy who have either been eliminated or banned by the South African white minority government are too numerous to mention here. However, in order to prove the point, it is pertinent to mention Steven Biko, founder of the Black Consciousness Movement, who, inspite of his "peaceful resistance of apartheid" died of brain injuries sustained from the brutal manhandling of South african white police. He died while in police custody. Watson (1984: 410) has correctly stated that

Government investigators (of Biko's death) alleged that nobody was criminally responsible for his death, but, this did little to persuade those who alleged that he had been murdered.

Nelson Mandela, the central figure in this book, a strong founding member of the African National Congress, was accused of planing to overthrow the government of South africa and establish a communist government. Consequently, he was sentenced to

imprisonment in 1962, released and later sentenced to life imprisonment in 1964.

Also, in March, 1960, several thousand Africans who sought to resist apartheid via Ghandi's methods, gathered at Sharpsville to carry out a demonstration against the South African pass laws and "to invite arrest". The police fired at them and killed sixty-seven. Watson, (1984: 410) wrote that

the authorities sought to terrify them with low flying jets and eventually the police opened fire, killing sixty-seven as the Africans tried to escape and demonstrating to the world the ruthlessness of the South African System.

In 1973, eleven African miners were shot at Western Deep Levels Mine in the Transvaal in a very violent clash with the police. This further confirms the level to which the concept of white supremacy can be protected.

As if to worsen matters, in 1976, there was a mass revolt against apartheid in the black townships including Soweto, near Johannesburg. The police confronted the African demonstrators with a premeditated and well co-ordinated brutal attack, killing more than two hundred blacks. One writer has reported the incident as follows:

The police hit back with violence far in excess of that used in Sharpsville. Official casualty figures put non-white deaths at Soweto and elsewhere well over two hundred. The authorities meanwhile, continued to deal harshly with moderate black leaders. Luthuli had died in 1967.

Colin Legum (1969: 482) has referred to what we call white supremacy as white aristocracy. He says that the strongest strand (of apartheid) is the establishment and maintenance in South Africa of an aristocracy in which all whites - irrespective of origin, religion or accomplishment - are entitled to share fully, and from which all non-whites - irrespective of their accomplishments or qualifications - are virtually excluded. He adds that, this pattern was evolved in the early decades of white settlement in the middle of the seventeenth century. It was the creation not of the Dutch East Indies Company but of the settlers themselves. Legum reports that official and church policy tried hard at first to draw the social line, not between the races, but between christians and barbarians'. According to Van Riebeeck this was the proper distinction between civilized and uncivilized peoples. Reports say that "indeed, for two centuries the Dutch Reformed Church upheld the principles of the oneness of all christians. 'The issue was not what a

man's colour was, but, whether he was a member of the christian church'. It was not until 1857 that the races were separated in the Dutch Reformed Church".

Legum (1969: 483) has stated that, both the whites and non-whites co-habited in South africa until the commingling had reached a point

within sixteen years of the founding of the colony where intimacy between whites and non-whites was denounced as a 'disgrace to the Netherlands and other christian nations.

Consequently in 1685 inter-marriage was forbidden officially between whites and freed slave women.

Our main purpose here is to highlight the major traits or characteristics of white aristocracy as an off-shoot of the hienous apartheid policy. For want of time and space, we shall state briefly such practices that conform with the concept of white aristocracy. White aristocracy introduced lack of desire by the white to work with blacks. The labour policy was that:

all hard work was regarded as 'Kaffir work' and socially degrading.

While it may be thought that white aristocracy, especially division of labour was based purely on the feeling of superiority on the part of the whites in relation to the non-whites, it is important to stress here that this policy partially originated from the disgraceful, indolence and moral degeneration of the early white settlers who occupied their time with debaseful alcoholism. It is reported by Legum (1969: 483) that, the labourers among the early settlers were:

mostly idlers who did not like regular work and who as numerous letters prove, were mostly enslaved to drink. Thus, it was that immediately after the settlement of the whiteman he began to establish a particular race pattern which necessarily resulted in the creation, in the long run, of a problem of most serious dimension.

The inability and lack of will to work became 'a way of life' with taboos, religious and social sanctions to justify it, reports Legum. It is therefore not surprising that

within a single generation, the foundations were laid of a society of masters and servants; of black servants and white masters; of superiors and inferiors; of people with inherent privileges, and of others with inherent duties.

General Janssens writing about the white settlers in the eighteenth century reported that, "they describe themselves as humans and christians and the Kaffirs and Hottentots as heathens; and by achieving in this they permit themselves everything". He adds that, "the common Europeans have become gentlemen and they desire to be well attended upon". Consequently, before the eighteenth century could run out, "a young Dutch seaman could describe the outlines of a social system which is still what prevails today 'From his youth onwards, accustomed to call for slaves, he (the Afrikaner) believes he is elevated above all and may only be obeyed". White aristocracy was characterized by the master and servant relationship. The Master and Servant Act which regulated the relationship between the whites and non-whites was "buttressed by a wide range of complementary legislation, particularly at the end of the nineteenth century, when all Europeans coming to South Africa irrespective of their European state of origin (e.g. the French Hugenots, the Germans) refashioned the policy of white aristocracy to "meet the new circumstances of an urbanized society" occasioned by the discovery of gold and diamonds and accompanied by industrialization.

White aristocracy was characterized by supply of cheap labour to the European white settlers, miners, industrialists, etc. It is important to observe that, not all whites supported the policy of cheap labour to be supplied by non whites to the white establishments. The whites had established an economic bar which would lead to a colour bar. The aim was to ensure that the Africans or non-whites earned less than the whites and consequently enjoyed a lower level of living standard. It is reported that, white workers demonstrated against this labour policy in 1922 but were defeated by the policy makers who believed that it was economic bar that would lead to social bar. The policy of white aristocracy was supported by many whites for social, political and economic reasons, irrespective of whether they spoke "Afrikaans or English, or whether they are rich or poor". Professor P.V. Pistorius, has reportedly summed the issue this way:

The bare and unashamed fact is that, the European needs the native as a labourer, but, that he is not prepared to allow him to cross the economic colour bar not to give him political equality.

White aristocracy had deprived Africans of land in South Africa. All of the land in South Africa, except one-eighth is owned by the whites. To the whites, rendering the Africans landless means creating cheap labour for the whites in their farms and industries and so nobody bothers about that. Africans are not permitted to buy land, except, perhaps in the "Native Reserve areas which measure 17½ millions morgen (12.9 percent)

of the republic's area. It is broken up into 260 separate units". During the Great Trek, the expanding white communities were reported to have driven the Africans into smaller land units, while the majority came to work on the white farms and in the white industries and towns. Two thirds of all Africans live in and among the whites, where they are segregated residentially and socially. Infact, the overall settlement pattern is that of communities of whites encircled by vastly greater numbers of personal black servants and other workers.

The blacks work on the white farms and similarly, they can be found in millions in white industries. It is the irony of the policy of apartheid that in spite of apartheid policy with its principles of segregation, white supremacy-aristocracy, the white areas, due to land policy, social and economic pressures have become more black than white. Legum has confirmed this assertion when he says that

the total effect of land policy and social and economic pressures has been to force non-whites into what are regarded as white areas. As a result of these, white areas have become steadily 'black'. The distribution of Africans at the last census was 3,651,000 in the native Reserves; 3,261,000 in white rural areas; 2,623,000 in white urban areas.

A more revolutionary approach to apartheid is that there should be no black servants for the whites, the whites must learn to work hard in order to do without black servants in order to ensure a clean break between the whites and blacks. For instance, the constitution of the Transvaal Republic did categorically stated under the 'Native Policy' that

the people is determined to permit no equality between the white and black, in church or state.

Legum (1969: 486) has stated that, with the hardline approach towards the practice of apartheid, the Boers (Afrikaans) had developed their distinctive language (Afrikaans); produced a remarkably virile literature; and bred their own cattle (Afrikaners), created their own states, staunchly defended their own way of life and adopted unambiguous 'native policy'. It was not surprising therefore, to observe that: "what they retained from Europe was their calvinistic religion and the Old Testament rather than the New".

White aristocracy and indeed Afrikaner aristocracy was extended to all areas of human endeavour including trade, trade unionism, religion, education, politics, employment. This led to unrelenting pursuit by the Afrikaners after World War II, to ensure that, there were two spurs of achievement. That is:

the one was to defend the white aristocracy against the blacks clamouring to enter the exclusive circle; the other was to establish the ascendancy of the Afrikaners over the English.

Politically, it must be noted that the dominant factors or issues in the politics of South Africa are: defence of the white aristocracy, and Afrikanerdom's Kragdadidgheid (firm resolve) to dominate within it. That is to say generally, the white must dominate in South Africa, but more specifically, the Afrikaners (Dutch/Boers) who have the "will and the capacity to resist the challenge to white supremacy", must be at the vortex of the political economic and social arrangement in the Republic of South Africa.

We shall take a brief look at the political experiment of apartheid policy and also briefly outline its main features. The main features in the political area of South Africa include the following:

Seven years after the Boer wars, Britain granted South Africa independence "as an act of liberal 'atonement'". It is very unfortunate that, this act of liberal atonement was not extended to the non-whites. The Act of Union of 1910, among the other things "enfranchised only the whites, the coloureds and a handful of Africans who already had voting rights. It entrenched the rights of the coloureds, as well as the two official languages, English and Afrikaners". In 1936, African voting rights were expunged from the constitution and the rights of the coloureds too were done away with through gerrymandering with the constitution in 1955. From that time onwards, the coloureds were allowed to elect only a quota of white members of Parliament and finally, "the limited rights of Africans to elect white representatives was taken away in 1959".

Generally, the policy of apartheid received a great boost, two years after the Union Act. i.e. 1910, when General J.B.M. Hertzog started to make historic speeches advocating "... that the South African (Afrikaner) should be baas (boss) everywhere in South Africa...." Thirty-six years later in 1948, when the National Party won election, Hertzog's assertions became a reality. The party led by Dr. D.F. Malan "defeated the Union Party Government of Field Marshall J.C. Smuts". When Dr. Malan took over office, he valiantly declared that, South Africa belonged to them Afrikaners once more. Said he:

for the first time since Union of South Africa is our own, May God grant that it will always remain our own.

Years following Dr. Malan's speech have been years of ruthless entrenchment of nationalist's white aristocracy and unalloyed supremacy in the scheme of things. The Chief Justice of the Union once emphatically stated that "in the political sphere... we, the Afrikaners, have

unchallengeable control". He went on, however, to recognize the fact that the Britons apart, the Africans still constituted an unmitigated challenge to Afrikanerdom. Mr. F.C. Erasmus, a Minister of Defence once stated that:

the blackman in Africa is driving the whiteman back - step by step.

He continued that, "he was no longer making a secret of this. Some white people were reconciled to this trend. But, unfortunately, others were determined to resist it to the last". (Legum 1969: 492).

In practical terms, political, economic, social and religious analysts believe that, the implementation of the apartheid policy (most especially since 1948 under the nationalist Party) has proved impracticable and unworkable in the purest sense, unpuritanical and down-to-earth controversial and calamitous. The practice of apartheid policy has ushered in unlimited restlessness for the whites. It has on the other hand also perpetuated misery, oppression, suppression, disillusionment, unmitigated hell, unquantifiable and unqualified political, economic and social degradation for the black Africans and the coloureds, plus Asians in South Africa - hence the struggle against the policy.

Before we take a look at the struggles against apartheid, it is pertinent to touch, albeit briefly, the views of the international community on the policy of apartheid. Generally, there has been an almost unanimous condemnation of the apartheid policy by the world community. The major problem has been that, the international community's condemnation of apartheid has in most cases lacked effort to dismantle the obnoxious policy, until steps are taken to eliminate the social, political and economic monster (i.e. apartheid policy). Colin Legum (1969: 502) has stated that, the international community is unanimous in its view against apartheid. Said he:

world opinion is unanimous in its view of South Africa's race policies. Apartheid has been described as 'abhorrent' by Britain as 'toxic' by the United States, as 'hateful' by India, as 'thoroughly repugnant' by Belgium as 'inhuman' by Guinea, as 'slavery' by Nigeria, as 'degrading' by Canada, as 'fundamentally immoral' by Japan, as 'shameful' by the U.S.S.R., as 'the negation of all social purpose' by Holivia, as 'cancer' by Algeria, as 'a catalyst of violence' by Tanganyika.

It is very significant to note that, inspite of the condemnation of apartheid policy, both the United Nations as a body and her powerful members have in the past failed to take drastic measures to end the policy. Most disappointing in the fight against apartheid policy is the role

of the United States, Britain, Germany, France, Portugal, etc. and their fellow traveller in Asia, namely, Japan. The inability on the part of these countries to fight apartheid is premised on the fear of economic loss, since they own a wide range of economic investments in South Africa. Commenting on the role of international organizations and individual countries in the fight against apartheid policy, which has been ineffective, Jack Watson (1984: 412) has this to say:

Apartheid was frequently condemned else where along with South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia, where South Africa continued to rule, although making vague preparations for self-government. The Organization of African Unity, the Communist Powers and the United Nations all deplored South Africa's apparent indifference to criticism. In 1962, the United Nation General Assembly voted in favour of a resolution to sever diplomatic relations and impose an economic boycott. Although some countries took the necessary action, it was ineffective. South Africa was not without friends, at least among some certain white capitalist powers. Portugal with colonies in Angola and Mozambique, had a vested interest in white supremacy in Southern Africa. The U.S.A., Britain and France condemned apartheid with words but stopped short of taking action. South Africa was well armed and strategically situated, perhaps a useful ally in confrontation with communism, and the capitalist countries were willing to tarnish their own reputations rather than break openly with a blatantly racist state run by whites of European descent. It was argued that South Africa was stable, with deposits of gold and diamonds more prosperous than other African States, and that apartheid would eventually be modified. Harold Wilson's government refused to supply arms to South Africa and some unofficial bodies in Britain tried to boycott South African goods, but the controversy at this time raged mainly around sporting fixtures, resulting in cancelled cricket tours and South Africa's expulsion from Olympic Games.

In the preceding paragraphs, under this chapter, we have discussed, though briefly the origin of the apartheid policy in South Africa, what it means, its cardinal principles, its impracticability in the utopian sense, the world community's opinion about it, and finally the inability of the international community to offer a useful solution, to the problem of apartheid policy.

Human being's nature is that, when he or she is faced with a problem, there is usually a need to tackle such a problem. The usual thing is to try to tackle such a problem internally. When internal approaches fail, one resorts to external solutions. When external solutions fail to come, humanity is faced with the need to take a final decision based on his/her personal ability to solve such a problem. This is exactly what has taken place in South Africa. A time came when opponents of the apartheid policy within the South African enclave believed and were

determined to take their destiny into their hands. Thus, began the long tortuous journey of the opposition to apartheid policy by way of a seemingly insignificant individual opposition. This was followed by group organizational opposition to the policy of apartheid. This is what forms the next chapter of this work entitled, "The Struggle Against Apartheid Policy in South Africa".

CHAPTER THREE

The Struggle Against Apartheid Policy

It is an established fact that, in most countries of the world, where human degradation, suppression, oppression, social, political and economic inequalities, domination, and dehumanization are the order of the day, the initiative to fight for freedom in such countries is usually taken and conscientiously pursued by the patriotic and progressive elements in the countries. A few examples may serve for the purpose of illustration here. In the Soviet Union, Lenin led the revolution to change the peasantry and semi-bourgeois and infact semi-capitalist Russia in the October, 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. In China, Mao Zedong (Mao Tse Tung) led the 1949 revolution against the exploitative system prevalent at that time in China. In Cuba, Fidel Castro took up arms with his supporters to topple the Pro-USA, capitalist system established and nurtured to growth by Batista. In Guinea-Bissau, the late Amical Cabral, fighting under the aegis of P.A.I.G.C. found freedom for his people. In Nicaragua, Ortega spearheaded the struggle against forces of oppression and exploitation. Other instances include Augustinho Neto in Angola, Dr. Samora Machel in Mozambique, Dr. Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe, Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam. Sam Nujoma in Namibia, Sankara in Burkina Fasso, etc. It could also be recalled that, even in bourgeois revolutions such as those of America and France, some liberal and to some extent progressive thinkers were instrumental to the uprisings that hacked down the oppressive apparatus in such nation states. Infact, Robert Nisbet (1983: 211) says:

in the strict sense of the word, it was not a revolution that had taken place in the American colonies, but a war of liberation from mother country and nothing else.

because

one finds no evidence in the speeches and writing of even the most ardent of the Americans engaged in war with England of a desire for any substantial modification of social, economic and moral authorities. There was no determination to transform family, religion, property, language, education or anything else the colonialists had inherited from their European forefathers. And resolute though the continental Congress and the army under George Washington proved to be, we find an utter absence of the kind of revolutionary moralism and spiritual fanaticism that had become, by 1791, a major aspect of French Revolution. Only in the most limited and conventional sense can the

war between the American colonies and England be termed a revolution - though, it would be a mistake, of course, to discount American appeal to some of the same 'natural rights' that the makers of the French Declaration of the Rights of Man were to appeal to, just as it would be a mistake to dismiss the effects of American colonial success on revolutionary aspirations elsewhere in the world.

Coming to Nigeria, it will be observed that, many progressive thinkers and leaders took up the mantle of leadership in the pursuit of political independence for Nigeria. They are very many. This number includes such patriotic sons as Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, the late Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Mallam Aminu Kano. Joseph Sarwuan Tarkas, Sir Ahmadu Bello, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, etc.

In South Africa, too, there existed the opponents of the savage policy of apartheid, which had relegated the bonafide citizens of South Africa, the black Africans, to the position of slaves, servants, labourers without commensurate remuneration, hewers of wood and drawers of water, visitors; peripheral citizens, inhabitants of segregated townships and geographical regions, tillers of the most infertile one-eighth of the total land of South Africa for survival.

Opposition to the apartheid policy has a long distant history of origin. This opposition started even within the Nationalist Movement. On the one hand, there were those who believed in the territorial apartheid. There were also "those who cherished the rights of coloureds and those who do not". Others did withdraw their support because they could not fathom how the policy would succeed. One writer has stated that:

I do not see how anyone who seriously examines the development of the apartheid policy since 1948 can escape the conclusion that its original aim has been preceding further into the distance and becoming hazier the more keenly it had been pursued.

Right from the beginning of the apartheid policy, some churchmen, intellectuals and politicians rejected it on "ethical grounds". Some distinguished Afrikaner thinkers such as Professors B.B. Keet, P.V.L. Pistorius, Ben Marais J.L. du P. Basson, member of parliament and eleven theologians of the Dutch Reformed Church published a book entitled DELAYED ACTION at the end of 1960 against apartheid policy. The Christian Institute headed by Dr. Beyes Naude presented the toughest opposition to apartheid policy. It is on record that, Dr. Naude was expelled from the Dutch Reformed Church "because of his support for a multi-racial ecumenical movement".

An analyst of apartheid policy, Colin Legum has contended that, opponents of apartheid policy can be classified into three categories, which include "those who oppose nationalist doctrines, but nevertheless

uphold white supremacy (the conservative opposition); those who reject both apartheid and aristocracy the revolutionary opposition) and between the two radical opposition which must be distinguished from each of these".

As we have earlier stated apartheid has several categories of opponents. Some opponents came into existence right from the genesis of the policy. Others followed. Today, we can name many opponents of apartheid, even though we may not be able to exhaust the list. While it is necessary to name several opponents of the apartheid policy for the records, it is equally important to stress that, in the final analysis emphasis would be placed on the origin, growth and continued struggle of the African National Congress. This is the opposition movement and later political organization, in which the dramatis personae of this work, Nelson Mandela was and is still an active member as well as the Deputy President.

Apartheid policy, from its beginning has had varying forms and degree of opposition from the following: The conservative opposition, the radical opposition which comprises the Black Sash, the South African Institute of Race Relations; The Revolutionary Opposition, which is composed of The Liberal Party, the Congress of Democrats, the South African Congress of Trade Unions, African National Congress, The Pan African Congress, Indian National Congress. Today, we have more oppositional groups springing up against apartheid policy. Among them are South African Communist Party, led by Joe Slovo, Mass Democratic Movement (which includes media workers of South Africa (MWASA), the Inkhatha Movement - which has recently declared itself a political party, headed by Chief Buthelezi, the United Democratic Front, which was launched in 1983, the Council of Union of South Africa plus many other anti-apartheid groups which have not been mentioned here.

As earlier mentioned, many anti-apartheid movements emerged in South Africa to stem the tide of apartheid policy. One of such movements is the African National Congress of which Dr. Nelson Mandela is currently the Deputy President.

According to Colin Legum, (1969: 500), the African National Congress is the oldest of the non-white political movements against apartheid policy, having been founded in 1912. Incidentally, 1912 was the year when General Hertzog was laying the foundations of the Afrikaner Nationalist Party. 'African people' was the main concern of the A.N.C., that is, the party detested the idea of tribalism. The party was concerned with reforming the South African political set up. It considered reconciliation as one of its cardinal principles. However, over the years, the uncultured, barbaric and bestial policies of apartheid policy, manifested in uninhibited suppression and degradation of the blacks,

compelled the party to shift base from mere reformation and reconciliation in the South African social, political and economic landscape to a more martial, combative, belligerent, aggressive and armigerous position. It is significant to note that this political organization which has suffered all kinds of campaign of calumny from the South African authorities firmly

upholds the ideal of an inter-racial society; it has never sought in any way to deny to the whites the right to full citizenship in a democratic state which it is pledged to secure.

It is very significant to observe that, the A.N.C. has, from its foundation day, worked with liberal-minded whites. In spite of tolerating the white liberals, the A.N.C. has at one time or the other been involved in a "Congress Alliance" with groups that are considered leftists. Historically, it was the "outlawing of the Communist Party in 1951" which compelled the bellicose A.N.C. to develop the idea of going into alliance with the leftist groups. Prior to the ban "the communists had always attacked the A.N.C. as a 'bourgeois reformist movement'". An analyst says once said the A.N.C. alliance with the leftist groups "is purely one of tactics, born of desire to secure the association of all forces willing to work for a democratic society". It is a fact that there are some remnants of "former communists in the A.N.C.". It must be born in mind, however, that, the A.N.C. leadership - as typified by its top leaders, the late Chief Albert Luthuli, Nelson Mandela, and Oliver Tambo - are opposed to communism. Following the 1960 Sharpville anti-apartheid protest by Africans, the A.N.C. was "outlawed". This unfortunate situation compelled some of the leaders of the A.N.C. to go "into exile and have since formed the United Front with the Pan-African Congress and the Indian National Congress", says Colin Legum.

Today, as we discuss Nelson Mandela's release from twenty-seven years of imprisonment by the South African white minority racist government, and his subsequent visit to Nigeria, it is necessary to inform the world that, the A.N.C. is still on its feet as a single political party ready with both verbal and military salvos to hit the apartheid policy. It has done that in the past. It can still do that. It is the continued and unyielding spirit in the fight against the apartheid policy that has among other forces, compelled the South African white minority government to release Nelson Mandela from his twenty-seven years of incarceration. Since our discussion is more or less centered on Mandela, it would be appropriate for us to turn to the latter's role in the formation of the A.N.C., his activities therein, his imprisonment, and his release from prison, which constitute the precursors of his historic visit to Nigeria.

Dr. Nelson Mandela joined the African National Congress and was co-founder of African National Congress Youth League. He was later voted as the President of the A.N.C. Transvaal Branch, 1952, before he was banned by the racist South African regime, (*The Voice*, 12th February, 1990).

In 1952, a defence campaign organized by African National Congress in support of its demand for the repeal of the pass laws and other repressive laws against African (Blacks) under the leadership of such leaders as Mandela was counterpoised by the apartheid government of South Africa through the arrest of 8,000 volunteers and a criminal intensification of the application of the apartheid policy.

Passive resistance, petitions and entreaties by African Nationalist leaders in the past against apartheid failed. The Sharpville mass massacre of Africans is still fresh in our minds. The biggest blow to the fight against apartheid came to light following the imprisonment of early nationalist leaders such as Nelson Mandela on the Robben Island, and Robert Sobukwe on the same Island. Albert Luthuli was deposed from the throne of a chief for supporting a defiance campaign against apartheid policy.

For Mandela, the period between 1952 and 1964 had been the beginning of the years of gruesome taste of the nauseatingly cataclysmic hogwash of apartheid government of South Africa. As *The Voice* (12th February, 1990) has correctly reported, "between 1956 and 1961, he was put on trial for treason and in 1961, he was acquitted. Later in 1962, Mr. Mandela was arrested and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. Thereafter, he was put on trial for further charges, and sentenced to life imprisonment in June, 1964".

Following the life imprisonment of Nelson Mandela in June, 1964, it became clear to watchers of the politics of Southern Africa that what Lord Marven wrote in 1956 about the political situation in the Central African Federation that, "political control must remain in the hands of civilized people, which from the foreseeable future means Europeans" had become true of the Union of South African Republic. Furthermore, the imprisonment of Mandela came to actualize what Strijdom once stated that:

call it paramoucy, Baaskap or what you will, it is still domination. I am being as blunt as I can; I am making no excuses, either the whiteman dominates or the blackman takes over.

It is significant to note that, right from 1946, when apartheid was at its embryonic stage, the United Nations Organization initiated action against it. The action proved unworkable due to the unco-operative

attitude of Great Britain and the United States of America, the world's most loudmouthedly acclaimed lovers of unlimited freedom and rugged individualism respectively. The economic sanctions initiated in 1962 against apartheid South Africa by the United Nations were put in the cooler by the U.S.A. and Great Britain, Thus, paving the way for an unguarded and devilishly unlimited growth of apartheid policy in power, status and modus operandi. thus, guided by economic gains on the part of the British and American multi-nationals in South Africa, it had increasingly become almost impossible to convince the U.S.A. and Great Britain about the pernicious iniquities and malum of apartheid policy which needed to be nipped in the bud. Thus, the U.S.A. and Britain continued their subtle and surreptitious support for South Africa in many aspects of the Union's social, political and economic outings. The United States of America, Britain and France persistently continued, until recently, to block the chances of staging a good fight against apartheid by way of their abstentions and use of veto powers in the National Security Council of the United Nations Organization. Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe after a careful observation of the non-challant attitude of the world powers, especially the U.S.A., Britain, France and West Germany at the United Nations on the issue of apartheid South Africa and denigration of Africans had this to say:

the lack of respect for human dignity has led to the political bondage of man by man in Africa. Until the conscience of the world has energetically aroused to solve this problem, frankly with absolute honesty, it is safe to predict that the political resurgence which is now sweeping all over Africa, is capable of leading to a revanche movement which would be disastrous to the peace of the world.

In spite of the spirited support given to the racist South African government by some white racial bigots all over the world, the fight against apartheid policy has become more intensified. The mass murder in Soweto has not deterred Africans against South African racist policy of apartheid. The undaunting determination of blacks in fighting against apartheid became heightened in the 1980's.

In one of his earlier works on apartheid policy entitled *Washington We Are Watching You* (an unpublished manuscript on apartheid), the writer made the following comment on the heightened anti-apartheid struggles in South Africa in the 1980s which spilled over to 1990 and consequently led to the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela from prison on February 11, 1990. Here goes the comment at length.

The United Nations Organisation and the Organization of African Unity have both passed resolutions which oppose apartheid. Some members

of the O.A.U. refuse to have any dealings with South Africa or its supporters on political, economic or cultural grounds, but other countries such as the U.S.A., West Germany, France, Britain, Japan believe that they can only break down the policy of apartheid by having more links with it (South Africa). Inside South Africa, one of the main African Movements that are fighting against the apartheid policy is the African National Congress, formerly headed by Nelson Mandela but now headed by Oliver Tambo. The Organisation was banned by the South African government in 1960.

Before the 1980s, there had been no effective resistance against apartheid by the national Congress. When Chief Luthuli, a moderate and much respected leader, tried to organize defiance of the segregation laws in 1952, he was deprived of his chieftaincy and a new law was introduced to impose flogging on those who wilfully broke existing laws. The Africans continued to operate under non-violence approach. Thus, in March, 1960, they, applying Ghandi's tactics of non-violence, assembled at Sharpsville to demonstrate against the pass laws and to invite arrest, the authorities decided to terrify them with low-flying jets and eventually the police opened fire on them killing 83 people and wounding 350 as the Africans tried to escape. This was a clear demonstration to the whole world that South Africa was going to be ruthless with any anti-apartheid movement. In 1973, eleven Africans miners were shot in the course of a violent clash between workers and police at the western Deep Levels mine in Transvaal. This is another signpost to the tensions in the apartheid system.

When the Empire of Portugal shamefully collapsed under the mounting pressure of nationalist forces in the north of South Africa, the Republic went to a near crisis point. In 1974, the nationalist party of South Africa was returned into power. This event ushered in an unprecedented wave of protests by South Africans in 1976, when many African townships, especially Soweto near Johannesburg was turned into a hot seat of revolt against the system. The South African government reacted in its characteristic brutality, through police shooting which left over 500 Africans dead. This shoot-out exceeded that of Sharpsville. Luthuli died in 1967 and Nelson Mandela who is the architect of the African National Congress has been imprisoned since 1962 for life. Steve Biko who founded the Black Consciousness Movement, which still emphasized peaceful resistance to apartheid was brutally killed by South Africa police who injured his brain through persistent tortures in police custody. As Watson states:

Government investigations alleged that nobody was criminally responsible for his death, but, this did little to persuade those who alleged that he had been murdered.

What the apartheid government seems not to know is that, most of the South African Youth today are more politically conscious, especially those who survived the Soweto mass murder and the older ones who watched the vandalistic shootings of Sharpsville.

Today, a renewed wave of anti-apartheid movement

engulfing the whole of South Africa has sprung up. In the past 10 months, a 'current of violence' has spread through the country. 'It has been more intense, more widespread and more sustained than either the Sharppville crisis of 1960 or the Soweto crisis of 1976 (*Sunday Concord*, 25th August, 1985). It is believed that, apartheid has never been so much threatened like this before. It is contended that, more than 600 Africans have so far lost their lives in the pursuit to dismantle apartheid in the past 10 months. It has been stated that, the past 10 months popular mass action against apartheid which has begun is yielding some dividends. The examples are as follows:

1. the decision of the United States Congress to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa if there are no reforms by 1987 and the ban on the sale of Krugger rands in the apartheid country;
2. withdrawal of its ambassador from Pretoria for consultations, following the state of emergency,
3. the cancellation of flights to Pretoria with effect from next month (September, 1985) by the Scandinavia Airlines (SAS) for the same reason,
4. America's refusal to accept the credentials of South Africa's new ambassador in Washington thereby causing the apartheid government to call the latter for consultation after a wait for 2 months,
5. restraining action on the New Zealand courts to stop all rugby tour of South Africa,
6. the recall of French ambassador to South Africa after the imposition of a state of emergency by the racist regime,
7. the decision by France to freeze all new investments in the apartheid territory,
8. the action of France to convene a meeting of the United Nations Security Council because of the state of emergency; and
9. the decision by the Security Council to impose voluntary sanctions against South Africa with an option to further review the situation if no improvements follow the decisions. And in the United States, demonstrations against apartheid regime have continued unabated since early this year. (*Sunday Concord*, 25th August, 1985).

As earlier stated, the main reason for this write-up is to demonstrate to readers for how long the United States of America with the cohort of her western propagandist have paid lip service to

democracy which is to them the basis for freedom. Attempts have been made to concretise the writer's belief that, America and her western authors of freedom, equality, etc. have never lived by their word. Instead, they have always fought to persistently and perpetually imprison some people, especially those in the third world in the cage of suppression, oppression, inequality, lack of liberty, etc. under the cover fighting for people's freedom, when they are actually fighting against communism and perpetuating the unbridled exploitative tendencies of international capitalism. These few instances have been cited to bring us to the full understanding of the hide-and-seek game the U.S.A. plus Western Germany, France, Canada, Britain and even Japan are playing, in surreptitiously abetting the growth and strength of apartheid.

Why has it taken the U.S.A. such a long time to see that freedom is granted to the over twenty million Africans in South Africa? Why has America decided to redefine democracy to suit South Africa? Is democracy no more the rule of the majority under a universal suffrage? Why is franchise only being limited to the whites in South Africa under the long nose of the Americans? We may take a whole year and volumes to answer these questions and other related ones not asked here about South Africa. Our main concern here is to establish in brief, why the U.S.A. has always stood behind South Africa particularly now under the obnoxious "constructive engagement" policy of President Reagan which is being implemented by his ignorant under-secretary of State for African Affairs, Chester Crocker?

In the past:

the western countries had done more rhetorics (and polemics) than positive contributions towards the demise of apartheid. The political, economic and social castrations of the blacks in South Africa had not worried them. Their huge investments that gave apartheid fuel to run its oppressive machine are their own concern. More than 90 percent of foreign investments in South Africa is accounted for by Britain, the U.S.A., West Germany, France, Switzerland. British corporate investment is about 16 billion dollars, the U.S.A. has about 13.78 billion dollars, West Germany about 2.3 billion dollars, France 1.66 billion dollars and Switzerland about 1.34 billion dollars. (*Sunday Concord*, 25th August, 1985).

From the foregoing, it can be crystal clearly seen that, one of the major forces standing in the way of the U.S.A. and her western allies in the dismantling of the nauseating apartheid policy is capitalism. America does not want to lose her much cherished capitalist interests in South Africa. The lame argument pushed forward is that if you disinvest in South Africa, then, the Africans will have no jobs and the situation would be much worse off. Why can't America help dismantle apartheid so that fertile land, instead of being retained only by the minority

whites would be distributed to blacks for their economic survival and that of the nation state at large?

Calvocoressi (1977: 387-388) has argued that since the campaign for economic sanctions against South Africa started in the 1960s, the U.S.A. and Britain were not able to do something about it because while America was concerned with Vietnam and Latin America, Britain was more intimately involved because of the old Commonwealth connection but declined to intervene against apartheid for fear of foregoing her small trade with South Africa. This argument only goes to confirm ultimately the point that both countries are not only concerned about freedom of the people all over the world and South Africa in particular, contrary to the manner they have made even care-Africa inhabitants believe that they want freedom for all people. While the U.S.A. was in Vietnam and Latin America trying to contain communism/extend capitalism and consolidate her regional hold on the Monroe Doctrine, Britain was busy trying to create a forum whereby she could continue the exploitation of her ex-colonies through a clandestine neo-colonialist trade arrangement with South Africa.

Another argument is that, Britain hesitated to take action against South Africa for fear of the reprisals South Africa may bring on her dependencies of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland. This contention can be countered by the fact that, if South Africa could through sanctions and other forms of pressure be made to change to the so-called western democracy, then, she would have not reached the level of international mental degeneracy which could have made her clamp down easily on the British land-locked dependencies. Moreso, when the government would have been run by an African majority, whom it is definitely hoped, would not have embarked on unjustifiable territorial expansionism embracing the three dependencies of Britain.

One other contention is that, both the British and Americans did not like to hurt the feelings of South Africa because of the need to use the Simonstown naval base to thwart communist approach to South Africa by way of force. This goes to confirm the earlier point raised that the main concern of both the U.S.A. and her clique of western democratic propagandists is to contain the U.S.S.R. in any part of the globe and not to help peoples of the world establish a form of government of their choice.

Another fallacious contention of the U.S.A. for not carrying out sanctions against South Africa in the past as stated by Calvocoressi (1977: 388) is the fear that, sanctions would require a blockade and a blockade could lead to war and that within South Africa, the collapse of the regime could produce anarchic situation, bloodshed and misery. The question of sanctions through a blockade producing war is quite untenable since by the 1960s, South Africa had not attained any reasonable level of striking capability compared to Washington and London. Why did the U.S.A. impose a blockade or mine one of the South Vietnamese ports at a much later date, that is, in the seventies when it was aiding an unwilling South Vietnamese under a puppet Mr. Thieu to fight the Vietcong? Didn't America know that she was inviting a more devastating war from the communist U.S.S.R. and China or at

least one of them? After all, South Africa is an offspring of western blood and racial bigotry which could have been much more easy to suppress even by mere serious discussions. The gibberish about the collapse of apartheid producing anarchy and misery is weak. America later created problems in Vietnam, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Britain did so in the Falklands which are much more horrendous than what they pretentiously feared would result into anarchy and misery in South Africa in the sixties. The whole exercise was a deliberate act of abandoning oppressed Africans to the whims and caprices of extended families of Europe, whose branches also reached the Americas. The United States and her European friends have no good defence before the eyes of the world to allow South African minority whites to continue to lord it over the majority blacks.

(Quoted from *Washington We Are Watching You* By Lohodeedoo Burya, 1985).

Thus, while it is true that, internal forces against apartheid have become intensified, it must be emphasized that the positive impact of external forces in the struggle against apartheid policy have also started emerging and are encouraging. The next chapter discusses briefly such external forces.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Impact of External Forces on the Struggle

By late 1950s and early 1960s, the flame of African nationalism (especially black nationalism) which had been ignited by the New World Pan-Africanist giants such as Marcus Carvey, W.E.B. Du Bois, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, etc. had taken a dynamic turn with the consequence of many African countries becoming independent in a game of domino style. This was followed closely with the establishment of the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.). The establishment of governments of independent African countries was accompanied by unyielding spirit of liberating the whole of Africa. Many independent African countries joined the United Nations Organization where they vehemently condemned the apartheid policy of South African government.

Added to the wave of anti-apartheid policies of independent African countries, was the early 1960 uprising of African-Americans against the white racial bigotry in the United States of America, which produced a spillover effect on the whole of Africa, especially in South Africa. The role of black American civil right leaders in the fight against apartheid also took a more progressive turn, especially in the 1980s. For instance, the visit of Rev. Jesse Jackson to that country was a big morale booster to South African black nationalists.

By the late 1980s, it had become clear to the South African authorities that the wind of change had eventually started blowing across the continent. In spite of all the mass massacre of blacks, arrests and political imprisonment, in 1984, 1985, 1986 etc., the blacks in South Africa had become more determined than ever to overthrow the apartheid regime of South Africa and replace it with a democratically elected majority government. At the centre of this struggle was and still is the central figure in the person of Nelson Mandela. Pressure against the apartheid policy (as a consequence of the imprisonment of Nelson Mandela) from many countries of the world became the order of the day. Nigeria, for one, has played a significant role in fight for the release of Mandela in particular, and the end to apartheid policy generally, which can not be adequately accounted for here, due to shortage of space and time. That aspects demands a full discussion in a separate work.

At last, it had dawned on the South African racist authorities that, Dr. Azikiwe's prediction that

the political resurgence which is now weeping all over Africa, is capable of leading to a revanche movement which would be disastrous to the peace of the world.

was coming to pass with the continued imprisonment of Mandela and the practice of the apartheid policy. The positive role of the American Congress basically dominated by democrats and liberal republicans) continued to exert pressure on Ronald Reagan and his errand boy, Chester Crocker to soften their deals on "Constructive Engagement" policy in South Africa and put on a more realistic toga of anti-apartheid, manifested in application of stringent and effective economic sanctions against the South African racist white minority government. The Nordic countries of Norway and Sweden also intensified their anti-apartheid stance and the Soviet Union took a more realistic approach. The United Kingdom parading Margaret Thatcher, an unrepentant pro-apartheid head of government could not withstand the salvos of the United Nations Organization's anti-Apartheid Committee, headed by Nigeria's diplomatic soldier, retired Major-General Joseph Garba. Thus, by early 1990, it became clear to the white minority leaders of South African Government that even if the apartheid policy would not be hastily dismantled there was an urgent need to appease the world and also placate black South Africans by releasing Dr. Nelson Mandela from his twenty-seven year old imprisonment.

CHAPTER FIVE

Mandela: A Strong - Willed Nationalist

Jailed in June, 1964, Nelson Mandela has remained an insurmountable sign-post of black nationalism. The well planned, mental tortures, political victimization, social deprivations and ail sorts of evil machinations dished out to Mandela with the sole purpose of dehumanizing him to the level of yielding to South African reactionary forces could not stand the lion-hearted giant son of Africa. He did not succumb to South African villifications scoffing, mockery and ridicule. Mrs. Winnie Nomzamo Mandela, Mandela's wife, a women's woman, also a South African politician, born in 1934 in Pondoland, South Africa (married to Mandela in 1958), stood undauntingly by her unrelenting husband throughout his years of degradation, denigration, and dehumanization by the white-livered, racial bigots of South African government. Here is a prominent lesson in "for better for worse" which true women should emulate. They should emulate Mrs. Mandela. Dr. Nelson Mandela has been a strong-willed nationalist all along. Writing about Nelson Mandela in an article titled "Portrait of an Activist", Seve Kehinde had this to say in the *This Week Magazine* of February 26, 1990:

"Twenty-seven years ago when he was charged on two counts of inciting African workers to go on strike and for leaving South Africa without a valid travel document, he held the court room spellbound. Instead of conducting himself in utmost humility and begging for mercy like most accused persons, he used the now famous Rivonia trial as a platform to deliver his diatribe on the apartheid system. How does anyone think justice would be done here? He thundered. I face a white magistrate, confronted by a white prosecutor and I am escorted into the dock by a white orderly. Can anyone honestly and seriously suggest that in this atmosphere the scales of justice are evenly balanced? Mandela asked, I feel oppressed by the atmosphere of white domination that lurks all around this court room. This atmosphere calls to mind the inhuman injustices caused to my people outside this court room by this white domination.

Last week, when Nelson Mandela stepped out of Victor Vorster Prison, he was his old self, sounding tough, showing that the symbol of the South African struggle will remain defiant as ever. In a way, it also goes to prove that, neither age nor prolonged incarceration had had any effect on him. With a clenched fist and amidst a crush of cheering

supporters, he reaffirmed the principles of the African National Congress including the armed struggle and urge the outside world to step up economic sanctions against racist South Africa.

In his speech, he defended the use of violence to overthrow apartheid:

Our resorting to the armed struggle in 1960 formation of the military wing of the ANC was purely defensive action against the violence of apartheid,

adding:

the factors which necessitated the armed struggle still exist today. We have no option but to continue.

Several times, there have been whispers of his release, and of him being sent into exile in Lusaka, Zambia to join his comrades where they have their headquarters. But all have proved abortive. First, the racist South African authorities said that they would release him if he agreed to go and live in a nominally independent Transkei homeland or Bantusan. His cousin, Chief Matanzima, President of the enclave even urged him to accept the offer. In his characteristic defiant manner, Mandela refused to trade his imprisonment for a life in what he has consistently fought against - the division of South African into tiny bits of land.

With its first attempt botched, the South African government tried another tactic. Would Mandela agree to his release provided he made an undertaking to renounce violence,. Not only did Mandela refuse the offer, he made a song and dance of it. He issued a public statement read by his daughter, Zinzi, at a meeting in Soweto Stadium, in which he said:

Let him (Botha) renounce violence first.
 Let him say he will dismantle apartheid.
 Let him unban the people's organization,
 the African National Congress (ANC).
 Let him free all who have been imprisoned,
 banned or exiled for their opposition to apartheid.

He adds:

Prisoners cannot enter into negotiations.
 As long as my people are not free, I
 cannot accept freedom.

He however made it clear that, he would not accept any offer of freedom which has conditions attached to it. When the new De Klerk government in South Africa made Mandela a fresh offer of freedom, he gave them five new conditions for accepting, in line with these put forward by the ANC as pre-conditions for talks with Pretoria, namely:

- Unbanning of ANC and other political groups,
- Lifting of the state of emergency;
- Release of all political prisoners;
- halting political trials and executions; and
- Pulling out of troops from the black townships.

Mandela was born in the tiny village of Qunu, in the Transkei region of South Africa in 1918. His initiation into political activities occurred during his university years when he supported a student strike which led to his dismissal from Fort Hare College. He, however, finished his degree by correspondence course and went on to study law at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. On qualification, he set up South Africa's first black law firm with Oliver Tambo.

What made him loathe and resist all acts of oppression of whites at a relatively young age were the tales of the series of wars fought by his ancestors in defence of the fatherland against the Boer settlers which he listened to when he as a child.

It is to Mandela's credit that, despite his incarceration, he still holds dearly to the ideals he stood for in the 1960s. Rather than waver, this streak in him remains as strong as ever. At the Rivonia trial in 1964, he said that, his ideal was a

democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunity.

It is an ideal which I hope to live for and achieve, but, if need be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die. These same lines also formed the addendum to his speech at the rally in Cape Town on Monday, February 12, 1990. More than any other person, Nelson Mandela is now the man of the moment. He more than ever before symbolises the dream of black self-determination on the African continent, says Kehinde.

CHAPTER SIX

Internal Cracks in South Africa

In the early second half of the month of January, 1989, Pieter Botha, "the frail and stubborn president of apartheid South Africa", was struck by what observers described as a partial stroke. To many Nigerians who are avid readers of the comic magazine titled "Ikebe Super" published by Wale Adenuga, it would appear as if the fictitious wizards and witches mentioned in the magazine, who were reportedly heading for South Africa, had wrecked havoc on Pieter Botha. The important point here is that Pieter Botha has suffered from a stroke at about January 19, 1989.

On February 2, 1989, Pieter Botha resigned his appointment as the leader of nationalist party. He however, "made it clear that he would not compromise his job as president of the apartheid enclave". Said he:

in my opinion, the role of the state president and role of the chief leader of the National Party should now be separated so as to put me in a position to continue just with the role of president.... The time has come when the two offices should be separated so that the president could assume the role of a unified force, free from party politics. (*Newswatch*, March 27, 1989, page 32).

Unfortunately for Pieter Botha, an opinion poll held in South Africa on the issue of his retaining the post of president, showed that majority of the people in six major urban areas were of the opinion that it was time for Botha to call it quit. *Newswatch* reports that, the people said, "No way.... the time has only come for you to quit and give the party leader the traditional opportunity to double us the head of government". *Newswatch* continues: the "results of the poll, commissioned by the *Johannesburg Star*, the country's biggest daily newspaper, just as the crisis deepened, showed that, 47 percent of the people in six major urban areas, believed that it was time for Botha to bow out, while 33 percent wanted him to stay put and 20 percent were undecided. Those who want and are urging, Botha to stay, are 'beneficiaries of his 10 years of imperial presidency', especially the powerful men in the presidents' palace, thousands of members of the armed forces, the police and the intelligence service, who staff the pervasive National Security Management System, (NSMS). 'Those toadies' complained. The Beeld, 'are worse than enemies'".

President Pieter Botha's stubbornness on the issue of retaining the presidency after resignation as leader of the National Party prompted

political analysts and newspaper commentators "throughout South Africa" to predict a "prolonged power show-down between Botha and the party-backed De Klerk". *Newswatch*, (Ibid page 32) reports that:

Botha is impregnable, said the *Citizen*, pro-government Johannesburg newspaper, in editorial of March 15, 1989. Though the *Star* said Botha had lost the vital party support, the paper contended that if Botha chooses to delay elections and stay in office until early next year, he is capable of weathering the storm.

Reports say that:

Pik Botha, the country's foreign minister, who also vied for the party leadership when Botha took ill, also foresaw a prolonged battle but suggested last week in London that a dignified solution be found to the debacle. He said of Botha, 'He should be allowed to do so (step down) with dignity, having served the country creditably well'.

It is important to note that in spite of the protracted nature of the debacle, Botha resigned from the party leadership. As the adverse effect of the stroke continued, Botha took a sick leave. Following his sick leave, the Nationalist Party sacked Pieter Botha from the party leadership and "named De Klerk, as successor".

Sensing the tense unfavourable situation, Botha reportedly "cut short his sick leave by two weeks and hurried back to work". The ignominious, uncolourful and shivery return of Botha to office as reported by *Newswatch* of March 27, 1989 stated that:

Pieter Botha, the frail and stubborn president of apartheid South Africa tottered when he appeared on television last week, soon after returning to work, in defiance of the sack notice served on him by his party, the ruling Nationalist Party (N.P.). His right hand groped unsteadily, missing the target, as he tried to offer a handshake to some waiting State House aides. His black bowler hat in his left hand shook all the way, as he shuffled through the small crowd of loyal aides, into his office.

It is reported that

for his (Botha's) growing band of political opponents in the ruling National Party, who had unanimously endorsed Frederick De Klerk, the party's new leader, to succeed Botha, it was clear that this grand old patron of apartheid was yet to recover from what was officially called a 'mild stroke'. But Botha, 73, a man reputed to have the 'constitution of a bull', proved last week that, there was still some fire left in him. He told off his party in an unprecedented political tug-of-war and balked at the decision of the party to forcefully show him out of office. 'I have informed them that I have resumed my task as the state

president today', Botha told a handful of loyal ministers at his formal, first meeting with them in two months. (*Newswatch*, March 27, 1989, page 31).

As it would normally be expected, the return of Botha to office after his party had dispossessed him of the leadership of the Nationalist Party, ushered in a Gordian knot in the political arrangement of South Africa precipitating

a fierce power struggle described as the worst constitutional crisis in South Africa since 1984.

This led *The Beeld* Newspaper, an Afrikaans (Dutch) language daily to ask "just who, exactly, is running this country?"

The ruling Nationalist Party held an emergency meeting in Cape Town in which the party discussed behind closed doors and "clearly expressed anger at Botha's refusal to step down 'honourably', the party's 29-member supreme Federal Board (an advisory body which consists mostly of the cabinet members and party chieftains) and the 133-member party caucus (which is made of all party's legislators) voted unanimously to withdraw Botha's mandate to rule. De Klerk, 52, the Education Minister was elected the leader of the party after Botha was struck by a stroke, was mandated to replace the ailing Botha. 'The National caucus had told Botha to pack his bags'. This decision "in principle was that, the leader of the National Party should be the state president", said Con Botha, the spokesman of the party. This clearly shows that, the party got wind of Botha's unyieldable determination to stick to the presidency. The party spokesman reportedly sounded an alarm to Botha 'to avoid confrontation' and ensure a smooth handover to De Klerk", stating further that:

this decision leaves the door open for Botha to retire It is now expected to be merely a matter of time and procedure to arrange for his (Botha's departure from Tuynhys, the State House) and public life.... There is a strong feeling by the caucus that, confrontation should be avoided if at all possible. (*Newswatch*, March 27, 1989 page 32).

The President elect, de Klerk also called on Botha to: "quietly retire". de Klerk who is reported as having handled the "toughest leadership crisis" of the party, said after the emergency meeting of the party, "I am in principle the leader-in-chief of the National Party, and the decision was in principle, that the leader-in-chief of the National Party should be the state president".

Unbelievably, the unyielding Botha, in a television interview, living in a fools paradise, and continuously disregarding de Klerk merely described de Klerk as 'one of my good advisers' whom he said was only being 'misused by some people' in the party. He oozed out a shocker to party members when he announced that, he "would not even call for an early election this year (1989) but until the end of his tenure in March next year (1990)". Earlier on, while recovering from his partial stroke at a place referred to as wilderness, Botha had the temerity to voice out his intentions to "seek re-election after his five-year term expires".

It is on record that, the crisis in party, master-minded by Botha, created a constitutional impasse or stalemate which resulted into an agonizing frustration on the part of the ruling Nationalist party. This was so because, the party "lacked the legal and constitutional powers to force the president out of office before his term of office expires". Furthermore, the constitution says that:

it is the president, not the party, who sets the date for a general election. And for that reason, many believed that it is only a pacified and gracefully treated Botha who holds the key to solving the crisis.

The crack in the ruling Nationalist Party was bound to create a crack on the whole body politic of South Africa, because, as Aniete Usen, of *Newswatch* has reported

even if Botha were to change his mind and call for elections right away, analysts believe the damaging public fight would certainly hurt the party and give an edge to its main rival, and Andres Treunicht's far-right Conservative party, (C.P.).

Thus, the crack in the ruling party gradually took a bigger dimension. Observers, watchers and political analysts, therefore, began to question and weigh the probable outcome of "the power struggle" in the light of the overall South African situation. Opinion and speculations differed. Some people opined that, "if de Klerk takes over, will that mean a significant shift, change of heart or perpetuation and re-enforcement of the apartheid status quo, to the detriment of black majority. Or, are Botha and his close aides better disposed to speed up the 'reforms' - a case of the enemy you know being better than the one you don't know".

Now, the question is what has the devil you know, done in the favour of blacks, which the devil you do not know may do which may harm blacks the more? According to *Newswatch* of March 27, 1989, in his 10 (ten) years as South Africa's leader, Botha pressurized by international affront "legalized mix-marriages and scrapped laws that preserved many jobs for whites and prevented blacks from moving into the so-called

white cities coloured (mixed race) and Asian South Africans were given their chambers in parliament. But blacks were kept out, and they rejected subsequent attempts to offer them anything less than full voting rights in a colour-blind democracy". Furthermore, it is reported that, to his western mentors, Botha appeared as a person who is quite aware of the limits of apartheid system, "that apartheid has no place in today's world." Botha, it seems sometimes recognizes the limit of South African power: that South Africa cannot sustain forever terrorism against neighbouring Frontline States or afford to go on losing soldiers in Angola or pay for the occupation of Namibia. That much is known about Botha".

On the other hand, various questions had been raised on "who is de Klerk" and all that he stands for in terms of either invigorating Botha's crippled reforms or not. A British magazine with a conservative background predicted that, de Klerk was "unlikely to be in a hurry to (continue) with reforms". Several instances were cited whereby "as a leader of the party's Transvalle branch, the bastian of the right-wing racial onslaught, he resented the so-called "wide-ranging reforms" that Botha embarked upon. As Education Minister, he tried unsuccessfully to cut down the number of blacks enrolling white universities and to stop political activities there. Following his election on February 2, 1989, he addressed white parliament. He stated among other things that the South African government needed to develop a constitution which would take care of the rights of both the whites and the blacks in South Africa. Said he:

I want to state unequivocally that, the National Party is against domination, of any one group by others. White domination, in so far as it still exists, must go.

His speech was taken with some reservations, since it bordered on double-dealing, which clearly manifested itself in a speech in which he said:

government was committed to segregated neighbourhood, schools and other facilities under the principle of 'group rights'.

As if he was addressing kindergartens, de Klerk, went on to inform South Africans (blacks) that

a strong emphasis on group rights, alongside individual rights, is based on the reality of South Africa and not on an ideological obsession or racial prejudice.

The reaction from watchers of South Africa, following that speech was predictable. People quickly

cast de Klerk in the mould of the grumpy and 'blood thirsty' John Vorster, Botha's predecessor, who was chased out of office by a huge scandal in 1978.

Our attempts in the preceding chapters is to chronologically outline the factors which led to the final release of Dr. Nelson Mandela. In this wise, it is significant to emphasize here as the topic of this chapter states that, cracks had started developing in South Africa. It is therefore quite human to expect that cracks in the South African ruling National Party would definitely fall within the warm embrace of the blacks. This is exactly what happened. One black South African miner in Carltonville, a mining town in Transvaal, reportedly said, "for now, we are glad spectators". The crack also fractionalized the ruling National Party, culminating into a weak position vis-a-vis the rival conservative party and the anti-apartheid campaigns.

The crack in South Africa assumed a tremendously irreparable proportion, when the Afrikaner's Dutch Reformed Church (the largest and the white minority's most influential church), historically declared apartheid "as a sin and expressed guilt for its role in providing spiritual sustenance for the racist ideology". After a week-long meeting, the church came out unequivocally to state that, "we confess with humility and sorrow the participation of our church in the introduction and legitimization of the ideology of apartheid and subsequent suffering of people apartheid cannot be accepted on christian ethical grounds, because it contravenes the very essence of reconciliation, neighbourly love and righteousness". This explicit and candid statement of condemnation of apartheid policy of South African government by over one million white-membered church marked a watershed and infact an irreversible turning point in the social, political and economic constitution or structure of South Africa. This is because, "Pieter Botha and virtually all his cabinet ministers and senior officials of the party" belong to the Dutch Reformed Church. As Aniete Usen has aptly stated:

for a church that provided the spiritual foundation for apartheid and actually codified racial segregation, its repentance, observers said, is a big blow to apartheid.

Before the dawn of 1990, the more destabilizing issues continued to work against the apartheid policy, thus deepening the crack in the system. When the government - appointed law commission published its report in March, 1989, the waves of devastation had been let loose on the

South African political terrain. This is because, the report of the law commission "called for an end to all apartheid laws and the creation of voting rights for the black majority". Aniete Usen reported in the *Newswatch* that, this commission which was appointed by Kobbie Coetsee the Justice Minister in 1986 included officials of the Justice Minister as well as top-ranking judges and legal scholars. It is this very important commission which said:

all attempts at race reforms were unlikely to succeed unless the government allows the country's 28 million blacks to participate fully in the national elections.

The commission emphasized that

a bill of rights will not be accepted as legitimate if the black peoples in South Africa are not given the vote.

The commission added that

the right to vote is one of the fundamental human rights that must be enshrined in any constitution.

In effect, the recommendation of the commission entails that

as a first step to the new constitution that is being prepared, the present statute books should be purged of all discriminatory legislation.

Whether or not the government of South Africa acts immediately on the recommendations of the commission, what we are sure of is that a deep crack has been established in the apartheid system and that its demise is just a question of time. We wish to re-echo the fact that the stand of South African Church is devastating to the apartheid system. Aniete Usen of the *Newswatch* says of it:

but the church's stance and the commission's total rejection of the murderous racist ideology is certainly the beginning of the inexorable end of apartheid.

Inspite of unrelenting attempts by Botha to cling tenaciously to power, de Klerk, welding the support of the ruling Nationalist Party uprooted him and became the South African President. By the end of 1989 and by the beginning of 1990, de Klerk had started initiating moves which eventually led to the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela. Reliable sources have it that, he (Pieter Botha) had planned to release Nelson Mandela in order to appease the blacks and also soften international

pressures against apartheid. However, F.W. de Klerk, a clever chap, pulled a fast one by advising Pieter Botha against such move. de Klerk had played his game. The stage was now set for him to make history, i.e. become the President of South Africa, release Nelson Mandela and attain the role of a dramatic personae of South African and international politics in the 1990s.

In the second week of February, 1990, President de Klerk announced the lifting of the 30-year-old ban on anti-apartheid movements in South Africa. "He the President had practically been driven to make the historic policy statement by Mandela's unyielding fighting spirit". (*African Guardian*, February 12, 1990).

President de Klerk stood in the South African Parliament which is dominated by whites and announced "the legalization of the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan African Congress (PAC) and most surprisingly, the Communist Party" (*African Guardian*, February 12, 1990). This announcement meant that, "the Mass Democratic Movement (MDM), an umbrella union, bringing together the various anti-racist organizations at home in Pretoria, were now to operate freely". He told Parliament that, Dr. Mandela's date of release would be announced "soon".

As Emenike Okorie of the *African Guardian* has correctly stated,

for the ANC leader, however, what appeared to matter most was not the date for his release, but Pretoria's decision to legalize ANC and other groups. This was one of the conditions given by Mandela, for dialogue with the white minority government. The ANC chief, who is South Africa's best known black leader, also insisted on the release of all political prisoners and the lifting of the three-year state of emergency. He had refused to settle for less, even when that entailed his indefinite detention.

Sensing excessive pressure from the international community and exacerbating internal violence, Pretoria, even before de Klerk assumed the presidency, "with his reformist agenda, in October, 1989", had "on its part, demanded that, Mandela renounced violence as a condition for his freedom". When de Klerk took over, the racist regime further demanded Mandela "to endorse, in principle, a peculiar form of 'democracy' for South Africa in which all races will have equal say on the basis of group rights. Such a system implies the negation of the universal democratic principle of one man one vote, through which political power was expected to go eventually to the blacks (the majority)", says Okorie of the *African Guardian*. Nelson Mandela refused all the proposals of Pretoria; because he knew that the issues for which he had been imprisoned since 1962, were more involving and "quite enormous". This meant that for him to accept political pardon based on such conditions, "without insisting on

the change of the unjust system under which he was jailed - would have immediately obliterated whatever gains his three decades of self sacrifice brought".

Nelson Mandela, a seasoned nationalist and politician had refused to be set free on conditions laid down by the South African authorities in order to avoid retaining an inferior position in the process of conducting negotiations with the racist regime. Emenike Okorie sums it up this way:

President de Klerk had hoped that Mandela, after his release, would lead other black nationalists in negotiations with Pretoria. The fact, analysts however say, is that if he (Mandela) had agreed to step out of prison on Pretoria's terms, he would have placed himself at a very inferior position vis-a-vis the racists authorities. In which case, he would, at best, have hoped to extract only a few, insignificant concessions from the government. But with him still in jail, the rising tide of world opinion was expected to give him necessary political leverage over the racist authorities. Besides, whatever reform efforts made by de Klerk, experts said, would perpetually be overshadowed by the international concern for Mandela's freedom.

Pan African Congress still made very stringent conditions for talks with South African authorities such as the "acceptance of the principle of one man, one vote, abrogation of all racists laws among other things". The racist regime had not completed negotiations with the ANC by Saturday, February 10, 1990 either. It was therefore a special news to the world when on Sunday, February 11, 1990, 3.00p.m. Nigerian time, Dr. Mandela's release from prison was announced.

It is significant to state here that, the release of Dr. Mandela is just the beginning of things. A stage is now being properly set for a revolutionary onslaught on the racist policy of apartheid and the strategies could be learned from the lessons of the Nicaraguan revolution which forms the next chapter, titled: "Sustaining the Struggle Against Apartheid".

CHAPTER SEVEN

Sustaining the Struggle Against Apartheid

The strong will of Dr. Nelson Mandela, the concerted efforts of the ANC, the PAC, the Communist party, the MDM, the South African blacks and the progressive world has led to the release of Nelson Mandela. This is a signpost for greater revolutionary achievements against apartheid government in the nearest future. However, this revolutionary zeal, flavour and success will remain illusionary if the denigrated and incarcerated blacks of South Africa refuse to learn the lessons of Nicaraguan revolution as argued by Dr. Ayu of University of Jos.

It is significant to note that

"tucked in a far away Central America, Nicaragua and its revolutionary politics may not appear very remote from Africa. However, like Vietnam, it is close on the doorsteps of the oppressed of Africa in its past history of imperialist assault, contemporary history of authoritarian regimes and militarized society; and the struggle of its people to overthrow tyranny and exploitation and in its place, erect a just and humane society".

There are certain "broad lessons African and black South Africans nationalists can learn from the Nicaraguan peoples struggles.... inspite of obvious differences in detail".

First, the people of South Africa must not allow imperialism, the "monopoly stage of capitalism that emerged in the 19th century" which "has no respect for humanity", takes "roots and thrives on the division of" the "indigenous people" to constitute a hurdle in the drive towards the political, social, moral, intellectual and economic liberation of the oppressed South Africans.

Secondly, the people of South Africa must not allow the ruling class to mediate the division of the people "with secondary variables as religion and ethnicity, factors which have, for years divided and prevented even the working people from uniting to decisively confront imperialism", both internal and external.

Thirdly, the African Nationalists must on succeeding ensure that a social, political and economic system, institutionalized in South Africa, takes proper care of the whole citizenry in all forms of good social services, acceptable standard of living and reduction in excessive capital accumulation or unlimited acquisition of "private property", because,

"despite vocal propagation of freedom, human rights, liberty and democracy, imperialism recognises only one freedom, i.e. the freedom of private property".

Fourthly, imperialism thrives in independent countries "in association with other fractions of the dependent bourgeoisie". The local capitalists and their imperialist cousins must be checked in order to establish an orderly and progressive South Africa.

Fifthly, the South African nationalist must ensure that the culture of fear which the racist South African government has institutionalized, (promoted and has made prevalent, becomes a thing of the past. This is because whatever their messianic pretensions, "*Somoiza type authoritarian military regimes which have no popular base such as apartheid South Africa*" - emphasis mine) survive only as the future of fear which they institutionalize and promote prevails".

The sixth point is that, "the culture of fear has its limits, for sooner or later, an oppressed people, faced with no other choice, will certainly respond. In doing this, they resurrect the whole history of resistance to oppression". We have had the Sharpeville massacre, the Soweto uprisings in South Africa. South African nationalist must acknowledge that the culture of fear can be wrecked with a ferocious onslaught of mass uprising organized by a purposeful leadership such as happened in the cases of "Mau Mau in Kenya, Iva Valley in Nigeria, Anya Nya in the Sudan", headed by "the 19th century patriotic struggles of Benjamin Zeledon and more prominently Augusto Caesar Sandino".

The seventh lesson is that, liberation can neither come to use

through the apathy or the culture of silence.

Africans must possess the moral courage to speak the truth in the face of their misfortunes.

Today in Africa, more than any other people, we require this moral courage to speak the truth about our peoples misfortunes; droughts, hunger, malnutrition, disease, squalor, mass migration and mortifications. All of which are overseen by enormous wealth and unconcerned tyrannies.

As Dr. Ayu has correctly contended,

in speaking this truth, however, it is to our own people rather than the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other components of imperialism that we need to direct our pronouncements. For in the final analysis, it is the mobilized, organized, conscious and determined people of Africa themselves like the people of Nicaragua, who will fight and end their condition of misfortune.

The eighth lesson which Africans generally and South Africans in particular have to learn is that of the role of intellectuals. The intellectuals in South Africa choose between working for the present decadent racist regime or join other nationalists in the struggle against apartheid South Africa. Once more as Dr. Ayu has correctly stated,

the intellectuals of the oppressed nations have a choice. They can either continue to work for the reproduction of exploitative relations either consciously or by pretending to be neutral scholars or become organic to the struggles of working people. If the latter, then, they will become, a vanguard who will agitate, organize, mobilize and lead them in battle against their oppressors.

because

in China, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, Algeria, and South Africa, names of Nkrumah, Neto, Mondlane, Machel, Cabral, Fanon and Mandela respectively, represent this tradition of revolutionary intellectuals.

The "younger generation" of African intellectuals must take up the challenge of Nkrumah, Fanon and Cabral, "by leading the people to decimate imperialism in Africa in both its apartheid and neo-colonial forms".

The ninth lesson the African nationalists in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa must learn from the Nicaraguan revolution is that as Franz Fanon correctly taught:

imperialism is an organized and violent phenomenon which can only be destroyed by a better organised, disciplined and greater violence.

This is true because as Ayu has acceptably stated

putschist conspiracies, assassinations or bourgeois elections, no matter the magnitude of their significance, cannot dismantle imperialism.

The number ten lesson the South African nationalists should learn from the Nicaraguan revolution is that, there are usually "immediate gains that popular struggle translates into. Remembering what Wheelock says, it means popular participation in decision making on a day to day week to week, month to month, year to year and long term bases. It means the people control the means of economic and social production and distribution. It means jobs, effective health care, food, houses, clean water and quantitatively and qualitatively meaningful education for every citizen. It means full equal rights for women at home and at work. Above all, it means a new personality, dignified, confident and determined to

defend the gains of the people", says Dr. Ayu. "On the reverse side", Dr. Ayu argues that, popular power means "saying no to imperialist control, no to dependence on foreign aid and foreign loans, no to the I.M.F., no to the dominance of multi-national and industrial capital. It means the end of ruling tyrannies of the Somoza-like families of exploiters; it means the termination of massive outflows of capital to imperialist dens".

Number eleven lesson is that "if Nicaraguans can liberate themselves from a similar system (imperialist system) African people must gear up support for the liberation movements in South Africa, the ANC and SWAPO". Dr. Ayu in his uninhibited characteristic has contended that:

Nicaragua, like Angola, teaches us that people who try to truly liberate themselves must be prepared to confront counter-liberation reaction of imperialism. It means that cordiality with the imperialist powers explains the domestic nature of the regime; so also the existence of tense relations. Here, one may note the propaganda drive against Libya, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe on the one hand; and the praises for Nigeria, Kenya, Ivory Coast and Senegal on the other. This and recent events in Nicaragua should teach us a thing or two about what true liberation means.

Imperialism has to be vehemently resisted because as Daniel Ortega has reportedly testified, imperialism

cannot conceive of a free people. Because simply and plainly, for them "the people" is nothing more than an empty phrase.

It is an established fact that brutal defence of private property is the hallmark of imperialism. It should however be noted as Ayu has clearly stated that defending private property which is a hallmark of imperialism

is in itself an act of desperation by a decaying socio-economic system.

Dr. Ayu contends that

support for apartheid South Africa, Somoza's Nicaragua, Mobutu's Zaire, Nimeri's Sudan, the Shah of Iran and numerous other dictatorship around the world should teach Africa that imperialism is not interested in African Liberation, never mind the Chidins and Reagan's 'Constructive Engagement' which is a euphemism for active support for apartheid South Africa.

Viewed from the perspectives of recent happenings in Eastern Europe, some bourgeois intellectuals and undiscerning minds may be tempted to

question the relevance of Dr. Ayu's undisguised visitation of imperialism with brimstone and fire. However, what should be realized is that, the recent social, political and economic upheavals in Eastern Europe are not in the least a wholesome acceptability of imperialism and international capitalism with their unrestrained and unpardonable criminality which has left numerous human beings in Europe, America, Japan and elsewhere in irredeemable slums, nauseating squalors and repugnant incarcerations among other woes.

Recent happenings in the Soviet Union specifically and Eastern Europe in general only confirm and are in conformity with Lenin's teaching that compromise is an acceptable weapon in the liberation struggle and should be adopted where necessary. According to Lenin,

it (compromise) is an indisputable objective law of the revolutionary process, and in the broader sense, of historical process as whole. (Lebede 1989: 49).

Alexander Lebedev (Ibid page 49) comments on the issue of compromise during the revolutionary struggle thus:

undoubtedly, the sum total of political ideas linked with Lenin's views in the period of his activities that we have examined gives reason to maintain that *compromise* (emphasis mine) is not at all a special case of 'paradox' in the general history of the liberation movement. On the contrary, compromise is an undisputable objective of the revolutionary process and, in the broader sense, of historical process as a whole.

The U.S.S.R. Year Book 1989: 51 says:

the idea of the inter-relationship between proletarian and global interests, inherent in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, has found a new, much deeper appreciation in the U.S.S.R. today. This has led to the conclusion that universal human values are indisputably of prime importance nowadays. The realization of this primacy is at the heart of the new political thinking.

In the case of the West versus the East, it is clearly seen that, there is no clear demarcation in the social and economic programmes. For instance, the social welfare programmes introduced in Britain, Germany, France, America plus some western European countries have been borrowed from the eastern block. This explains why the present agitation for adjustments in the eastern block should not be construed as a total relegation of the socialist system. It is a question of cross-carpeting of ideas based on practical approach to issues of the time.

Talking about liberation movements in South Africa, it is significant to suggest that, where the concept of compromise could solve

the problem of dismantling the apartheid policy and instituting a humane democratic government of the majority, a little of the compromise should be applied. For as Lebedev (op cit page 48) has correctly stated:

compromise grows out of a combination of social circumstances, which are often extremely varied, as a result of the inter-action of rather complex situations, situations which might even seem mutually exclusive, a compromise can be said to be the "resultant" of conflicting social forces.

What is happening in eastern Europe is a realistic approach in the redefinition of socialist principles along the lines of present day demands of humanity as well as Lenin's emphasis on compromise as a necessity in the general history of liberation movements, (*U.S.S.R. Year Book 1989: 51*). Africans should not be blinded by the recent happenings in eastern Europe in their drive towards a total liberation of their people not only from political dependence but also from the melancholy tentacles of shameless imperialism and global capitalism.

The number twelve lesson we have to learn from the Nicaraguan revolution is that:

The liberation of Nicaragua, like the liberation of Vietnam, Russia, China, Cuba, is the liberation of Africa. The contribution of the Russian and Chinese revolutions and the struggle in Vietnam and Cuba to African independence governments and independence itself had been decisive. Apart from spurring on African nationalists, these revolutions weakened the resolve of imperialist powers, by showing that imperialism can be defeated by the power of the organized people.

Today, following the release of Nelson Mandela, we expect the oppressed and incarcerated people of South Africa to be more organized under a committed leadership of African nationalism with Mandela and others constituting and providing them with the necessary "guiding stars" and vanguardship for the total social, economic, political, cultural and Psychological emancipation. In this way, the liberations of people elsewhere may be said to have had a positive impact on South Africa and the adage that "one liberation weakens imperialism and advances other liberations" shall deem to have come true. Dr. Ayu concludes on the lessons of Nicaraguan revolution for Africa by saying that:

but vice-versa, a newly liberated territory is better strengthened by stretching the forces of imperialism, i.e. by opening and intensifying new theatres of struggle. In essence, therefore, opening up and intensifying such theatres in Africa today in solidarity with the people of Nicaragua and other people struggling against oppression is a revolutionary imperative. Perhaps, it is this understanding that moved

Sandinó to declare (as we have noted) that the cause of the peoples of Nicaragua is 'the cause of all the oppressed people',

including South Africa. The authorities of the decadent apartheid South African policy must realise as J.F. Kennedy once stated that:

those who make peaceful reforms impossible make violent revolutions inevitable.

We wish to add that Lenin taught that application of revolutionary violence is necessitated by the resistance of the exploiting class" (Jacobs 1979: 181). In essence, we wish to emphasize that, as far as the white minority continues to exploit the majority black in South Africa, revolutionary violence has no alternative. It is in the light of the above that we wish to emphasize that revolutionary violence will continue indefinitely as long as black exploitation goes on in South Africa. It is usually the outcome of terror, emanating from the exploiters. Once the exploiters in South Africa cease unleashing terror on the blacks and agree to a purposeful and democratic settlement, then, the blacks will also stop using terror against the whites. According to Lenin, as soon as the political situation of a nation is improved, mass terror and death penalty should be abolished. This is why

as soon as the nations (Soviet Union's) political situation had improved, when in January, 1920, the Red Army took Rostov, and thus, won a most important victory over Deinkin, Lenin instructed Dzerzhinsky to stop mass terror and to abolish the death penalty. (Jacobs 1979: 180).

We do hope a day will dawn in South African when the exploiting class, i.e. the whites, will cease their terrorist acts against the blacks in order to pave way for a peaceful negotiated settlement with black nationalists. It is only then that mass terrorism in South Africa will end.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Nelson Mandela Visits Nigeria

On Saturday, May 12, 1990, the *Weekend Concord* reported that, Dr. Nelson Mandela was billed to visit Nigeria. The paper reported that, this giant nationalist would start his visit on Sunday, May 13, 1990. The paper added that, "three grand laurels have been reserved in Nigeria for the living symbol of the protracted anti-apartheid struggle". These are "national honour" which would be conferred on Dr. Mandela at the State House on the Marina by President Ibrahim Babangida. The paper further reported that, the University of Lagos, "will confer an honorary Doctor of Law degree on the 71 year old black leader" at a special Convocation scheduled for Monday at the Akoka Campus of the University. The report went on to say that, Dr. Mandela would then move to the National Theatre, Iganmu, "where he will collect the City of Glasgow Award, an honour received on Dr. Mandela's behalf by Nigeria nine years ago".

Dr. Mandela's release from South African prison and subsequent visit to Nigeria is very significant. First, his release justifies the belief generally held by all progressive forces that, no amount of human suppression, oppression and degradation can ever triumph over the determination to fight for freedom by either one person or many people. Freedom of man and humanity generally is the golden gift from our creator - God. This means that, unless God sanctions the oppression of a person or a people, it will never come to pass. God in his infinite mercy and omnipotence has demonstrated to the world through the release of Dr. Mandela that the racial bigotry on the part of the whites in South Africa and elsewhere is only a question of time and His (God's) wish. By this release, we are today made to believe that, one day the concrete walls of racial discrimination and bigotry mounted by the white species, especially in Britain and United States of America and other parts of the world would collapse like a pack of cards. Colonel Gaddafi of Libya is reported to have once stated that the black people constitute the last race to rule the world. With the released of Dr. Mandela and powerful upsurge of people like Jesse Jackson (black civil rights leader) in the United States of America's political arena and election of a black parliamentarians in Britain, we can proudly say we have seen the hopeful signs of black leadership of the world in not a very distant future. Secondly, the visit of Mandela to Nigeria is significant because of the prominent role Nigeria played both at African and world platforms to ensure that this "model son of black race and Africa" is release of the

gargantuan task which Nigeria has set for herself, that is, the total liberation of Africa and the black race from the unrelenting clutches of whites, yellow, etc. racial bigots all over the world.

CHAPTER NINE

Our Prayers

To this writer, who at certain times wept and prayed to God for Dr. Mandela's release, the release of Mandela and visit to Nigeria is a dream come true. We wish to welcome Dr. Nelson Mandela to Nigeria with cheerful and open minds and pray that the Almighty who endowed him with the iron-like strength to withstand the 27 gruesome years of tortuous imprisonment under the South African racist bigots, should give him more strength, a strong will, a clear mind, a rhetoric and eloquent voice so that, he will live a little longer to serve South Africa, Africa, the black race and the world dignifyingly in the social, political and economic arena.

All South African black leaders of ANC, PAC, Communist Party, MDM, Incatha should consult among themselves and stop in fighting so that they can unite for the purpose of total liberation of the Union of South Africa Republic and establishment of a democratically elected government in their country. In that way, all South African black leaders and we here in Nigeria and elsewhere in the world would be saying, Dr. mandela we welcome you from prison, we welcome you to Nigeria. We welcome you to the world. You have a positive role to play in world affairs and so, please, pick up the gauntlet and let us continue with the fight for peace and freedom of humanity which the current, wind of change has ushered into the world. The fight must be fought with zeal and zest. South Africa must be free. The world must accept freedom as an inalienable right of every human being, be it in the north or south pole.

CHAPTER TEN

Dr. Nelson Mandela's Visit to Nigeria as Reported by "Sunday Voice" and "Newswatch"

- a. *Mandela: The Man and His Mission Recollections on a Hero's Visit to Nigeria: by Jonah Ajigah*

Sunday, May 13, 1990, will go down the annals of Nigerian history as a unique day in the sense that it reminds all Nigerians of their struggle to liberate themselves from colonial bondage. The catalyst for that reminder was no other person than Dr. Nelson Mandela, the Black Moses of South African liberation.

That, Dr. Nelson Mandela chose to visit Nigeria to express his profound gratitude to a country that has stood solidly behind him like the Rock of Gibraltar, in his hours of travail and incarceration, is also a demonstration of his sense of seeing things from their right relations and proper proportions. That Nigeria welcomed him with open arms and bestowed upon his brow, garlands of honour is also an open testimonial to our collective resolve to see that justice and fair play, righteousness, forthrightness, truth, equity, impartiality, lawfulness, legality, propriety, reasonableness, rectitude, and uprightness, are accorded their prime place in a new South Africa where man would no longer play wolf to his fellow man.

As Martin Luther King once said, humanity must learn to live together as brothers or perish together as fools, for in the words of Carlos P. Romulo:

brotherhood is the very price and condition of man's survival.

No sooner had Mandela with his precious wife, Winnie, and their entourage touched the tarmac of Murtala International Airport than they became visibly aware that indeed Nigeria was their home, and Nigerians their kith and kin. This was evidenced in Mandela's own admission, when he said, that he was not just a guest in Nigeria, but that he was coming home.

Nigeria is a home for the Mandelas because of the role the country has been playing towards the dismantling of a warped system of government so repugnant to international conscience. Nigerians love and

cherish freedom and that's why our late families, namely, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Obafemi Awolowo, Ahmadu Bello, Anthony Enahoro, Tafawa Balewa, Mokwugo Okoye, Dennis Osadebey, J.S. Tarka and a host of their other contemporaries dead or alive, staked their lives and won for our country, an early independence, "on the platter of gold". These stalwarts were contemporaries with Dr. Nelson Mandela, whose life has been the struggle - the struggle to free his people from the jaws of hell on-earth.

The massive turn out at the National Stadium, Surulere, Lagos, at the Michael Okpara Square, Enugu, and at the Murtala Square, Kaduna, was no doubt a solidarity rally with the Mandelas that Nigerians are behind them in spirit and in flesh, in material and financial, in moral and legal aptitudes, to make sure that the crusade against man's inhumanity to man, of a few white misadventures against their superior majority blacks, is taken to its logical conclusion within our life time. Nigerians were also encouraged to turn out enmasse, to see a man born of royalty, but, who forsook his aristocracy of birth, identified with the oramen of humanity, and became a touchstone of freedom - freedom from apartheid, freedom from racism, freedom from persecution and tribulation, freedom from misguided arrogance, supercilious behaviour, and pharisaical attitude.

No wonder then that the Mandelas shed tears of joy when they witnessed the show of love, of respect and of admiration to them in all the places they visited. That, Mandela could spend 27 years in jail for no crime against humanity is in itself revealing. It speaks volumes of a frontier spirit - the spirit of Apollo which refuses to be diverted or deceived or defeated by the vicissitudes of the game of life. It shows a man of stature whose courage of convictions could not be questioned.

Mandela is a rare specimen of humanity who is more sinned against than sinning. No wonder then that in his citations on the conferment of an honorary doctorate degree of law (LLD) on him by the University of Lagos, Professor Nurudeen Alao, the citadel's Vice Chancellor, spoke in glowing terms:

We are here gathered to honour a man of exemplary courage, great wisdom, tremendous intellect and unusual selflessness.

We are here gathered to honour a man whose life has been totally immersed in the struggle for the liberation of the under-privileged and the oppressed. To honour Nelson Mandela is to acknowledge and honour the finest qualities of leadership in man courage, selflessness, perseverance discipline, deep insight and great foresight.

Professor Alao acknowledged mandela as a colossus who submitted to torture so that his brethren may be spared, one who

accepted incarceration and confinement so that his compatriots may be free.

Public orator of the University of Lagos, Professor Laz Ekwueme in his five-page citation for the honorary alumnus, said that, Dr. Mandela did not close his eyes to the inequality that existed between Africans and whites, and also among Africans themselves, even though birth conferred on him royalty.

Turning to Mandela, he declared succinctly:

Sir, your brilliance at schools is exemplified amply by your admission at the age of 16 to Fort Hare University College in the Cape Province to read for a Bachelor of Arts Degree. It was while you were at Fort Hare that the level of your consciousness attracted the attention of the authorities, and the mettle of which you were made, began to show.

Sir, you have dedicated your whole life to the service of your people and your sacrifices are recognised by the entire humanity as symbolising the victory of good over evil, of truth against falsehood, of human triumph over defeat, of love over hatred, of peace over war, of harmony over discord.

He went on:

Your fight against racism and human degradation and your renewed determined effort to see the emergence of non racial peaceful and harmonious society in South Africa, mark you out as a genuine leader, a rare statesman, a special symbol of justice, and noble specimen of homosapiens whose example is worthy of emulation.

Professor Ekwueme believes, and all other Nigerians and lovers of freedom believe with him, that in the fullness of time and in Mandela's lifetime, all South Africans would enjoy freedom and all that it brings. The celebrated freedom fighter has since received his honourarium.

But if the University of Lagos saw Mandela as a symbol of justice and fairplay and rewarded him with academic accolades, the Federal Military Government in Nigeria believes that Nelson mandela should be knighted with one of the nation's highest honours for his indomitable and relentless struggles against apartheid.

Taking measured steps towards the tall and imposing septuagenarian, President Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida awarded Dr. Nelson mandela with the Grand Commander of Niger (GCON), and decorated him with the red, white, green, white medallion of the award. The award itself was witnessed by Mandela's wife, Winnie, Mrs. Maryam Babangida and top government officers and diplomats, business and political leaders.

To President Babangida, Mandela is a citizen of the world. He assured him that Nigeria would stand by him until victory is won. He described Dr. Mandela as:

the source of inspiration for all humanity. A citizen of the world in every conceivable sense of the word and the beacon of our common hope for change in South Africa.

Praising mandela's fortitude, President Babangida noted that

our august visitor not only refused to resign himself to the loneliness of prison life, he also gave encouragement to his comrades who were jailed with him.

Maintaining that the struggle of the ANC Deputy President and others hadn't been in vain, President Babangida said that, the anti-apartheid consciousness of Nigerians had grown by the day. In the President's words:

your struggle is our struggle; your victory is our victory.

According to him,

Nigeria could not consider herself free until the blacks in South Africa were liberated from the shackles of racism.

General Babangida made a passing reference to Mrs. Winnie Mandela whom he equally lavished praises on, calling her, "mother of orphans of the revolution and activist extra-ordinary".

The Nigerian leader then prayed that when next Dr. Mandela visits Nigeria, it would be in his capacity as a leader of a free and united South Africa.

As Dr. Nelson Mandela savoured all these lavish ecomiums, he rose to the occasion by saying that:

messages of inspiration make us feel we are freedom fighters in the true sense of the word.

Nigeria, he said,

is an extremely important country to South Africa. It is so important that it is regarded as frontline state.

Nelson Mandela spoke at University of Lagos for fifty minutes without notes; he spoke at the State House, Marina, Lagos, without notes: But every word he uttered, every phrase he prepared, and every sentence he

made, was loaded with wisdom and optimism. "Nigeria", he said, "has given us financial and material support, and scholarship to our students to study in Nigerian Universities. Nigeria has also provided us professionals and made it possible for us to meet the needs which we would not have been able to provide for ourselves."

Mandela and his entourage later zoomed off to Otta, Ogun State, to have a dinner of "special rice, mushroom, fish, and other delicacies" with General Olusegun Obasanjo, Nigeria's former head of state.

That Otta Farm visit was to cause "go-slow" for the Mandelas' visit to Enugu. According to Mandela, they enjoyed themselves so much at Otta, that time just flew up, and by the time they got ready to zoom off to Enugu, rainy clouds had already descended on the coal city. Thus, rather than arriving Enugu at 4.40 p.m. on Monday as scheduled, the Mandelas were there at 7.00 p.m. after the people had waited for two and half hours amidst showers. Nevertheless, the people waited patiently while cultural dancers capered and enjoyed themselves in the rain.

Colonel Robert Akonobi and his wife, Mary, members of the Anambra State Executive, and thousands of other dignitaries had thronged the Nigerian Airport, Enugu.

While tens of thousands more, were waiting at the Okpara Square, the late arrival on Monday evening plus the heavy rain fall, made it imperative for the civic reception prepared for the august visitors to be shifted till the following day. Only a private dinner with the Akonobis and a private meeting with Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, the Owelle of Onitsha, had to take place Monday night.

Tuesday morning came, and the people of Anambra, Akwa Ibom, Cross River, Imo and Rivers States stormed the Okpara Square to behold in blood and flesh, Dr. Nelson Mandela, and his wife Winnie! Jubilation greeted the new dawn. Dancers thrilled the mammoth crowd. Bright Chimeze, the "guitar boy", was in attendance. He praised the Mandelas to the high heavens, and embraced both the man and his wife. members of the Akwa Ibom Traditional Council gave him a traditional title - "Ote-Ikong", a warrior title. Enugu Local Government gave him the key to the coal city. Before he presented mandela to the huge crowd, Professor Chimere Ikoku, Vice Chancellor of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, and former Chairman of the National Committee Against Apartheid eulogised him to high heavens:

The Military Governor, ladies and gentlemen

he said,

I present to you, in blood and flesh, the legendary Dr. Nelson Mandela, Deputy President of the African National Congress, (Grand

Commander of the Federal Republic of Nigeria), Civil Rights Lawyer, visionary and humanist, theoretician and tactician of the South African Revolution, seasoned strategist, uncompromising and Pan-Africanist, selfless and committed activist, freedom fighter par-excellence, prison graduate, inspirer of oppressed humanity and citizen of the world; man of the moment and of the year, nay, man of the century; accomplished negotiator for peace; acclaimed leader of the new South Africa that has been midwived by the irresistible and irreversible march of majority rule, total eradication of apartheid and non-racial democracy.

I also present to you the one and only the inimitable and indomitable, 'Winnie Mandela.

The applause that greeted this presentation was indeed stupendous. Mandela himself was visibly affected.

Robe: Akonobi assured his august visitors of

our committed solidarity to you our brothers and sisters in South Africa,

and charged them to:

kindly take these messages home, especially our conviction that after rain comes sunshine.

Mandela rose in his usual splendour, thanked the people of Anambra and Nigeria for their warm reception and hospitality. He called for world peace, and advised Nigerian youths to embrace education. He pledged that, South African chiefs would soon come to Nigeria to learn our system of royalty. Mandela was indeed in his best as he spoke, amidst shouts of Amandla, freedom, Mandela, and other catchy epithets.

Around 12 noon, the occasion came to a close and the mandelas left for Kaduna. Before their arrival there, the State Government had declared the day a public holiday in their honour.

Over 400,000 people thronged the Murtala Square to welcome him, while traditional dancers, rendered music in the name of Dr. Mandela, the great hero of Africa. Kalangu dancers as well as Bala Miller and his group were at hand to add life and pep to the grand occasion.

He is a worthy son of Africa", Mandela, continue with your good works". Winnie, she has also tried.

These and many more were some of the side comments as people from all works of life praised the courage and commitment of the mandelas for their life struggle.

Altogether, six governors including Lt. Col. Fidelis Makka of Benue State, John Madaki of Katsina State, Colonel Maina of Borno State, Lt. Col. Aliyu Kama of Plateau, Governor Abubakar Saliu of Gongola and the host, Colonel Muktar attended the Kaduna rally.

Yes, the visit to Nigeria of Dr. Nelson Mandela, his wife, Winnie and his team is a solid demonstration, once more of his commitment and our people, to the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. As they travel home and savour all they saw here in Nigeria, we wish to reassure them that, we respect them, that we admire them, and above all, that we love them. We wish them God speed in the fight to sentence apartheid to everlasting coma.

b. *Red Carpet for Mandela by
Dare Babarinsa (Newswatch, May 28, 1990)*

Mandela, Nelson, the world's man of the moment, becomes the toast of Nigeria, as government and people bestow honours on him.

When his name was officially announced, the 4,000 member select audience in the auditorium exploded into a thunderous six-minute applause. For the first time, the University of Lagos Community was having an opportunity to meet Nelson Mandela, 71, the dignified South African nationalist who has checkmated the entire power apparatus of the racist state by three decades of dare-devil brinkmanship, stubborn principles and self-denial. For four days last week, Mandela, vice-president of the African National Congress, (ANC) and Winnie, his equally famous and enchantingly beautiful wife, barnstormed through five Nigerian towns, drawing sincere adulation from millions of citizens, and honours from Nigeria and its institutions.

To keep a date with him last week, young people, most of them not even born when he was sentenced to life jail for organising armed struggle against the apartheid state, trooped to the National Stadium, the National Theatre and now lined his routes to the University of Lagos where he was awarded an honorary doctorate degree. As the special convocation continued in the auditorium, thousands of youths gathered outside the hall and sang solidarity songs for mandela, the man of history.

Mandela, the object of this adulation, received his accolades with dignified humility. Dressed in conservative dark suit and red tie over a snow-white shirt, Mandela who spoke extempore for forty-eight minutes in response to the citation read at the ceremony, said, the many heroes of the South African struggle could not come to Nigeria.

"I receive this honour on their behalf", he said. Speaking on the burden of leadership, Mandela said, a leader's chief attribute is service and the ability to continue learning:

when a leader starts thinking of himself as a hero or a messiah, then he becomes a problem to his people,

he declared,

then, he might even become disaster.

Nurudeen Alao, the University of Lagos Vice Chancellor and the Chairman of the Nelson Mandela reception committee described the visitor as a

distinguished world citizen and a living legend.

Said Alao

We are here to honour a man of exemplary courage, great wisdom, tremendous intellect and unusual selflessness. To honour Nelson Mandela is to acknowledge and honour the finest qualities of leadership in man - courage, selflessness, perseverance, discipline, deep insight and great foresight. We are thus honouring today, a colossus who submitted to torture that his brethren may be spared, one who accepted incarceration and confinement that his brethren may be free. We are honouring a man who is willing to lay down his life that human civilization may survive.

The reception at the Murtala Muhammed International Airport, the previous day, Sunday, May 13, was almost more elaborate than one normally accorded visiting heads of states. The Mandelas, as they stepped down the gangway of the Air Angola jet that brought them, were met by a government team led by Augustus Aikhomo, the Chief of General Staff. Present, too, were leading government officials, including governors and Ministers. Everyone was eager to bask in the glow of "this gem of humanity". Flags of the African National Congress (ANC), and Nigeria as well as portraits of President Ibrahim Babangida and that of Mandela, decorated electric poles along the routes to the national Stadium, Surulere, where an elaborate reception was to take place. It was the second time in history that a visiting dignitary of state would be treated to a reception at the national Stadium, the first being that of Pope John Paul II who visited Nigeria a few years ago.

The reception at the stadium as an emotional outpouring of love for the Mandelas, as about 40,000 people gathered to welcome the South African hero. Nigerian musicians led by the trio of Onyeka Onwenu, Christy Essien-Igbokwe and Sonny Okosuns, who have all rendered songs on the evils of the apartheid system, performed. Visibly moved, Winnie sobbed openly.

The day after the stadium reception, Mandela was formally received by President Babangida at the State House, Marina. Gathered for the reception, were the Nigerian men of power, including General Olusegun Obasanjo, farmer and former Nigerian Head of State, who had stuck up friendship with Mandela during his later years in prison. Obasanjo was then the Co-Chairman of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group (EPG), along with Malcolm Fraser, former Australian Prime Minister. The group visited South Africa when they spoke with Mandela in prison. Also, present was Nigeria's First Lady, who was making her first public appearance since the bloody April 22, coup attempt.

President Babangida who conferred the Grand Commander of the Order of the Niger, (GCON), the nation's second highest honour on the visiting South African nationalist, described Mandela as a great son of Africa. He pledged that, Nigeria would continue to support the South African struggle for a free, democratic and egalitarian society, until victory is won.

I would like on behalf of Nigeria, to publicly pledge our continued and unflinching support for the on going struggle of the heroic people of South Africa for the dismantling of the apartheid system,

said Babangida. The President hoped that by the time Mandela is visiting Nigeria again, it would be as the President of a free and democratic South Africa.

The President also paid tribute to Winnie Mandela, who is eulogised in revolutionary songs across the continent as "Mother of Africa". Babangida described her as the "wife of the South African peoples" struggle, mother to the orphans of the revolution, activist-extraordinary in her own right and a woman who endured three decades of separation from her husband, remained faithful against the odds in spite of persistent harassment to the cause of her husband and the ANC and all oppressed majority of that tragic land.

Mandela himself was to confess that he owed a lot to the love and unbending faith of Winnie. "When I was younger", he told his audience at the University of Lagos Auditorium, one hour after the State House ceremony:

It was not common for a pretty girl to listen to a love proposal from an ex-convict. But his lady.....

He glanced at his wife, who smiled and the hall exploded into an applause. He said for those long years of imprisonment, Winnie had carried on the struggle and had become world famous in her own right.

Now, I run the risk of being introduced as Winnie Mandela's husband,

he said jocularly.

The veteran fighter cast his mind back to the genesis of the armed struggle launched in 1961 after the Sharpeville massacre of 1960, when many African were mowed down by the racist police for protesting against pass law. He said the ANC has always advocated peaceful protest since it was formed in 1912. He recalled that, the Sharpeville protest had been peaceful and yet the police had fired on the protesters. He said when the ANC organised a sit-in-strike by asking workers to stay at home, racist police came to the townships to break down doors and force the workers back to work.

We were ready to negotiate and conduct peaceful opposition,

he said.

But, the racists were not prepared to allow us to even exist. They were deaf to our cries.

He said it is the oppressor who decided the weapons of opposition to his oppression.

If the oppressor is ready to listen, we would rather talk than resort to armed struggle,

he said.

Recalling those nascent days of the struggle, he quoted a part of the Umkhonto We Sizwe, the military arm of the ANC, manifesto:

The time comes in the list of any nation, when there remains only two choice, - submit or fight. That time has now come to South Africa. We shall not submit and we have no choice but to hit back by all means in our power n defence of our people, our future and our freedom.

Now that decision is paying off three decades later. This week, officials of the ANC and the racist regime of President F.W. De Klerk are meeting to review the implementation of initial agreement between the two parties. Mandela said the racist government has agreed in -principle to release all political prisoners, including those on the death row, the removal of troops from the townships, and an unconditional amnesty for exiles, numbering 40,000, to return home as free citizens. Mandela said it is only when these conditions are fulfilled that the ANC would consider "suspending" armed struggle.

The Mandelas held a meeting with Obasanjo at his Otta Farm

after which he kept a late appointment with Nnamdi Azikiwe, the man who was Nigeria's titular president when Mandela visited Nigeria first in 1962. Mandela praised Nigeria and her leaders and regretted that, he could not meet with Murtala Muhammed, the leader who played a decisive role in the independence struggle of Angola. The common throng, traditional dancers, and the elite, including Anambra State Governor, Robert Akonobi, joined the reception for Mandela at the Michael Okpara Square in Enugu, Tuesday afternoon. Mandela also kept date with the people at Kaduna and addressed the Commonwealth Ministerial Conference on South Africa held in Abuja, last Wednesday.

For Mandela, the Abuja Commonwealth Foreign Ministers meeting was serious business as it gave him the opportunity to address a world audience. Addressing the conference last Wednesday, Mandela implored the foreign ministers to resist pressure from those campaigning for the lifting of sanctions against the racist state. President de Klerk, has argued that the "reforms" he has engineered so far deserve rewards in the form of removing sanctions against South Africa. He has a willing listener in Margaret Thatcher, the British Prime Minister, who from the onset had been an unwilling traveller in the sanction bandwagon.

Mandela said last week that nothing has changed substantially in South Africa to warrant the outside world lifting the sanctions.

when I went to prison, I did not have the vote,

he said:

Twenty-seven years later, I still do not have the vote.

He continued:

The unbanning of the ANC and the release of political prisoners are not what the liberation struggle is all about. There are no grounds whatsoever for lifting sanctions against the racist regime or ending its diplomatic isolation.

President Babangida, who addressed the opening ceremony, said the Federal Government would continue to back the call for sanctions against South Africa as long as the vestiges of the hated apartheid system remains. He said until South Africa crossed the path to democracy and majority rule, the sanction wall should remain standing. he pledged Nigeria's continued support for the frontline African states in their collective resolve to back the ANC and resist South Africa intimidation. he condemned the continued occupation of Walvis Bay in independence Namibia and said South Africa could use it for political and military

intimidation of the young state. He urged the Commonwealth to continue applying pressure on South Africa, especially now that the international climate favours change and democracy, saying:

this is a most crucial period in international politics and in the history of South Africa.

Shridath Ramphal, the out-going Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, appealed to member nations to remain resolute in their opposition to apartheid. Ramphal said if the Commonwealth and the rest of the civilized world should lift sanctions now that the apartheid system is facing pressure, it would amount to "squandering the moment of opportunity". He said if the world should listen to the prayers of de Klerk and lift sanctions, it would demoralise the anti-apartheid forces inside South Africa. He recalled the visit of the EPG to Pollsmoor Prison, where Mandela was living four years ago, and said the changes in the racist enclaves since then have been dramatic. He said the Commonwealth must continue to encourage de Klerk on the path of reforms without lessening pressure on the regime.

we must encourage de Klerk and his colleagues to persist down this path, listening to the voices of all the people of South Africa,

he said.

Joe Clark, the Canadian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs who presided was also happy about the changes in the enclave. Clark said this is the cumulative result of pressures from the rest of the world as well as ceaseless struggle by the South African people.

when we met last in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia), none of us would have been so bold as to dare think that Nelson Mandela would be sitting in our midst, fresh from meetings with the South African President, of which a common commitment was made to a peaceful process of negotiations,

he said.

Mandela left Abuja last Wednesday for Algeria, a country where he once learnt the art of revolutionary warfare as a young activist for the ANC. Before leaving Abuja last week, the ANC leader commented on the on going fratricidal struggle within the black community in South Africa. Since Mandela was released in February, blood letting has continued between the Inkhata Movement led by Zulu Chief, Catha Buthulezi and supporters of the ANC. Mandela said the black community is not divided and that only the racist regime, eager to create a climate of chaos, has been sowing the seed of discord. He said because of this, the racist police has often looked the other way when fighting breaks out among the blacks.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Conclusion

Our Message

In chapter two of this work, we learnt that apartheid policy was advocated, nurtured to full growth by white intellectuals and churchmen. Without mincing words we wish to state that, the South African white intellectuals who masterminded the origin and growth of the apartheid policy have conspicuously displayed their intellectual indigency and the time is up with them today.

It is also reported that, the churchmen supported the diabolic apartheid policy with a Biblical quotation, to wit: Genesis 4:1, which states that God separated darkness from light. Today, we wish to say that, this was a gross misinterpretation of the holy words of God and the hate racial bigots who have misused the divine injunctions of God will pay dearly for their sacrilege. For God said in James 5:4 that:

you have not paid any wages to the men who work in your fields. Listen to their complaints. The cries of those who gather in your crops have reached the ears of God, the Lord Almighty. Your life here on earth has been full of luxury and pleasure. You have made yourselves fat for the day of slaughter. You have condemned and murdered innocent people, and they do not resist you.

Today, the day of reckoning has come for the racial bigots of the South African apartheid policy. They have made themselves fat for the slaughter by the black nationalists. There are two options for the whites. They either chose to dismantle the apartheid policy or face mass slaughter from the black nationalists.

Faced with the impending victory of the international community and the black nationalists, the apartheid government, early this year, has decided to gradually dismantle its devilish system, the first step being the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela. We wish to state that the release of Dr. Mandela is just an attempt to take the lid off the boiling pot.

The knots that have tightened the apartheid policy are yet to be loosened. The seal that was used in sealing and delivering the blacks of South Africa to perpetual penury, destitution, privation, want, need, low water, anguish, torment, excruciating pain and barbaric habitation is yet to be melted off. The perpetuity of unparalleled insanity and despicable display of carnage visited on the South African blacks has come face to

face with the gods of impermanency and the chorus boys are the whites, who must re-echo without mincing words that, "apartheid must go".

The white South Africans who believe in apartheid must realize today that the mercurial rise of search for freedom by blacks can greatly be enhanced by the hot atmosphere of white racial braggery. The white who support apartheid must be prepared to go ice-cold in order to survive the impending explosion of the upsurging black South African mercury of freedom.

The beautiful and glorious laciers of apartheid winter have got to unceremoniously vamoose with the advance of intolerable heat, occasioned by the black nationalist summer in South Africa.

The most recent past years have noticed an unprecedented increase in nationalist violence against apartheid policy in South Africa. We wish to restate here that, the South African whites who support apartheid policy must realise early what a one time American President, J.F. Kennedy said that

those who make peaceful reforms impossible make violence revolutions inevitable.

Today, supporters of apartheid have to chose between a peaceful reform in South Africa which would lead to a democratically elected government based on common franchise or face a violent revolution, whose gains will definitely go to the black nationalists while the devastatingly psychological and physical loss tilts preponderantly to the white South African side.

The white South Africans are the genetic offspring of the Europeans. What is termed civilization today is said to have originated from the so called venerated ideas of the west. Karl Marx a biological offspring of Europe has stated that;

the workers have nothing to lose

in any revolution. What they have to gain is the world. Apartheid white South Africans must realise that in the event of any revolution, it is they that will lose and not the blacks who provide them with cheap labour for luxurious living. The blacks will only lose their "chains" of slavery and unparalleled dehumanization.

It is an established fact that the present set up in South Africa is embedded on violence. Shakespeare once stated that:

these violent delights
have violent ends.

The white South Africans have for long taken so much delight in violence in their dealings with the blacks. Let it be known to them that the wind of change is blowing across the globe and sooner or later their violent delights will have violent ends, unless apartheid is dismantled.

The present political set up in South Africa which has created a favourable atmosphere for the world's renowned social, political, economic and cultural inequalities in that country is illegitimate. But what is legitimacy? Samuel Huntington (1957: 97) has stated that:

legitimacy can be defined as the extent to which the population accepts naturally, without questioning the organization to which it belongs. It releases in some fashion to its activities, an organization could be legitimate in relation to others. Consequently, the broader the area of acceptance, the more legitimate the organization. It can be measured by support given.

The present constitution of the South African apartheid political system is such that a little over 4 million whites have formed a government under the Nationalist Party and are lording it over 28 million blacks. Worst of all the blacks are not allowed to participate in the political process of setting up the government in South Africa. By March, 1989, South African National Party had "a 29-member Supreme Federal Board (an advisory body which consists mostly of the cabinet members and party chieftains) and the 133-member party caucus, which is made up of all the party's legislators" (Newswatch, March 7, 1989). None of the above mentioned is black. Infact, the whole government of South Africa does not recognise the participation of blacks in the country's leadership. If legitimacy is measured by "the broader the area of acceptance" as conceptualized by Samuel Huntington, then, the current apartheid government of South Africa is an unqualified and unquantifiable monument of illegitimacy and illegality. It should be a nauseating eyesore to those who cherish and embellish in the concept of the so-called western civilization.

The present apartheid government of South Africa is a state of slavery for the blacks, which is a direct opposite of the symbolic status of Liberty in America's New York City. America, a country that claims the world leadership of freedom lovers must therefore rise up to eradicate apartheid.

The present South African government which constitutes the bedrock of undisrupted comfort for the whites is a monolith of pain, misery, distress for the blacks as well as a volcanic vortex which has become an interminable source of irritation, anguish and affliction for the black people of South Africa. The white South Africans must realize that the sooner this grand edifice of illegitimacy disappears the better for their present generations and those yet unborn.

The present government in South Africa is an authoritarian conservative one which occurs where there is resistance to moves towards greater equality and greater participation as opined by Samuel Huntington. This system of government is archaic, and the world must rise up to ensure its demise for the benefit of humanity. A revolution is needed to demolish the present apartheid system of government in South Africa.

Apartheid South Africa is an "atrophied institution". Senator J. William Fulbright (1966: 76) has unequivocally stated that: "atrophied institutions" must be disposed of in order "to introduce the hope of social justice". This disposition, he argues must be carried out by way of revolution. He contends correctly that:

revolution after all is not in itself a blessing, it is the product of social and political failure and its sole merit is that it provides the means to dispose of atrophied institutions and to introduce the hope of social justice.

We wish to agree with Senator Fulbright that, the western countries and Japan who support the present apartheid government need to reverse gear and give support to the blacks in their revolutionary struggle against apartheid policy. Senator Fulbright says that

it is important, therefore, that, we set aside false analogies and recognize the social revolutions of the 'third world' as alien phenomena, as phenomena to which American experience has little relevance but which warrant none the less our sympathy and support.

For the sake of peaceful human co-existence in South Africa, we call on the South African government to quickly dismantle the apartheid policy in order to avoid a revolution. This is because as Senator Fulbright (1966: 78) has contended,

the acute phase of any revolution is the rule of extremists. They are brought to power by the dynamism of violent change, which once begun, feeds upon itself, breeding fanaticism.... The extremists of great revolutions - English, French, Russian, Chinese, or Cuban - have demonstrated certain common characteristics, regardless of ideology they have posed. First and foremost, whatever their beliefs, they have possessed them with fanatical intolerance and a ruthless idealism that is used to justify acts of extreme cruelty against opponents. In addition, they all have practiced many of the same techniques of revolutionary action, including propagandizing, parading, street fighting, terrorism, non-violence, guerrilla warfare, and other techniques in varying combinations.

Therefore, in order to survive the impending doomsday which would be ushered in by extremists of anti-apartheid nationalists, and revolutionaries, we call on the white minority in South Africa to dismantle the present apartheid policy with alacrity. We call on supporters of the present apartheid system, especially the western countries, spear-head by Britain, France, Germany plus America and Japan to put pressure on the whites racial bigots to end the policy of apartheid.

The present abhorrent apartheid policy which is heading fast to cataclysm, derives its unfortunate origin and strength from an ungodly concept termed racism. According to Leon P. Baradat (1979: 272) the tradition of racism which:

began in pre-history was passed through Fichte, Schopenhaver, Nietzsche, Gobineau, Wagner and Chamberlain and was finally adopted by Hitler as the basis of his insane political theory.

In the historical practice of racism, it would be observed that, racists have always viewed other races from the prisms of inferiority in comparison to theirs. Racism was central to Nazism. The present so-called allies of Israel e.g. France, Germany and other countries such as the U.S.S.R. (Russia), Spain and other European countries are quite aware of the anti-Semitism which stretched far back into German history. Anti-Semitism derived its source from the undiluted racism which was central to Nazism. Nazism itself was an extension of the Germanic myth and philosophy which extolled "the virtues of Germanic peoples compared to other groups". (Baradat 1979: 269).

Adolf Hitler, the originator of Nazism and hence racism

based his racial philosophy on works of a Frenchman and an Englishman.

It is reported that, a nineteenth century study of linguistics and anthropology had revealed that the languages of many people in Europe and Central Asia were related. In spite of sparse evidence, scientists:

assumed that, these related languages had a common origin, and many scholars began referring to the yet undiscovered people as Aryans.

Thus began a wave of theories on the origin of people in Europe. A French gentleman, sent to Germany as a diplomat, exerted a lot of influence on the Germans. He:

developed a theory of racial superiority that was to have a profound impact on German history. (Baradat 1979: 270)".

He argued basically:

that, the Aryans were a nomadic people superior to all other races, and at various times the Aryans had imposed their will on inferior peoples and had established new civilizations. Unfortunately, The Aryans tended to inter-marry with the inferior races, causing the decline of each of these civilizations as their purity became corrupted, (Baradat 1979: 270).

According to Gobineau,

"though the Aryans, blond and blue eyed, had at one time wandered from the north across Europe and Central Asia, by the nineteenth century inter-marriage, had caused most of their descendants to lose superiority".

He stressed:

Indeed, there was only one area left in which Aryan blood was pure enough to offer hope for a revival of human civilization. Extending across northern Europe Gobineau's Aryan heaven included Ireland, England, Northern France, The Benelux countries and Scandinavia. The ancient Gaul, the Franks, a Teutonic people had conquered the inferior Celts and had become the ruling nobility. This according to Gobineau's pseudo-scientific theory, the French nobility's Aryan ancestry justified its continued rule, (Baradat op cit 270).

He argued that, the Germans were the purest Aryans because they were: "the least mixed racially".

The Aryan idea was, according to Baradat ignored in most of Europe, "but became very popular in Germany".

Richard Wagner also dramatized the idea of German superiority which was centred at Bayreuth. A Germanized Englishman Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927), a nephew of British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain became an avowed supporter of Wagner. He later married his daughter after having served devotedly Wagner's wife, Cosima. After Wagner died:

Chamberlain combined Teutonic mythology, German philosophical irrationalism, and Gobineau's racial theories, achieving on paper what Wagner had failed to achieve musically. He argued that, the Aryans had created world civilizations, but, that each of these advances had been lost as a result of impurity produced by inter breeding. Chamberlain believed that all races were impure except the Germans, who were Aryan and good, and the Jews, who were completely evil. History was simply a struggle between the Aryans and the Jewish evil, (Baradat 1979: 271).

Hitler claimed that history was simply a struggle for domination among various races in the world. The Aryan race, the most powerful, repeatedly won out over inferior peoples and created civilization. He hated the Jews and blamed all German problems at them.

What is significant in our case here is the unscientific classification of races by Adolf Hitler, which forms the bedrock of the present apartheid policy in South Africa. Hitler claimed that there were three racial categories among the people of the world. These, according to him were: *The culture creating race*, which was of course the Aryans. This group included the English, Dutch (remember, the latter are the originators of the Dutch in South Africa referred to as the Boers or the Afrikaner) and Scandinavians. He argued that:

these peoples were less pure than, and hence inferior to, the German people.

He claimed that Aryan people were

responsible for creating every civilization in the history of the world, specifically, he argued that the civilizations of India, Persia, Egypt, Greece and Rome were Aryan creations.

He said:

Man owes everything that is of any importance to the principle of struggle and to one race which has carried itself forward successfully. Take away the Nordic Germans and nothing remains but the dance of apes. (Baradat 1979: 273).

According to Baradat (1979), Hitler claimed that the *culture-bearing races* were made up of the Orientals, latins, and Slavs. "These people", he argued:

where racially inferior, they could not spawn a new culture, but they could maintain a civilization as long as they did not allow their blood to be corrupted by inter-marriage with the lower forms of humanity.

Most important in our analysis is Hitler last racial classification of the peoples of the world. He argues that, *the last group*

the culture - destroying races included Negroes (Blacks) and Jews. Because of their destructive tendencies, these people were thought to be sub-human. They were responsible for the decline of great civilizations. (Baradat 1979: 273).

From the foregoing, one can easily discern the origins of racism which has become the bane of South Africa Republic today. It will be recalled that the English and the Dutch have been classified by Adolf Hitler as the culture - creating races, that is, makers of civilization. It is therefore significant to note that for the Dutch and English to settle in South Africa was a momentous transplant of racial bigotry and infact racism from the soils or the continent of Europe to African continent - man's continent of origin and hope. Thus, began the sordid and morbid journey of black humiliation and trepidation under the dehumanizing policy of apartheid in South Africa.

South Africa needs a revolution in order to establish a new system of human relationship based on the quality of humanity and not on the unscientific hypothesis and concepts of Aryan superiority which the English and the Dutch have transported from Europe to Africa to create unnecessary tension and lack of peace in the inter-action of the peoples of that area. Leon Baradat (1979: 303) says, a revolution is a profound change in the social, political, economic and/or cultural patterns of a given society that need not be violent but often is. Nisbet has argued that a revolution usually has its roots or origins from politics. Therefore for South Africa to face a true revolution, there must be a change in the superstructure, (Karl Marx).

By superstructure, here, Karl Marx means, all elements, including art, values, government education, ideology, and the like, that are built on the economic foundation of society, (Baradat 1979: 306). Destruction of the concept, principle and infact practice of racism, the latter which is the root cause of apartheid is the theme of our message. /without racism, there would be no apartheid and without apartheid there would be no segregation or separation and this is the final analysis will lead to a better understanding among the people of South Africa. The consequence of better understanding will be the establishment of a democratically elected government which will take good care of the pluralism of the South African nation.

By pluralism, we mean in the words of one writer

a decision making process in which the peoples interests are represented by various pressure groups; government policy is a compromise between the competing interests of those peoples. (Baradat 1979: 302).

Today, we call on America and her allies to unite and dismantle apartheid policy instead of supporting a decadent system. America as one of the world leading powers needs a rethink about her involvement in international crisis. America's support for the apartheid system is unholy

and unjust going by what she professes, except, perhaps, where we compare the practical demonstration of economic policies and infact the politics of America with that of South Africa. At any rate, we feel that, America's support for apartheid is a demonstration of arrogance of power, which Senator Jacob Fulbright (1966) condemns. He says of the Vietnam war:

the reason, I think, is an excess of pride born of power. Power has a way of undermining judgement, of planting delusions of grandeur in the minds of otherwise sensible people and otherwise sensible nations. As I have said earlier, the idea of being responsible for the whole world seem to have dazzled us, giving rise to what I call the arrogance of power, or what the French, perhaps more aptly, call 'le vertige de puissance', by which they mean a kind of dizziness, giddiness inspired by the possession of great power.

Today, we wish to invite America and her western political and economic allies, plus Japan, her greatest economic ally outside Europe and also her surrogate since World War II, to come to terms with reason and stop supporting the growth of apartheid. They should rather concretely contribute to the establishment of a democratic and humane system of government in the republic of South Africa.

The role of international organizations in extermination of the apartheid policy and the institutionalization of a democratic system of government can not be over emphasized. Rodes et al (1983: 516) has defined international organization as an association of states bound by a treaty to secure common goals. Examples of international organizations abound. We can mention a few here. The United Nations Organization, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Warsaw Pact, the ASEA, the Association of American States; the European Economic Community, the UpComing European Community, the Arab League, the Organization of African Unity, the OCAM, the ECOWAS, the Frontline States (in Southern Africa) and many others which can not be mentioned here for lack of space and time. In the interest of humanity, we wish to call on all international organizations to concertedly work towards the demise of apartheid policy in South Africa because a stitch in time saves nine. If the present state of unparalleled imbalances continues in South Africa, a disastrous end is the only feasible alternative, which is unfortunate for both white, black and brown races in South Africa.

It is important to accept what Harold I. Laski (1978: 287) has stated that broadly speaking, matters of common concern in modern civilization can be divided into three categories. There are political problems, there are economic problems, there are social problems. Laski (1978: 287) does not suggest that his categories of world problems:

are exhaustive or that they do not often shed off into one another. But, as a rule, the great majority of the questions we have to solve fall fairly reasonably within one or another of them.

What should be of significance to us in Laski's categorization may appear, the categories comprise numerous problems. Another fact is that, the whole world, i.e. every country is faced with these problems. Then, there exists these problems on the international level. We want the whole world to know that Laski's political, economic and social problems have been aggravated by the practice of the abhorrent apartheid policy. One may ask, but, what concerns the whole world with what is happening in one corner of the African continent called South Africa? We wish to emphasize here that, modern civilization has taught us today, more than ever before that the inter-dependence of nations is an inalienable part of human and nation states' existence.

Professor Laski (1978: 287) a western intellectual has confirmed our belief on the issue of international dependency of nation states when he said that:

I argued in an earlier chapter of this book that the scale of modern civilization has made the national sovereign state an institutional expedient of which the political unwisdom and moral danger are both manifest. We are committed on international experiment by the facts about us. We have been driven to recognize the economic inter-dependence of states. We have come to see that outside purely domestic concerns settlement in terms of common rules is the only method to make possible satisfactory international arrangement.

Basically, it is the belief in the inter-dependence of states in the world that we view the potentially explosive South Africa political, social and economic problems from the prisms of international responsibility and hence our urgent call to all international organizations to bring apartheid to its knees for the benefit of mankind. The European Economic Community knows what it gets from South Africa economically. The white community in South Africa is mostly composed of the descendants of the E.E.C. countries. America's multi-national commitments in South Africa are monumental. A reasonable Asian population exists in South Africa. For the Africans, it is their home, so, they are countless in numbers. It is however, the exploitative deprivation which they are currently undergoing that has motivated this work which is aimed at arousing the sleeping conscience of the west and its allies to the need of a peaceful change in South Africa. This change must emanate from unbargainable dismantling of the apartheid policy. the alternative to a peaceful solution is undoubtedly a revolutionary violence which will disorganize and later re-organize South Africa along the lines of the

democratic thinking of Nationalist Africans. That is the devil's alternative for white South Africans and their supporters.

Internal problems of South Africa can never be solved only by external pressure from the outside world. Efforts must be made by the South Africans themselves. Hence we see the struggle against apartheid by the African National Congress; Pan African Congress; South African Communist Party; Mass Democratic Movement, United Democratic Front (1973), the Council of Union of South Africa and other little groups that resist apartheid as very important. There is the Inkatha Movement of Chief Muthlezi which is not properly defined in terms of constituting a real threat to apartheid policy. It is a well known fact that, unrelenting struggle against apartheid policy by the above mentioned groups, especially the ANC is instrumental to the historic release of Dr. Nelson Mandela, who is currently the deputy to Oliver Tambo in the leadership of the ANC. God in his infinite knowledge has stated in His Holy Book, the Bible, that is, St. Mark chapter 3 verses 24-25, that:

if a country divides itself into groups which fight each other, that country will fall apart. If a family divides itself into groups which fight each other, that family will fall apart.

For the benefit of humanity in South Africa, especially the African blacks who have for more than forty years *suffered* all indignities from the apartheid policy, we wish to call on the following liberation movements and political party organizations to tolerate one another. By so doing, they will be able to work for the total liberation of South Africa from the white minority domination. They will then establish a democratically elected government based on the wishes of the majority of their people. These groups are African National Congress; Pan African Congress, South African Communist Party led by Joe Slovo, Mass Democratic Movement (which included Media Workers of South Africa - MWASA); the Inkhatha Movement of Chief Buthelezi; the United Democratic Front which was launched in 1983; the Council of Union of South Africa plus many other anti apartheid groups. Let these groups come to terms with reason and stop fighting each other but come together, fight and dismantle the monster called apartheid, in order to establish a popular and democratic system of government which would be capable of taking care of their numerous social, political and economic problems.

There exists vehement opposition in South Africa among many different groups on the question of apartheid system of government. The antagonism which exists among these groups is not in the least interest of the black people or democratic rule. The following groups must come to terms with each other if the war against apartheid is to survive; the

traditionalist versus the modernists; the young and the old; inter-clannish clashes i.e. clan versus clan, tribes versus tribe, i.e. the Zulu, Xhosa, Sotho, Khoikhoi, Ndebele, Ngani, Saazi, Tsonga, Venda, Gona, Nyahyasa, Tsawana, etc. - all these tribes, clans and many others not mentioned here must stop fighting each other in order to dismantle apartheid for a better black South Africa.

The current wave of feuds that exists among South African leaders and ethnic groups must cease in the interest of African people who have borne the brunt of apartheid policy for over forty years. Forty years of unqualifiable maltreatment, a determined molestation on the part of whites against blacks and display of unjustifiable outrage and atrocity against the South African blacks should prick the conscience of blacks who currently stand in the way of impending success against apartheid. Over forty years of debasement, inattention to black, disregard to blacks, obliviousness to blacks, unconsciousness extended to black existence and total absent-mindedness of black presence and cause in South Africa (except for the purposes of social and economic exploitation) should be able to awaken the conscience of the most insane and mediocre blacks to the fact that the time has come when South Africa has to be free from a bondage which has been encouraged by the bastardized concept of racism. Black leaders, youth, old people, women and men of all class should realise that nemesis is catching up with the minority white racial bigots and they must come to terms with the social political and economic realities of South Africa. The Almighty God has heard the prayers of peoples of the world and the end to exploitation of man by man in South Africa under apartheid is imminent. It is imminent. All that South African blacks need is to give impetus to the death of apartheid so it can die faster. This can not be done unless the unjustifiable and mindless feuds and vendetta among the black population is curtailed or even totally eliminated.

The extermination of apartheid in South Africa can not fully take roots unless the Inkhatha Movement, led by "the Chief Minister of Kwazulu Homeland, Gatsha Buthelezi" co-operates or is routed. This contention can be corroborated by the statement of a news magazine titled: *Focus on Africa - BBC Magazine*, Volume I, Number 2, which states among other things that:

but wherever there are members of Inkhatha and members of the A.N.C., whether its Natal, Sasolburg or Soweto, tensions are never far from boiling point. And each day burnt out, huts are abandoned fresh graves are dug. Buthelezi will not be pushed asides so easily as the other homeland leaders.

By all standards, we are convinced that, the Inkhatha Movement of Chief Buthelezi is a conservative organization. What do we mean by conservative? Leon Baradat (1979: 12) speaks our minds when he defines conservatives as people who are "the most contented with the status quo".

They are basically pleased with the system, and consequently, are not interested in a great deal of change. They will support extremely slow and very superficial alteration of the system, but, will even seemingly resist minor changes. They tend to see an intrinsic value in existing institutions and are unwilling to tamper with them claiming that to do so might seriously damage that which tradition has perfected. In the sense of the above definition, we can safely say that the Inkhatha Movement, led by Chief Buthelezi is not even a reactionary movement. This is because, "only the reactionary proposes retrogressive change. That is reactionaries favour a policy that would return the society to a previous condition or even a former value system". (Baradat op. cit. 16). It is a damned conservative movement that must change for the good and benefit of blacks in South Africa.

The importance of all we have so far related on the Inkhatha Movement is to establish the fact that Chief Buthelezi is leading a reasonable group to give up the status quo in South Africa, because of the value the group attaches to or derives from the present diabolic apartheid system in South Africa. It is our thinking that the situation in South Africa today demands that committed nationalist should discard self-seeking interests which the hitherto unwholesome apartheid had provided for the Inkhatha Movement of Buthelezi and his co-ethnics. The time has come for Buthelezi, the Kwa Zulu and the Inkhatha Movement to discard selfish pursuits and work relentlessly towards a total emancipation of the 28 million blacks in South Africa. This can not be done until the inter-tribal wars and the numerous feuds in South Africa come to an end. This will lead to a final extermination of the apartheid policy.

The doctrine of racism has eaten deep into the blood of many white South Africans. Today, we have the Afrikaner Resistance Movement (popularly known as Afrikaners without Brain). This group is composed of diehard white racial bigots. Members of the Afrikaner Resistance Movement have to be told in unequivocal terms that gone are the days of Hitler-inspired racism when, the Dutch, later Boers and much later Afrikaners considered themselves a superior race to the original inhabitants of South Africa. The Dutch, the Boer or the Afrikaner must today realize that the basis of his/her survival depends largely on harmonious racial relations in South Africa and on his/her ability to accept the fact that democracy in its real sense must reign in South Africa. And for democracy to reign, there must be a rule of majority, and

that for the foreseeable future, a majority rule in South Africa will definitely have to be predicated on the mass enfranchisement of black South Africans who constitute 28 million people as compared to the whites who regrettably constitute a little over 4 million people in that republic. The Boers definitely have to come to terms with the current wind of change and allow apartheid a safe journey to purgatory, from where it will come face to face with God's judgement on the last day. Apartheid and its supporters must be made to understand that purgatory, among other things, is "any place of temporary suffering or expiation". Those who practice apartheid must girdle their loins for God's judgement on the last day.

For the mean time, however, the system has no future and must be abandoned with ignominy as far as the future of South Africa is concerned.

What South Africa needs today is the destruction of the entire gamut of apartheid gadgets. The issue of "the far right" or wherever such groups exist has no meaning or relevance in the current social political and economic dictionary of South Africa.

The sprouting up of gangsters in the South African townships and over all the land as reported by *Focus on Africa*, is not in the interest of the current wind of change in South Africa. We call on the various squads such as the "Gaddafi Squad", "Disco Kids" and "A-Team", among others to return to the path of sanity in a march towards a free and democratic South Africa.

Incidents of vehicle highjacking (jackrolling) raping and murder must be halted by the A.N.C. and other nationalist groups. The brutal punishments which are currently reported to have been dished out to some communities, have to stop in the interest of a peaceful and harmonious approach to the final struggle against apartheid.

The setting of human beings ablaze after putting motor vehicle tyres around their necks, popularly known as "neck lacing" must stop.

The present white South African government from the time of release of Mandela, must avoid doing anything which would portray her as playing some kind of double dealing with the black nationalists. Suspicion must be avoided by way of unsuspecting actions on the part of the South African government.

The deep rooted prejudices in South Africa are well known to close watchers of the South Africa social, political and economic system. For a smooth transition to take place from the white minority apartheid government to democratically elected government under the franchise of all South African citizens, prejudices must give way to trust and confidence among the various people of South Africa.

For South Africa's name to be recorded in the books of the called civilized political entities, the government should embark on the establishment of a new constitution which will guarantee true democracy in South Africa. Africans must be given a pride of place as far as their social, political and economic existence in South Africa is concerned. The wealth of South Africa must be shared to the advantage of all. The high aspirations of the blacks following the release of Nelson must not be allowed to descend to a low ebb again, since such a situation will definitely reactivate anti-apartheid violence.

The desire of the younger generation to take the destiny of South Africa into their hands should not be ignored with a wave of hand. According to *Focus on Africa Magazine* Volume 1, Number 2, the National Union of Mine Workers, (NUMW) headed by Cyril Ramaphosa; the A.N.C. organizer by Patrick "Terror" Lekota, Zwelakhe Sisulu 'son of Walter Sisulu, long time A.N.C. General Secretary', Jay Naidoo, Head of Congress of South African Trade Unions (formerly organizer of the Federation of South African Trade Union in 1979); Eno Mabuza - former Inspector of Schools, leader of the Ka Ngwane Homeland, where anti apartheid organizations could hold meetings without harassment and Trevor Manuel, United Democratic Front's spokesman in Western Cape, are some, among the up-coming leaders (among the youth) who must be taken seriously in the onward march to South Africa emancipation from the cold grips of white minority slavery of the blacks occasioned by the ignoble policy of apartheid.

The Voice Newspaper of August, 1990 reported that over 3,000 racists orders have been issued in South Africa; the state of emergency was partially lifted between 8th and 9th June, 1990; a 10,000 police force had been increased with one billion rand pumped into its operations, South Africa holds the world record for sentencing people to death, adding that the country still had over 300 people on the death row; the report added that, over 324 people had been thrown into prison between February and April, 1990, without charges. Nelson Mandela's house and other A.N.C. leaders were reportedly, illegally searched and that between 1960 and December, 1989, 75,000 blacks (52,000 in the past 3 years) were thrown into prison.

If we had intended to include all that has happened in South Africa since the release of Dr. Mandela and his visit to Nigeria, this little piece of work would be over loaded and indeed not meet the purpose of its publication. The few reports on the situation in South Africa which have been included in this work, following Mandela's visit to Nigeria, are by the any stretch of human emotions, only irresistible in our attempt to lay bare the horrible situation in South Africa and appeal to both the

outside world and members of the South African community to come to terms with the wind of change currently blowing across the globe. From there, they could devise a means to putting an end to the seemingly interminable carnage which has characterized the impending last days of apartheid. The halting of inter-ethnic and inter-group classes would create a conducive atmosphere under which a reasonable path would be charted to a befitting democratic rule in that racially battered country.

In the light of the recent happenings in Eastern Europe, where communist governments are collapsing like a pack of cards and multi-party democracy is taking roots, one finds it rather difficult to make any recommendations based on whether or not a free South Africa should tow the line of socialism. It must however be emphasized that there are presently certain social, political and economic structures that need dismantling through a socialist revolutionary approach if apartheid is to be completely destroyed. For instance, imperialism must be brought to its knees in South Africa. Lenin defines imperialism as the most advanced state of capitalism, which followed the stages of industrial capitalism and finance capitalism and *represented the exportation of exploitation* (emphasis mine) (Baradat 1979: 297). The massive exploitation of black South Africans must come to a halt if a truly free and democratic South Africa is to be established.

The foundation of a society, i.e. any society, according to Marx, is economics. Marx argued that economics was the foundation of any society. This economic base was composed of the forces of production (resources and technology) and the relations of production (ownership). According to him, the economic base pre-conditioned the rest of the society (the superstructure). (Baradat op cit. 296). The significance of this statement is that the current alien system in which the economic foundation of the South African republic is in the hands of the minority whites, operating under the stupendous exploitation of the black labour, must give way to a fairer economic foundation, where blacks would take their appropriate place in the scheme of economic management of the South African Republic. The theory of economic determination underscores the belief that:

all social and political features are conditioned by economic environment.

The current enigmatic set up in South Africa where the economy is dominated by the whites is an automatic licence to whites' unlimited amassing of wealth and black exploitation. This massive possession of wealth on the part of white juxtaposed with the dehumanizing black poverty has created a great social imbalance. The social imbalance has led

to uneasy relationship between whites and blacks in South Africa, apart from laying a solid foundation for whites' political domination in the republic. The economic condition must change to entertain black economic power too, so as to enable a free and stable South Africa emerge from the tentacles of apartheid.

The 28 million black South Africans must avoid apathy with regards to the political happenings in their country. They must fully make positive contributions in order to free South Africa from apartheid.

South African intellectuals, both white and black must live up to the expectations of their counterparts elsewhere in the world, by speaking and massively agitating for the demise of apartheid. They must constitute the vanguard of the anti-apartheid agitators.

The present liberation movements in South Africa need the massive support of the black South Africans. This support of the black South Africans must be forth coming. As stated earlier, the liberation movements themselves must discourage friction among themselves. They must understand that, their only one enemy is apartheid and thus, face it squarely. The movements must be aware that the fight for self-determination, be it either in a capitalist or socialist state has historically been an uphill and yet successfully implemented task and same should apply to them in South Africa. In the socialist camp, it took the revolutionaries' both blood and fire to free their countries from puppet leaders and exploiters. Such instances could be found in Russia, China, Cuba, Vietnam, Guinea-Bissau, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola, Namibia, etc. In the bourgeois revolution, it took the French and Americans, etc. lives, blood, maimings, fire, suffering and determination to extricate their various societies from existing social, political and perhaps economic systems which they hated and greatly abhorred.

By the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela, President de Klerk has opened a can of worms. South Africa must be free from apartheid. It is now left to the present South African government to urgently repeal the hitherto numerous obnoxious apartheid laws which separate whites from blacks. These are the laws which:

have affected the political rights of non-whites, and their rights of movement, choice of residence, property, worship, choice of occupation, and marriage, Eliot (1970).

Some of these laws which "have established separate non white territorial units, known as Bantustans" must without equivocation be abolished. Anti-strike and trade union laws, must be abolished. Anti-miscegenation laws must go. The people must be free to inter-marry at their will. Equal opportunities to social (especially education) political and economic

facilities must, as a rule be established in South Africa. The present avalanche of over 3,000 racist orders and laws instituted by the apartheid government in South Africa have deprived the black people of South Africa of most of their basic human rights. It is time these human rights are restored through the abolition of the draconian apartheid laws. Otherwise, that country should be ready for a showdown with anarchism. By anarchism we mean, "a political doctrine advocating the abolition of organized authority. Anarchists hold that every form of government is evil and a tyranny. They want a free association of individuals, without armed forces, courts, prisons, or written law. Their methods have varied greatly, some have advocated peaceful transition to anarchy and others have demanded revolution. Anarchists murdered Tsar Alexander of Russia, King Humbert of Italy, President Carnot of France, Express Elizabeth of Austria, the President McKinley of the U.S.A." (Eliot 170). Generally, the word anarchism derived from the Greek word anarchial, which means non-rule. South Africa belongs to a people, especially the blacks. A few white racial bigots must not be allowed to push that country to the brink of anarchism by continuously refurbishing the apartheid policy.

The Nationalist Party in South Africa gradually seems to be realizing that time is up with apartheid, hence the voting of President de Klerk into power - de Klerk a person they know very well is bent on bringing changes in the South African social, political and economic relations before the timed bomb explodes. The Nationalist Party must not retreat.

We have earlier called on the churchmen or the white christians to review their definition of apartheid which they back up with a Biblical quotation. We wish to emphasize here that, the Afrikers Dutch Reformed Church (the largest and the white minority's most influential church) must not retract a single word from its declaration in 1989, the declaration in which the church:

made historic declaration that apartheid is sin, and expressed guilt for its (church's) role in providing spiritual sustenance for the racist ideology. (*Newswatch*, March 27, 1989, 33).

The denunciation of apartheid policy by the Afrikaner church is a land mark and, infact, establishes a milestone in the over forty years of the struggle against the insidious and insalubrious apartheid system. It is therefore necessary to conclude our discussion with a quotation from a statement of denunciation of apartheid by the Afrikaner Church, the body that gave apartheid its "spiritual sustenance". The Dutch Reformed Church said:

We confess with humility and sorrow the participation of our church in the introduction and legitimization of the ideology of apartheid and subsequent suffering of people Apartheid cannot be accepted on christian ethical grounds, because it contravenes the very essence of reconciliation, neighbourly love and righteousness. (*Newswatch*, op. cit. 33).

It is remarkable to state, in the words of Aniete Usen of the *Newswatch* fame that:

the statement by the more than one million-member church was the most explicit condemnation made by a large white body, to which Botha and virtually all his cabinet ministers and senior officials of the party belong. For a church that provided the spiritual foundation for apartheid and actually condoned racial segregation, its repentance, observers said, is a big blow to apartheid.

The Holy words of God in the Bible has taught us that

everything that happens in this world happens at the time God chooses.

It is our unshakeable belief that God's time for the end of apartheid has finally arrived and the reverse can not be the order. Ecclesiastes chapter 3:2-8 speaks of the times God has set for things to happen. It is beneficial for people to read this portion of the Bible. For our purpose here, we wish to emphatically quote the whole section, since most of what has been stated there is useful in explaining the impending demise of apartheid in South Africa; Ecclesiastes chapter 3:2-8 says:

- 2 - A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up what is planted;
- 3 - a time to kill, and a time to heal, a time to break down, and a time to build up;
- 4 - a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance;
- 5 - a time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing;
- 6 - a time to seek, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away;
- 7 - a time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;

- 8 - a time to love and a time to hate; a time for war,
and a time for peace.

The past forty years have been unfortunate years of hate and war between the minority whites and the majority blacks in South Africa as a result of the apartheid ideology. Today, we are strongly convinced that, the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela is a pointer to greater things to happen in South Africa. It is a signal to the return of love, peace and prosperity under an imminent democratic government to be ushered in by way of a universal franchise in South Africa, following the end of apartheid. The over four million white South Africans have a decisive choice to make. This is the moment for them to choose to wither dismantle apartheid and establish a human e society in South Africa or continue to uphold and perpetuate apartheid which is an open invitation to a bloody revolution, the latter, whose consequences, the white man is not unfamiliar with, both in theory and practice.

Bibliography

- Ayu, Dr. Iyorchia: "Essays in Popular Struggle, Nigeria", 1985.
- Ajiga, Jonah: "Mandela, The Man and His Mission, Recollections on a Heros Historic Visit to Nigeria" in the Sunday Voice, Makurdi Benue Printing and Publishing Corporation March, 20, 1990.
- African Guardian: African Guardian Magazine*, February 12, 1990, Guardian Magazine Ltd., Rutam, 1990.
- Baradat, Leon P.: *Political Ideologies. Their Origins and Impact*, Eaglewood Cliffs, N.J. Princehall Inc. 1979.
- Babanrinsa, Dare: Red Carpet for Mandela in Newswatch of May 28, 1990. Newswatch Communications Ltd., Lagos 1990.
- Calvocoressi, Peter: *World Politics Since 1945*, London, Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press) Ltd. 1977.
- Dan, Jacobs N.: *From Marx to Mao and Marchais: Documents on The Development of Communist Variations*, New York Longman Inc. 1979.
- Elliot A.. *Dictionary of Politics, Britain*, 1970.
- Fanon Frantz: *The Wretched of Earth*, Penguin, London.
- Fulbright, Senator Jacob W.: *The Arrogance of Power*, London Cox and Wyman Ltd. 1966.
- Focus on Africa, B.B.C. Magazine Volume 1, Number 2.
- GoodNews Bible: The Good News Bible: The British and Foreign Bible Society*, London, 1976.
- Guest, George: *The March of Civilization*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books, 1979.
- International Defence And Aid Fund: *Nelson Mandela The Struggle is My Life*, London, 1986.
- Kehinde Seye: *Portrait of An Activist* in This Week News Magazine of February 26, 1990 Lagos, 1990.
- Lenin, V.I.: V.I. Lenin: *Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry* Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1971.
- Legum, Collin: *African Handbook*, Aylesbury, Hazzell Watson and Vincy Ltd. 1989.
- Nisbet, Robert: *To Social Philosophers Community and Conflict in Western Thought*, New York, Harper and Row Publishers, 1982.
- Novost, Press: *USSR Year Book 1989*, Moscow, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1989.
- Newswatch: March 19, 1989*, Newswatch Communications Ltd., Ikeja, Nigeria, 1989.
- Newswatch: March 27, 1989*, Newswatch Communications Ltd., Ikeja, Nigeria, 1989.

- Newswatch*: March 28, 1990; Newswatch Communications Ltd., Ikeja, Nigeria, 1990.
- Oxford University Press: *African Encyclopaedia For Schools and Colleges*. London Fletchev and Sons Ltd., 1974.
- Oxford University Press: *The Dictionary of Quotations*, Oxford University Press, London, 1975.
- Rodney Water: *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, London, Bogle L'ouverture Publications, 1972.
- Russell, Bertrand: *History of Western Philosophy*, London Unwin Paperbacks, 1979.
- Sunday Concord*: *Sunday Concord*, August 25, 1975, Concord Press of Nigeria, Ikeja, 1985.
- Thompson David: *Europe Since Napoleaon*, Pelican Books by Hazzell Watson and Viney Ltd., Aylesbury, Bucks, 1966.
- Thompson, Leonard M.: *South Africa*, *Encyclopedia Americana* International Edition, 1981.
- The Voice*: *The Voice*, August 8, 1990, Benue Printing and Publishing Corporation, Makurdi, 1990.
- Watson, Jack: *Success in Twentieth Century World Affairs*, London, John Murray (Pub. Ltd.) 1984.
- Wilmot, Patrick F.: *Apartheid And African Liberation, The Grief and the Hope*, University of Ife Press Ltd., Ile_Ife, 1980.
- Wislon And Thompson: *The Republic of South Africa* (Location and Publisher and Year of Publication Missing).





ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mr. Gabriel Lohodedoo Burya was born on 15th June, 1947 of Terundu and Kpilakaa Burya in Kpilakaa village near Kyado, Mbaterem in Ukum Local /Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. He attended S.U.M. Junior Primary School at Saai from 1959-1961; S.U.M. Junior Primary School at Igemwase in 1962, S.U.M. Senior Primary School, Zaki Biam from 1963-1965. He entered W.M. Bristow Secondary School between 1966 and 1970 where he passed the West African School Certificate Examinations. He attended the Higher School Certificate (H.S.C.) course at Government Secondary School, Kuru, Plateau State in 1971, where he passed the confessional entrance examination into the Jos Campus of the University of Ibadan, in Plateau State and did a preliminary arts course from 1972-1974.

In 1974, Mr. Burya entered the Main Campus of the University of Ibadan where he obtained a B.Sc. degree in Political Science and served in the N.Y.S.C. at Aisegba, Ondo State as a teacher in the 1977/78 year.

After a successful completion of N.Y.S.C. he joined the Benue State Schools Board as an Education Officer II and taught at the Padopads Harmony Secondary School, Makurdi from September, 1978 to May, 1979.

Between June, 1979 and October, 1980, Mr. Burya worked as an Administrative Officer II at the University of Jos, in Plateau State.

Mr. Burya returned to Benue State on 1st December, 1980 and joined the services of the College of Education, Katsina Ala as Academic Officer of the College, where he rose to the rank of Assistant Registrar in October, 1981.

From 1982 to 1983, he attended the University of Jos where he obtained his Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.) in January, 1985. He returned to Katsina Ala where he rose to the rank of Deputy Registrar in October, 1988.

On 1st June, 1992, the Governor of Benue State, the Reverend Father Moses Orshio Adasu approved the appointment of Mr. Burya as the Registrar of the College of Education, Katsina Ala, Benue State, where he has worked for the past 12 years.

Mr. Burya who has many unpublished manuscripts to his credit has published many articles in newspapers. He loves reading, music, especially Indian, singing, gospel music, photo collection, world affairs, gardening, animal husbandry and basketball.

Mr. Burya who is married with a son is a baptized and seasoned Protestant Christian, who loves reading the Bible and the Quran and believes in the golden rule of "do unto others as you would like them do unto you". His greatest moment of joy comes when he helps a fellow human being out of a **problem**.