

# The decolonization of Africa: southern Africa and the Horn of Africa

The general  
history  
of Africa  
Studies and  
documents 5



**In this series:**

1. *The peopling of ancient Egypt and the deciphering of Meroitic script*
2. *The African slave trade from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century*
3. *Historical relations across the Indian Ocean*
4. *The historiography of southern Africa*
5. *The decolonization of Africa: southern Africa and the Horn of Africa*

# **The decolonization of Africa: southern Africa and the Horn of Africa**

Working documents and report of the meeting  
of experts held in Warsaw, Poland,  
from 9 to 13 October 1978

The Unesco Press

Published in 1981 by the United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization  
7 place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris  
Printed by Imprimerie Tardy Quercy, Cahors

ISBN 92-3-101834-5  
French edition: 92-3-201834-9

© Unesco 1981  
*Printed in France*

## Preface

In 1964 the General Conference of Unesco, as part of the Organization's effort to further the mutual understanding of peoples and nations, authorized the Director-General to take the necessary measures for the preparation and publication of a *General History of Africa*.

Scientific colloquia and symposia on related themes were organized as part of the preparatory work. The papers prepared for discussion and the exchanges of views on a wide variety of subjects at these meetings have provided valuable historical material, which Unesco has now decided to make known as widely as possible by publishing it in a series entitled 'The General History of Africa: Studies and Documents'.

The present book, the fifth in the new series, contains the papers presented and a report on the discussions that followed at a symposium held in Warsaw, from 9 to 13 October 1978, on the decolonization of southern Africa and the Horn of Africa.

The authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this book, and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of Unesco and do not commit the Organization.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of Unesco concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

# Contents

Introduction 9

## Part I: Decolonization in southern Africa

- Independent African states and the struggle for southern Africa,  
*Ali A. Mazrui* 13
- The role of liberation movements in the struggle for southern Africa,  
1955-77, *Elleck K. Mashingaidze* 24
- The position of South Africa, *E. L. Ntloedibe* 32
- The challenges confronting South Africa, *Edmond Jouve* 42
- Zimbabwe: the Internal Settlement in historical perspective,  
*David Chanaiwa* 65

## Part II: The decolonization of the Horn of Africa

- Decolonization in the Horn and the outcome of Somali aspirations  
for self-determination, *Said Yusuf Abdi* 97
- The survival of the national culture in Somalia during and after the  
colonial era, *B. W. Andrzejewski* 108
- Decolonization of Ethiopia, 1940-55, *Richard Pankhurst* 119
- Neo-colonialism or decolonization? *Hagos Gebre Yesus* 133

## Part III: Report of the meeting of experts

- Inaugural session 141
- General discussion 143
- Southern Africa 147
- The Horn of Africa 152

## Appendices

1. Speech by the representative of the Director-General  
of Unesco 159
2. List of participants 162
3. Agenda 164

# Introduction

The International Scientific Committee for the Drafting of a *General History of Africa* proposed during its fourth plenary session, held at Nairobi in April 1978, that a meeting of experts be held to consider the problems of decolonization in two regions of Africa where the situation seemed particularly intricate. The purpose of such a meeting would be to give information and guidance to the editor of Volume VIII of the *General History of Africa* and to the International Scientific Committee with a view to finalizing the table of contents and the substance of the volume *Africa since 1935*.

The Polish National Commission for Unesco responded to the proposal of the International Scientific Committee and offered to undertake preparatory work for the meeting, in collaboration with the University of Warsaw and the Unesco Secretariat. The International Scientific Committee expresses its deep gratitude to the Polish National Commission and the University of Warsaw for their co-operation in the organization of this meeting.

The first part of this volume includes working documents prepared for the meeting, especially on the decolonization of southern Africa. The paper by Ali A. Mazrui, editor of Volume VIII of the *General History of Africa*, provided the point of departure for discussions on this theme. The role of the liberation movements in the struggle for southern Africa is the subject of Elleck K. Mashingaidze's paper, and the legal status of the Union of South Africa since the passing of the South Africa Act of 1909 by the British Parliament is analysed by E. L. Ntloedibe, who is a member of the Central Committee of the Pan-African Congress.

The communication by Edmond Jouve is concerned particularly with the attitudes of international organizations and of foreign powers towards South Africa, and David Chainawa in his contribution throws new light on the history of Zimbabwe.

The second part of this volume brings together working documents on the problem of the decolonization of the Horn of Africa. Said Yusuf Abdi retraces the history of Somalia since the European colonial conquest, and



**B. W. Andrzejewski shows how Somali culture has been preserved since the colonial era thanks to the work of poets, playwrights and collectors of oral literature. The communication by Richard Pankhurst sketches the history of the decolonization of Ethiopia from 1940 to 1955. Finally Hagos G. Yesus, analysing the relation between neo-colonialism and decolonization, warns against a decolonization that will in fact be merely disguised neo-colonialism: 'The spectacle of this second edition of the scramble for Africa is there to see for all who have eyes. But then there is also the spectre of resistance and revolution, which haunts them all.'**

**In the third part of this volume is to be found the report of discussions that took place at the experts' meeting.**

Part I  
**Decolonization  
in southern Africa**

# **Independent African states and the struggle for southern Africa**

Ali A. Mazrui

The importance of the support that independent African states have given to the liberation movements in southern Africa has often been underestimated. Purely in terms of financial contributions, or indeed in terms of military and paramilitary assistance, the role of independent African states may at first appear relatively modest. But the repercussions of that support have been wide-ranging and have provided much of the necessary diplomatic legitimacy that the liberation movements have increasingly acquired.

Vincent B. Khapoya once analysed nine forms of support that African states extended to liberation movements.<sup>1</sup> These were, first, provision of asylum to politically active exiles; second, provision of field offices for the liberation movement; third, provision of facilities for military and militarily oriented activities of the movements; fourth, irregular payment of assessed dues to the Organization of African Unity's liberation committee; fifth, regular payment of assessed dues to the OAU committee; sixth, initiation or participation in efforts to unify liberation movements from the same country—such as attempts to unify the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union with the Zimbabwe African National Union, or the attempt to unify the three movements in Angola before independence; seventh, opposition by African states to dialogue with South Africa; eighth, serving as host to non-political refugees from target areas; and ninth, provision of additional aid to movements in terms of cash, medical supplies, educational facilities and the like.

Khapoya underestimated the broader diplomatic support at the United Nations and in world politics, a form of support that has continued on the one hand to erode the legitimacy of white-minority rule in southern Africa and on the other to increase the legitimacy of those who have taken up arms against white rule.

It is almost certain that without international African support the United Kingdom might have been tempted much sooner to reach some kind of understanding with Ian Smith in Rhodesia. Without broad African diplomatic solidarity on these issues, the United States might also have found it more opportune to safeguard the status quo in southern Africa. And

without broad African international pressure, France would have continued to deal and trade in military hardware with South Africa, and the United Nations would not have found the political will to pass an arms embargo against South Africa in 1977.

### **Racial sovereignty and continental jurisdiction**

But what do African states have in common in their attitudes to the problems of southern Africa? And in what ways do those attitudes differ in degrees from one African state to another?

It would of course be naïve to conclude that African states are united in support of liberation in southern Africa because they are united in valuing human rights. Many of the states that are very strong in supporting liberation in southern Africa, ranging from Amin's Uganda to Sékou Touré's Guinea, are guilty of gross violations of human rights in their own societies.

It would be almost as naïve to assert that African states are committed to the principle of majority rule, if by that we mean a system of government that allows the majority of the people periodically to choose their own rulers in free elections. Again, almost none of the African states that are committed to liberation in southern Africa approach their own internal societies in a spirit of democratic dedication to majority rule.

What the African states are committed to are in fact two principles that are disguised in different vocabularies but are in effect the following imperatives. The first is the principle of racial sovereignty. This does involve a concept of majority rule, but not in a liberal sense of periodic elections that seek to discover the will of the majority. Under the principle of racial sovereignty, the people in a given society should not be dominated by a racially alien minority. The rulers of each society should as far as possible be racially or ethnically representative. Foreign rule is not merely rule by a nation-state from abroad, but could be rule by a foreign racial or ethnic minority. White rule in southern Africa is illegitimate partly because it violates the principle of racial sovereignty.

The second important principle operating in African attitudes to problems of southern Africa is the principle of continental jurisdiction. This is a kind of African Monroe Doctrine, seeking to keep outsiders from interfering in African affairs and aspiring to consolidate the autonomy not only of individual African states but of the African continent as a whole. Primary initiatives in African affairs under the principle of continental jurisdiction have to come from Africans themselves first and foremost.

Motivated by relative concern for both racial sovereignty and continental jurisdiction, African states and movements have attempted to

realize two forms of pan-Africanism, especially in the second half of the twentieth century. These two forms of solidarity have been, first, pan-Africanism of liberation and, second, pan-Africanism of integration. Pan-Africanism of liberation seeks to reduce alien control over African affairs, whereas pan-Africanism of integration seeks to encourage Africans to form larger economic communities or wider political federations. Pan-Africanism of liberation is partly concerned with keeping outside powers at bay, whereas pan-Africanism of integration seeks to bring Africans themselves together.

On balance so far in the twentieth century, pan-Africanism of liberation has been significantly more successful than pan-Africanism of integration. One African country after another has succeeded in at least ending political colonialism and establishing at least formal sovereignty. A number of other African states have pushed their economic liberation even further ahead. And the struggles to end first Portuguese rule in Africa, and more recently other forms of white minority domination in southern Africa, have known their moments of triumph.

Pan-Africanism of integration, on the other hand, has had one failure after another. These have ranged from the breakup of established federations, like the collapse of the Mali Federation in 1960, to the collapse in 1977 of the East African Community, which had once linked Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania in an elaborately institutionalized form of regional co-operation.

In short, Africans in the second half of the twentieth century have been far more capable of uniting in order to keep colonialism at bay than of uniting in order to bring each other closer together.

In southern Africa the two forms of pan-Africanism have sometimes pulled in different directions. For example, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland while it lasted seemed, on the one hand, to be a possible basis of pan-Africanism of integration in the future once white control was ended; and yet since white control was indeed already omnipresent, pan-African solidarity was aroused more in the effort to end that white control than in the effort to preserve a unification of three colonial territories.

In a related sense, South Africa might have served the long-term aims of pan-Africanism of integration by absorbing and incorporating South West Africa (Namibia) into the body politic of the republic. But since the republic itself was under white racist rule, the absorption of Namibia would have resulted in the expansion and consolidation of apartheid.

On the other hand, apartheid itself in its doctrine of homelands aspires to break up the republic into cultural segments, beginning with the independence of the Transkei in 1976. This doctrine of separate black 'homelands' runs counter to pan-Africanism of both liberation and integra-

tion. It compromises the freedom of the homeland territories and of their citizens working in white-dominated South Africa itself; and it also attempts to cause serious fragmentation among blacks just at the time when prospects for black solidarity in South Africa itself are brighter than they have ever been in history.

As for the front-line states (Mozambique, Botswana, Zambia, Angola and the United Republic of Tanzania), they have definitely provided a major infrastructure for pan-Africanism of liberation. In their involvement in pursuit of that goal, some of them have also experienced the beginnings of regional integration. The rail link between Tanzanian territory and Zambia, partly conceived for reasons of liberation, has become part of the foundation of greater economic and social intercourse between these two countries. The closure of the border between Rhodesia and Zambia, while weakening the integration between those two countries, initiated integration with Zambia's northern neighbours.

Relations between the Tanzanians and Mozambique, which in the modern period entered a new phase as Mozambique struggled for liberation from Portuguese rule, have become the basis of greater potential intercourse between the two countries in the years ahead. Some analysts are even speculating that Mozambique and Zambia might one day be more closely integrated with the United Republic of Tanzania than the latter was in its first fifteen years of independence with Kenya.

What all this means is that the participation of African states in the liberation of southern Africa has included repercussions for those African states themselves and how they relate to each other, over and above the fortunes of liberation *per se*.

But African states vary considerably in their commitment to the struggle for southern Africa, in spite of what we have observed concerning their readiness to subscribe to the principles of racial sovereignty and continental jurisdiction. Commitment to those principles is inevitably a matter of degree. How far a particular African state is prepared to go in the shared endeavour of liberating southern Africa is conditioned by a variety of factors, some of which are peculiar or unique to the particular African state in question.

What are the determinants of the degree of support that African states give to the struggle for southern Africa? It is to these that we must now turn.

### **Distance, values and personality**

Five important factors condition the support an African state gives to a liberation movement. The first is physical distance from the target areas in southern Africa. Certainly contiguity to southern Africa helped to define the

front-line states. But contiguity was only one of the elements that determined the political activism of front-line states, for 'front line' is in fact a geopolitical term. Until the Portuguese coup the most important contiguous countries to white-ruled southern Africa as it then was were Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania. Khapoya's measurements of support ranked these two countries high.

Since the collapse of the Portuguese empire following the coup in Lisbon in April 1974, two other relatively radical countries have become critically involved in the liberation of the remaining areas. These are Mozambique, which has become the base of the most important military wing of the Zimbabwean fighters, and Angola, which is becoming increasingly critical in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

But physical distance is only one form of distance. There is also cultural distance, especially as defined in terms of different colonial heritages. This is the problem of geocultural distance. Khapoya, in his assessment of performance before the Portuguese coup, found that the worst twelve African countries in terms of support for liberation movements were almost wholly French-speaking. This situation has basically continued since the Portuguese coup. Francophone Africa on the whole tends to be less committed to pan-Africanism of liberation than English-speaking Africa.

In the case of Portuguese-speaking Africa, there is a combination of physical nearness to the rest of southern Africa, on the one hand, combined with cultural distance at least between the élite groups, though not necessarily among the masses with their indigenous cultural connections. Three out of the five front-line states are English-speaking (Zambia, Botswana and the United Republic of Tanzania). All the remaining areas to be liberated from white control are almost bound to become part of English-speaking Black Africa when the blacks resume power. These are Zimbabwe, Namibia (though for the time being English is internally overshadowed by Afrikaans and German) and South Africa itself. Less involved in activist liberation politics is Malawi, which is also English-speaking.

Then there is the cultural distance between Arab Africa and Black Africa. In this case physical and cultural distances seem to reinforce each other. And yet, paradoxically, the support that Arab states have extended to liberation in southern Africa has on the whole been well above average. There is a particularly high performance by Algeria and Egypt. In the case of Algeria, support has basically been next only to that of the front-line states. And no Arab country so far falls within the bottom 25 per cent of states involved in the politics of liberation.

Then there is the ideological distance to be taken into account, between the supporting state and the liberation movement as a whole.

Guinea, though francophone, scores higher than such anglophone countries as Kenya and Sierra Leone.

On balance, governments that are left of centre in ideological orientation in Africa may be presumed to be more committed to the struggle for liberation, at least in terms of rhetorical and diplomatic agitation in one international forum after another.

Related to this is the degree of nationalism in the total ideological orientation of a given African regime. Here it is worth distinguishing between combative nationalism and supportive nationalism. Combative nationalism exhibits a readiness to engage directly in the struggle for patriotic aims and objectives, and exhibits faith in hard solutions and less reliance on compromise. Supportive African nationalism, on the other hand, leaves the basic fighting to others, and may even let the decision to fight be made primarily by others, although it may exhibit enough identification with the fighters to lend them moral and sometimes material support. Combative nationalism is a war-cry of militant engagement; supportive nationalism is a form of ululation among the fans on the sidelines. Combative nationalism very often needs warriors in defence of the fatherland; supportive nationalism needs cheer-leaders to help the morale of the warriors.

African commitment to liberation in southern Africa ranges from the relatively weak and sometimes ambivalent supportive nationalism of the Ivory Coast, on the one hand, to the increasingly combative nationalism of Zambia on the issue of Rhodesia, on the other hand. The point of ideological distance which an African state occupies in the spectrum of nationalism helps to colour its concrete policies on southern Africa.

The fifth conditioning factor is the personality of the African individual in control of a particular state. The relatively collaborationist policies of Hastings Kamuzu Banda of Malawi over the years have been partly due to geopolitical factors concerned with Malawi's vulnerable nearness to white-controlled Africa; partly due also to Malawi's economic weakness, which for quite a while made it even rely on access of its workers to the mines of South Africa; and partly due to the personality of Kamuzu Banda and his idiosyncracies.

An even clearer case of personality as a factor in policy concerns Idi Amin Dada of Uganda. When he assumed power in 1971 he quickly proclaimed his belief in dialogue between black states and the Republic of South Africa as an approach towards solving the problems of southern Africa. But well before he became the chairman of the Organization of African Unity in 1975 he had become a militant nationalist on the issue of liberation in southern Africa, at least in terms of rhetoric and diplomatic agitation. The change in policy at the time it first occurred in 1972 was primarily the outcome of Idi Amin's own impulses. But the maintenance of



the policy since then has been due to other factors, including Amin's enjoyment of his reputation as one of the militant voices of anti-imperialism emanating from the Third World.

The personality of Félix Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast has also played a part in shaping his policies on southern Africa. He sees himself as the voice of moderation, compromise and enlightened pragmatism in African affairs. This self-conception has contributed to his faith in the strategy of dialogue and détente between the black states and the Republic of South Africa.

But some people might inquire how much of the Ivory Coast's policy is in fact less a case of the preferences of its leader and more a response to the influence of France. This brings us to the whole phenomenon of derivative relations between black states and the struggle for southern Africa. It is to these that we must now turn.

### **Southern Africa and derivative relations**

Derivative relations are those that are conditioned by considerations not directly concerned with the issue of liberation itself. For example, does the amount of aid an independent African country receives from the Western world affect the country's relations with liberation movements in southern Africa? In fact the correlation between Western aid and support for liberation is quite weak. There is very little difference between Zambia and Malawi in volume of aid received from the West in the last ten years, and yet Zambia has been one of the major centres of commitment to liberation, whereas Malawi has often tended to collaborate with the white-minority regimes.

On the other hand, does the amount of aid an African country receives from the Soviet Union affect its relations with liberation movements? There is indeed a positive correlation between high support from the Soviet Union for an African state and high support by that state for liberation movements in southern Africa. And yet this correlation may itself be due to a prior congruence of ideological dispositions. In other words, what made the country increase its contacts with the Soviet Union may be the same prior ideological consideration that made the same country support liberation movements in southern Africa.

All these are exogenous derivative relations, meaning that they are relations partly derived from or affected by African links with external powers. But an external country may derive its own African policy from a relationship with a third area of the world. A striking illustration of this is China's African policy, which is basically a derivative of China's policy

towards the Soviet Union. This was particularly true in the 1970s, when the Chinese tended to respond to Soviet initiatives in Africa, choosing friends on the basis of opposition to the Soviet Union. What this means is that exogenous relations of this kind are basically extracontinental from Africa's point of view.

What about intracontinental derivative relations? These do indeed exist. Sometimes they are quite subtle. For example, in 1976 and 1977 Kenya's policies on Zimbabwe were from time to time affected by Kenya's relations with the Tanzanians. Impatience with them, or envy of the United Republic of Tanzania as a front-line state, sometimes reduced the enthusiasm of at least sections of the Kenyan Government for the liberation cause in southern Africa.

Arab support for southern Africa is also partly derivative, although on the whole the derivation is both intracontinental in the sense of being concerned with African issues and extracontinental in the sense of being linked to the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Arabs have needed African diplomatic support in the global attempt to isolate Israel. They have needed African voting power in international organizations as part of the strategy of gaining greater legitimacy for the Palestinian cause.

Some of the more radical Arab states would have sided with the black struggle in southern Africa in any case. But on balance a relationship of *quid pro quo* has evolved between the Arab need for support against Israel and the need of the African states for support against white rule in southern Africa.

Both intracontinental and extracontinental relations have their contradictions. It is to some of these that we now turn.

### **Dialectical relations: regional and global**

Dialectical relations arise partly out of the tension between the legacy of imperialism that still exists within the newly independent states and the aspirations for total autonomy that are held by the leaders in those states.

A particularly striking anomaly concerns Mozambique. There is little doubt that Mozambique under its new Marxist-Leninist government since independence is committed to liberation in southern Africa, and indeed in the rest of the African continent. And yet Mozambique's revolutionary commitment coincides with the country's high absorption into South Africa's economy. The government receives support in gold and money as its share of the exploitation of its own workers who go to mine in South Africa.

Mozambique provided a base for the fighting forces of the Patriotic Front for the liberation of Zimbabwe. Yet the same revolutionary

Mozambique has to play a cautious game with the more racist regime of Pretoria.

It is this dialectic between dependency and revolution, between the continuities of imperialism and the quest for social justice, that constitutes the most agonizing paradox of almost all the front-line states. Mozambique's predicament is certainly repeated, though in a somewhat different manner, in Botswana. Even Zambia, as it struggled to reduce its dependence on Rhodesia after Ian Smith's unilateral declaration of independence, has increased its economic and to some extent infrastructural dependency on the Republic of South Africa.

Angola chose a different form of dependency, which we shall discuss later. But even the Tanzanian Government, precisely as it has become more important in the final stages of the struggle for the liberation of southern Africa, has at the same time embarked on partial deradicalization at home. The revolutionary fervour of the late 1960s is beginning to waver, and a new groping for Western support in the economic field is under way. The dialectical relations between dependency and liberation are almost as omnipresent in Dar es Salaam as they are in Maputo.

As for dialectical relations at the global level, these encompass the superpowers themselves. Competitive imperialism between the Soviet Union and the United States helped to provide liberating potentialities for southern Africa after the collapse of the Portuguese empire. On the whole, the Soviet Union is as much an imperial power as the United States. But the fact that the superpowers have entered a period of rivalry in southern Africa has opened up opportunities which those who are oppressed may sometimes succeed in exploiting.

The first major scramble for Africa occurred in the wake of the Berlin Conference of 1884–85. The second major scramble for Africa was precipitated by the coup in Portugal in April 1974 and its aftermath. The last of the great European empires of old, the Portuguese one, collapsed. A new opportunity opened up in Angola. The United States was paralysed by the aftermath of Viet Nam and Watergate, and could not have had congressional agreement to a policy of intervention in Angola. The Soviet Union saw its chance and moved in with the Cubans to help Angolan Marxists capture the country.

But the success of that venture by the Soviet Union, Cuba and the MPLA created a new climate in southern Africa, and a sense of urgency among the Western countries to try to bring about a solution to southern African problems before Marxism triumphed elsewhere. Competitive imperialism was indeed facilitating the general struggle in the continent. The West was learning about the need for racial justice as a result of the challenge posed by the Soviet Union and Cuba. Even Western support for

the United Nations embargo on sale of arms to South Africa, ambivalent as it is and uncertain as it might well be, would nevertheless have been inconceivable before the collapse of the Portuguese empire and the triumph of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola.

Cuba's own role in Africa has contradictory implications. On the one side, Cuba is indeed a revolutionary paradigm, a special model for much of the Third World. Cuba signifies the success of a small country that managed to transform itself in spite of the hostility and opposition of virtually all its thirty neighbours in the Western hemisphere.

And yet this same island, which symbolizes revolution and liberation, is beginning to play a subimperial role in Africa. African civil wars are being decided in their outcome partly from Havana. Inter-African rivalries in southern Africa and in the Horn are being partly resolved by Cuban militia. The island of revolution in the Caribbean is able to throw its weight around in a continent of fragmentation, thousands of miles away.

But while Cuba's role in other parts of the African continent may be dubious, its role so far in southern Africa has helped to prepare the ground for the end of white rule generally. The battle is not yet over by any means. But in the southern African equation, at any rate, the Cuban factor is on balance part of the calculus of liberation.

## **Conclusion**

We have attempted in this essay to place the role of African states in the struggle for southern Africa in both a continental and a global context. We have also tried to relate the policies of independent African states to considerations that range from geopolitics to culture, from ideological impulses to the attributes of personality.

The impact of independent black states, especially as reinforced by the support of the Arab states within the continent, has been critical in creating a global climate hostile to white-minority rule in the continent and responsive to the clarion call for racial justice and self-determination.

South Africa itself may well turn out to be the last historical case of institutionalized racism that mankind is ever to experience. Other forms of discrimination will persist for a long time to come. So will racism in some of its other manifestations. But the idea of teaching children in separate racial schools, forcing adults to use racially separated compartments on buses and trains, or forbidding adults from marrying across racial lines, or structuring electorates on the basis of segregated voting power—all these older forms of institutionalized racism may well be experiencing their last-ditch stand in South Africa.

Related to this development is the high consensus the international community has managed to reach against white-minority rule in southern Africa. This could be one of the first major contributions of non-Western and non-white countries to international morality and international law as a whole. There was a time when racism was acceptable to international law because that body of law was derived ultimately from Western values and orientations. There was also a time when the apartheid policies of South Africa were accepted throughout the Western world as strictly a case of internal jurisdiction within South Africa. But the alliance of African states, supported by other Third World countries, has gradually forced even the more conservative Western capitals to regard racism in South Africa not simply as immoral in a private sense, but as a matter of legitimate international action. To withhold arms from South Africa was itself a form of action. The world had moved one step forward towards the ideal of abolishing at least the more blatant and institutionalized forms of racism.

In this struggle to gain world consensus for the eradication of these forms of racism, the part played by independent African states has been central and quite indispensable. Theirs had to be part of the initiative for change, theirs had to be the persistent voice of protest against the status quo, theirs had to be the nucleus of agitation.

The struggle continues, but prospects for ultimate victory have been greatly enhanced in the last few years. The Second World War weakened the European imperial powers and helped to speed up the independence of the formally colonized. The Viet Nam war weakened the United States, and helped to reduce its capacity to maintain the status quo in southern Africa. But while these wars weakened the imperial forces, the ultimate will for liberation had to come from the colonized themselves. The struggle in southern Africa now is from bush to bush, village to village. And when South Africa itself falls under the challenge of revolutionary forces, the struggle will be from street to street, alley to alley.

The struggle at that stage has of course to be mainly conducted by black South Africans themselves. But the role of African states will continue to be critical, bringing to culmination a long-drawn-out groping for both racial sovereignty and continental jurisdiction.

## Note

- 
1. Vincent B. Khapoya, 'Determinants of African Support for African Liberation Movements: A Comparative Analysis', *Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 4, Winter 1976, pp. 469-89.

# **The role of liberation movements in the struggle for southern Africa, 1955–77**

Elleck K. Mashingaidze

Perhaps a universally acceptable definition of southern Africa is not possible. Recently the area has been defined so as to include South Africa, Lesotho, Swaziland, Namibia (South West Africa), Botswana, Angola, Zaire, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Zimbabwe.<sup>1</sup> The inclusion of the United Republic of Tanzania within the southern African region has also been justified by that country's key role in the current liberation efforts in the area.<sup>2</sup> Whatever our definition, it must be admitted that the concept of a southern Africa cannot be static. For the purpose of this paper the above definition(s) will be adopted.

This vast region was occupied by the United Kingdom, Portugal, Belgium and Germany, whose white settlers colonized and reduced African states, large and small, to subjection for centuries. The objectives and the impact of colonial rule in the region differed of course from one country to another, depending on the colonizers and on the response of the colonized. Whatever the differences in the impact and objectives, however, one fact remains: colonialism was established to serve and promote the colonizer's interests at the expense of those of the subject peoples. Colonial government structures, laws and economic institutions were carefully and deliberately designed to exploit human and natural resources in the respective colonial possessions; for example, in South Africa, Rhodesia, Namibia and Angola land was expropriated from the Africans, who were forced to live in the crowded and impoverished areas generally known as reserves.<sup>3</sup> In these countries large-scale expropriation of land from the Africans led to the creation of a landless class compelled to go to the mines, white settlers' farms and white-owned factories in urban centres in search of unskilled work. The exploitation of this cheap or semi-slave labour was a prerequisite of white capitalist prosperity in the region. The exploitation of black labour begun during British rule in South Africa has now reached perfection under the present regime, Racial discrimination against the black majority, the Bantustan system, the migrant-labour system and institutionalized police brutality against the oppressed black people form the important pillars of Afrikaner colonialism.

## **African nationalism and decolonization**

By the middle of the 1960s, the situation had changed tremendously in most countries of the region. By 1968, with the exception of South Africa, Rhodesia, Namibia, Angola and Mozambique, the area had been decolonized and brought under national governments. The first to establish a nation-state was Congo-Kinshasa, now Zaire, in 1960, followed in 1961 by Tanganyika. With the final collapse of the white-minority-dominated Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1963, Malawi and Zambia also became independent, in 1963 and 1964 respectively. The year 1966 saw two former British possessions, Bechuanaland and Basutoland, taking their rightful positions as the sovereign states of Botswana and Lesotho respectively, and 1968 brought Swaziland's independence.

Behind this impressive record of decolonization was the force of African nationalism in the various areas. Of course, the emergence and growth of African nationalism were both directly related to white-settler colonialism and capitalist exploitation of the black people. Political and cultural oppression by the colonizers and economic exploitation by both local and international capital had their impact upon the African populations. There was, for example, widespread poverty and a general deterioration in the standard of living of the Africans, especially in the urban and industrial areas. As a result there was widespread discontent among the oppressed. African discontent was made even more acute by the knowledge on their part that it was their sweat, and sometimes even blood, that ensured high standards of living among the settlers. The Africans began to complain about the way they were treated by their oppressors and exploiters.

African nationalism as we know it today is therefore inseparable from black awareness or consciousness. The African people began to feel that they were oppressed and exploited simply because of their skin colour. African nationalism began to manifest and express itself in a variety of ways. For example, through black labourers demanding that they should be treated as human beings and that they should be properly recognized as workers by their employers and exploiters; or even through black evangelists and Christians demanding that they should be equal with white missionaries and Christians; or through ordinary villagers in the remote areas demanding that their colonial administrators should listen to their opinions on how the Africans should be ruled. Eventually this opposition to the colonial system and all its structures became more articulate and eloquently voiced through such organizations as labour associations, independent African church organizations, cultural associations and sometimes loosely organized political groups. All these are the true forerunners of nationalist political movements as they later developed in the various countries of southern Africa.<sup>4</sup> The

more the colonial authorities tried to stop the African nationalist ferment by strong-arm tactics, the more widespread and the better organized African nationalist parties became.

Although African nationalism succeeded in decolonizing Zaire, the United Republic of Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland, it was successfully halted in other countries of the region: South Africa, Namibia, Angola, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Mozambique. The white minority governments of these countries were determined to fight for the survival of the type of colonialism they represented. In a way, it can be argued that these countries presented different types of colonialism from that which had existed in other parts of the region. For example, since the United Kingdom abandoned the interests of the black peoples of South Africa in 1910, there has developed in that country a kind of internal colonialism in which the colonizers (the white minority) live in the same country (and claim to belong to it) as the colonized (the black majority).<sup>5</sup> While few people would question the white people's claim to be South Africans, many would certainly not agree that this entitles them to subject the black people to economic exploitation and political and cultural oppression. The white minority have created boundaries within the same state between areas occupied by black people and areas occupied by them. The former areas are subjected to perpetual under-development while the latter are fully developed by the use of black labour. The Africans are oppressed politically and culturally.

The Rhodesian case is somewhat similar to that of South Africa. A form of internal colonialism could be said to exist there. With British encouragement and tacit approval, the white settlers have, since 1923, been assumed the position and the practices of internal colonizers. They have done everything possible to frustrate any peaceful development of a non-racial community or society in Zimbabwe. As a result, black and white have been developing into two nations within one state.<sup>6</sup> The white nation, as in South Africa, is colonizing, oppressing and exploiting the black 'nation'.

The case of Angola and Mozambique is different. In these countries, the colonizing power, Portugal, had not the slightest intention of quitting its colonies. It continued to oppress and exploit its African subjects while promoting its myth of multi-racialism or 'Lusotropical civilization' according to which Portugal was said to have no colonies, but provinces, in Africa. Accordingly, Portuguese nationals in Angola and Mozambique were not regarded as colonists but as Portuguese citizens living in Portugal's provinces overseas.

Fearful of the changes taking place elsewhere in Africa, the settler minorities in South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Angola and Mozambique prepared themselves not to sail with the current but to resist it. Their



governments became even more racist. For example, in a desperate bid to prevent or stop the inevitable change in Zimbabwe, the white-minority regime of Rhodesia illegally declared the country's independence in November 1965. When, in 1966, South Africa was called upon by the United Nations General Assembly to hand over Namibia to the international organization so that the people of Namibia could be independent, not only did South Africa defy the order, it also went ahead with the annexation of the country.

Another sign of desperation and nervousness on the part of the racist oppressors was the development of military co-operation between the South African, Rhodesian, Mozambican and Angolan white regions, as well as the increase of institutionalized police brutality and violence against the oppressed African peoples in these countries.

### **Liberation movements**

The African nationalist movements soon realized that the South African, Rhodesian and Portuguese governments had decided to set their faces firmly against democratic and peaceful change in South Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique. It was also clear to African nationalist parties in the respective countries that the white minority regimes were perfecting their police and military machineries to crush with brutality any opposition to the status quo. Clearly the task of bringing about political change in the five countries was beyond the abilities of simple African nationalism and the organizations this force had inspired. More important still, the people involved were rapidly and increasingly convinced that 'normal political pressure and agitation' would never change the oppressors' stance.<sup>7</sup>

For the foresighted in the nationalist circles, it had also become clear in the early 1960s that because of the height and the involved nature of the stakes in these countries, simple decolonization was not the answer. What was needed in South Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, Namibia and Mozambique was total liberation. While decolonization had been achieved in other countries of the region by African nationalist parties, total liberation would require entirely different political organizations, equipped with a completely new ideology from nationalism. The new organizations were the liberation movements which, by the end of the 1960s, were by far the most important forces in the struggles for Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa. In most cases the liberation movements were transformations of the old nationalist organizations in the respective countries, where the objective material conditions obtaining made this transformation inevitable.

In strictly historical terms, therefore, it is an anachronism to talk about the role of liberation movements in the southern African struggle before the 1960s, perhaps the mid-1960s. We would also submit that it is equally

misleading to refer to the dramatic political changes taking place in such countries as Zaire, the United Republic of Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland in the 1960s, as total liberation. A distinction should be made between nationalist organizations and liberation movements. The processes which these two types of forces of change created in the region, though closely related, should also be distinguished in our analysis. African nationalism, the dominant force from the end of the Second World War to the mid-1960s, brought about the process of decolonization. The liberation struggle, the dominant factor from the 1960s on, sought and still seeks to bring about more than mere decolonization. The liberation struggle's objective is total liberation.

The activities of African nationalist parties compelled colonial governments to grant political independence to the peoples of Zaire, the United Republic of Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland. This process of decolonization brought with it changes: the formation of national governments under indigenous presidents or kings, new constitutions, flags, national anthems, sometimes improvement in people's conditions of living and more opportunities for education. It must be admitted, however, that such changes and improvements have, in most cases, not been followed or accompanied by a total transformation of society, its values, social structures, institutions and, of course, production relationships. One of the very few exceptions, however, is the TANU of the United Republic of Tanzania, which made efforts, even after independence, to transform itself from a mere nationalist organization to a revolutionary party determined to introduce revolutionary changes in Tanzanian economic life and social organization. Most independent African countries made very little effort, if any, to change the political, social and economic systems and structures which were inherited from the colonial past. In production relations, for example, the worker is still subordinate to the capitalist organization which extracts and accumulates surplus value at his expense. The relationships with former colonial masters continue to be characterized by economic dependence, which often tends to deprive African states of their right to develop and follow their own independent foreign policies and positions in crucial international debates and questions.

What about the changes brought about by liberation movements? By the 1960s, colonial regimes in Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Namibia and South Africa realized they were no longer dealing with the old nationalist organizations, in spite of the names which, in some cases, had not changed. The South African ANC and the PAC, the Namibian SWAPO, the Angolan MPLA, the Mozambican FRELIMO and Zimbabwe's ZANU and ZAPU had been transformed into liberation movements and were determined to lead their respective countries to independence through a

different path from the one followed by the nationalist movements already mentioned. To appreciate why the liberation movements chose a different path it must be realized that, although historically related to the nationalist organizations, they differed from nationalist parties in that they were products of revolutionary material, which was behind the transformation from mere nationalism to the present liberation movements.<sup>8</sup>

The southern African liberation movements are characterized by the following features: (a) they are, without exception, uncompromisingly anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist; (b) they are guided by clearly defined and articulated emancipatory ideological positions, seeking to bring about a complete break with the colonial political, economic and social systems and structures; (c) they are mass movements whose efforts and policies are deliberately designed to involve all sections of society, especially the working people and the peasantry, who are rightly regarded as potential revolutionary material in the liberation processes; (d) scientific socialism has been accepted as the guiding philosophy by all liberation movements in southern Africa; (e) a protracted armed struggle has been fully accepted as an important and necessary instrument of revolutionary change. For this reason, each liberation movement recruited a military wing variously known as 'the liberation army', 'the revolutionary army', 'the people's liberation force or army', etc., whose cadres were, and are, also missionaries of revolutionary ideology and change.<sup>9</sup> The freedom fighters, as the military cadres are also known, were and are expected to be new men and women guided by high moral and revolutionary principles. And, as Mubako observes in relation to the Zimbabwean liberation movement(s), on account of their special training and field experience, fighters in the people's forces also provide the radicalizing influence that 'sets the ideological standards for the parties, and the older generation of politicians will promote or destroy their political career to the extent to which they measure up to or fall short of those standards.'<sup>10</sup>

Now, not only have the liberation movements accepted armed struggle as the only realistic method of bringing about genuine political change and total national liberation, they have also convincingly demonstrated its effectiveness, when FRELIMO and MPLA smashed Portuguese imperialism and colonialism after many years of war. For ZANU and ZAPU in Zimbabwe, and for SWAPO and the ANC and PAC in Namibia and South Africa, therefore, it is no longer a theory that national liberation can be won on the battlefield, and against any colonial force no matter how brutal and how well equipped it may be. Thus, led by their vanguard parties, the oppressed and exploited subject peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa are more determined to smash white settlerism and end the white-minority governments of Salisbury and Pretoria. They are also determined to

establish peoples' democracies in the place of these outdated political systems.

The emergence and development of liberation movements—and especially the victories of the Mozambican and Angolan socialist parties in 1974 and 1975 respectively—shook imperialism to its roots. By the mid-1970s the activities of FRELIMO, MPLA, ZANU and SWAPO in particular, were rapidly making the southern Africa region a zone of both military and ideological conflicts. The stakes were becoming very high, and they were also assuming wider dimensions. The fall of Portuguese colonialism in Mozambique and Angola, and the subsequent unequivocal acceptance of socialism by the Mozambicans and the Angolans led to the intensification of Western capitalist involvement both indirectly and directly to protect their interests.<sup>11</sup> And, in an effort to safeguard their socialist gains and victories, the Mozambicans and Angolans were also compelled to appeal for assistance from fellow socialist and progressive allies, including the USSR and Cuba. The liberation movements of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa also became increasingly dependent on socialist countries for material assistance in the prosecution of their struggles against the Salisbury and Pretoria regimes.

By 1977, therefore, two things had become abundantly clear to the capitalist supporters of white-minority regimes in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa: first, that no military force, no matter how powerful, would prevent the now politicized recipients of starvation wages, the politically oppressed and the crowded inhabitants of the seriously impoverished Bantustans, tribal trust lands and homelands of South Africa, Rhodesia and South West Africa, from identifying themselves with the liberation cause. The co-operation given to FRELIMO fighters by the rural masses during the wars with Portugal, co-operation given to MPLA by workers in Luanda, the role played by the rural masses of Zimbabwe in supporting ZANLA and ZIPRA forces since 1972, the support given to SWAPO in Namibia, and the Soweto uprisings (spreading to other centres) in 1976, all went to show the irreversibility of the revolutionary tide in the region. Secondly, for the region the question was no longer decolonization, which both the oppressed and the oppressors were already regarding as inevitable. The question now was how to dilute the effects of the revolution and thus ensure the perpetuation of capitalist interests in Zimbabwe and in Namibia. This would in turn guarantee South Africa's protection.

Hope seemed to lie with what has since been referred to as Phase II of the southern African détente, begun in 1976. Détente was frustrated by the intensification of the liberation war in Zimbabwe and Namibia where the people's forces continued to direct telling blows against the racist forces of Rhodesia and South Africa.

## Notes

---

1. This definition was adopted by the Organizing Committee of the International Conference on Southern African History, National University of Lesotho, 1-8 August 1977. See also editor's note, *Mohlomi, Journal of Southern African Historical Studies*, Vol. II, Moriija Printing Works, 1978.
2. President Julius Nyerere of the United Republic of Tanzania is the chairman and spokesman of the front-line presidents directly concerned with the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa.
3. 'Native Reserves', as they existed in such white-dominated countries as Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and South West Africa, were serving a number of purposes: e.g. to keep African communities in areas where they could be easily controlled; to segregate them from the whites; to create reservoirs of unlimited cheap or semi-slave labour to serve the white-owned farms, mines and factories.
4. The earliest of them was the South African National Congress, formed in 1912.
5. H. Walpole, 'The Theory of Internal Colonization: The South African Case'.
6. R. Gray, *Two Nations*, London, Oxford University Press, 1960.
7. E. Mondlane, *The Struggle for Mozambique*, p. 121, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1970.
8. S. V. Mubako, 'Aspects of the Zimbabwe Liberation Movement 1966-1976, Part I', *Mohlomi, Journal of Southern African Historical Studies*, Vol. II.
9. E. K. Mashingaidze, 'The Southern African Political Scene from the 1960s', paper read at the Danish Volunteer Service Seminar, Maseru, 28 June 1978. Also Mubako, op. cit.
10. Mubako, op. cit.
11. The West tried to assist counter-revolutionary elements in Angola in order to frustrate the MPLA. South Africa also threw its military weight against both the MPLA and FRELIMO but without success. American involvement also failed.

# **The position of South Africa**

E. L. Ntloedibe

## **Introduction**

The political concept we today know as South Africa came into existence on 31 May 1910, when the South Africa Act of 1909 of the British Parliament merged into the Union of South Africa, 472,359 square miles of land and placed administrative responsibility for it in the hands of the white coalition government of the former colonial administrations of the Cape, Natal, Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Each of the four white component parts had been given 'responsible government' at different times in its colonial history: the Cape Colony in 1872, Natal in 1893, Transvaal in 1906 and the Orange Free State in 1907.

The struggle of the African people of Azania did not start at that time, nor was it essentially waged in opposition to that development as such. The nature that the struggle took from this time onwards changed form in order to cope with the development of the political situation but its fundamental nature and character remained the same as of yore. We hold that the granting of unilateral so-called independence to a white foreign minority by British colonialism was not an act of decolonization but rather a transfusion of colonial authority which took the form of dominion status for the white government. It was inevitable that the colonial rule concomitant with that status should assume despotic and sectarian practices, which could not but require continuous and consistent backing by violent armed force. It became imperative that those despotic and sectarian practices should be institutionalized to give them the force of respectability, legitimacy and legality.

The dominion status of the 'new' territory, in our view, was merely the continuation or the transplantation of the old concept of sectarian 'responsible government' under new conditions and involved no material change from the original relationship. The status only meant, in practical terms, that the white coalition government had been allocated a share with big British capital and given the governmental powers of a colonial authority over as subject black population, whose social position did not change with

the new 'constitutional change'. The position of whites in general did not change either from what it had been in the days of 'responsible government'. They retained their privileged position over and against the black subject population in order to give legitimacy to the despotic authority of the white government and hold the responsibility of being the conscious and willing electors of the handmen of British colonialism. It became the solemn duty of successive white governments to respect and uphold the incentive and extravagant bribery of white privilege for this purpose. The British Prime Minister, Henry Campbell-Bannerman justified the position of the House of Commons debate over the draft bill, which subsequently became the South Africa Act of 1909, by pointing out that 'it was not the English way to rule whites as subject peoples'.

The white coalition government consisted of a cabinet made up of four ministers from the Cape, three from the Transvaal and two each from Natal and the Orange Free State. Its colonial authority over its subject black population was manifestly expressed in what they called 'native policy', which is characterized by sectarian native administration, arbitrary distribution of land ownership and despotic labour practices. Native policy is a fundamental feature of colonialism, and the present 'Bantu homelands' policy of the racist government in South Africa is its latest version. There is no 'native policy' in any of the independent African states, which are themselves successors to colonial rule and this makes it patently clear that these black governments are not colonial authorities. They have departments of the 'interior' or 'home affairs', as any other sovereign states in the world but none of their citizens are subjected to sectarian 'native policy'. That is the major fundamental principle of self-determination by which we identify the sovereignty of peoples and nation states.

It is in this light that the African people in Azania seek the re-examination, re-adjustment and re-definition of racist South Africa's legal international status, taking into account the principle of the national right to self-determination in so far as it affects and relates to them. They do not accept that they are an independent people who are merely discriminated against racially or ethnically but hold that they have been arbitrarily and militarily deprived of their land and therefore of their nationhood; deprived of their citizenship rights by arbitrary and despotic denial of free and full participation in the public affairs of their country, and deprived of ordinary human rights by arbitrary imposition in that country. These activities, on the part of the present South African state system, conclusively, collectively, conjunctively, contemptuously and in all other ways trample underfoot their national right to self-determination, violate the sanctity of their national sovereignty and the territorial integrity of their beloved fatherland. There can be neither betrayal nor compromise on these sacred national issues. Our

people cannot abandon the national destiny and capitulate to national subjugation, no matter what odds may be ranged against them. Their national duty is to find a historical solution to the matter of national relations in that country.

### **Present status**

There are several interpretations of South Africa's political international status under current use. The first is what we may call the 'apartheid viewpoint'. According to Chris Jooste in *South African Dialogue*, pp. 4-5 (Johannesburg, McGraw-Hill), the present government of the Republic of South Africa has set itself the task of 'restoring the independence' of those who lost their freedom to Great Britain and had been placed under the Union Government as subject peoples in 1910. The position as understood and defined is thus:

The Union Government was set up as a white government to rule over the former Boer republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the Former British colonies of the Cape of Good Hope and Natal, the Bantu territories which had been annexed and incorporated into British South Africa, as well as the non-white peoples domiciled in white territories, principally, the Indians and Coloureds living in Natal and the Cape Colony respectively.

The second is the liberal point of view. Discussing what she calls the crux of the race problem. Dr Ellen Hellman of the South African Institute of Race Relations points out that 'South Africa has been compared with other colonial powers with this difference: that her colonial subjects lived within the physical boundaries of the mother country'. She argues that

the general apparatus of colonialism, as it had developed by the 20th century, had likewise evolved in South Africa [where] peoples of European descent ruled the indigenous people and admitted them into white-dominated society to the extent that they were required as low-paid workers.

Eric Walker adds to the argument in his *History of Southern Africa* (Longmans, 1967), p. 538: 'The new Union Government was endowed with the high but ill-defined status of a post-war British Dominion [and] took up the task, which none but British High Commissioners had hitherto attempted, of regulating the affairs of South Africa as a whole.'

At the international level South Africa is regarded as an 'independent and sovereign state'. Clearly what is meant here is the international standing of the white government of the country. The Universal Declaration of



Human Rights states categorically: 'All peoples have the right to self-determination'. It is universally known that the African peoples in South Africa live under the rule of a white-minority government that denies them national sovereignty and violates the territorial integrity of their country. The right of peoples to self-determination is a fundamental principle of international law that governs the political status of indigenous peoples on their ancestral land. The African people in South Africa do not enjoy this right, and their struggle for national liberation is based upon the inalienable right to exercise it unrestricted, unhindered and unmolested. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 'inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence'. The denial of the enjoyment of the right is the manifest expression of a colonial status, and therefore the question of legality in so far as South Africa's present political international status is concerned is irrelevant to us because it ignores objective reality.

In raising the question of South Africa's legal international status our desire is to remove the ambiguities associated with it so that the situation may be correctly adjusted. We have already quoted part of the resolution of the twenty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly, which refers to self-determination, while another supports 'the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the total eradication of apartheid'. We wish to draw attention to two further resolutions of the United Nations. In Resolution 2787 (XXVI) of 1971, the General Assembly 'confirms the legality of people's struggles for self-determination and liberation from colonial and foreign domination and alien subjugation, notably in Southern Africa and in particular that of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) as well as the Palestinian people, by all available means consistent with the Charter of the United Nations'. Furthermore Resolution 3103 (XXVIII), adopted in 1973, states:

The armed conflicts involving the struggles of peoples against colonial and alien domination and racist regimes are to be regarded as international conflicts in the sense of the 1949 Geneva Conference and the legal status envisaged to apply to the combatants in the Geneva Conventions and other international instruments are to apply to the persons engaged in armed struggles against colonial and alien domination and racist regimes.

The national liberation movement of the people of Azania considers that the African people in Azania live under the rule of a white minority government that denies them national sovereignty and violates the territorial integrity of their country. That is a colonial situation, and 'human equality' is a secondary issue. The national right to self-determination is an international

issue, and in any case it is indivisible and means the same thing in Azania as in Namibia, Zimbabwe and any other part of Africa. This means that to the people of Azania the question of legality is irrelevant in this respect because it ignores the reality of our situation.

Our firm position in this regard is that white domination in Africa is not merely a matter of apartheid but is part and parcel of local and foreign exploitation of the African people.

The political status of the present Republic of South Africa, we hold, is that of a colonial country owned by the imperialist consortium of investors and trading partners who own more than 80 per cent of South African private property in company with the white bourgeoisie, of which the government is a significant part. The main aspect of the principal contradiction in Azania, therefore, is the control of the country and its riches. The country consists of the land and its peoples. The wealth consists of its natural resources and the labour of its peoples. Much of the land surface is made up of ancient rocks with a series of continental sediments rich in minerals. Unlimited mineral resources, according to tourist brochures, have made it so far the richest country in Africa. The population of the country, by the last official census, stands at about 25 million men, women and children, at least 21 million of them being Africans. A racist government minister recently described the so-called homelands, which we call 'native labour reserves', as having a permanent commodity which no other independent African country has: unlimited labour resources.

In the last thirty years, the white bourgeoisie has made concerted efforts to strengthen its economic stake in the country, but British imperialism still holds a dominating position and controls about 97 per cent of mining capital, 94 per cent of industrial capital, 88 per cent of finance capital, and 75 per cent of commercial capital. This power base is highly concentrated in the hands of seven finance houses, which control between them over a thousand of the largest companies with combined resources exceeding £1,000 million, while other Western imperialist interests have a stake exceeding £1,800 million invested in at least 1,632 companies owned by thirteen capitalist countries. Australia has 73 companies operating in South Africa; Belgium 44; Canada 15; France 85; Italy 21; Japan 2; the Netherlands 57; New Zealand 3; Sweden 59; Switzerland 17; the United Kingdom 630; the United States 494 and the Federal Republic of Germany 132.<sup>1</sup>

It is undeniable that all the foreign companies operating in South Africa observe the 'native policy' of the South African Government and operate strictly within the laws directly flowing from that policy. In short, they are all partners in apartheid or, conversely, apartheid is practised and applied on their behalf and to their advantage. Our submission is that the 'native policy' is applied in their colonial interest and, like British colonialism

before them, at their instigation. And this is because South Africa is their joint semi-colony.

We define white domination as a South African brand of colonialism. This is because, at the present moment, colonial authority over the African people is exercised by the white racist government, which inherited it from British colonialism in 1910. The British had exercised it throughout their colonial occupation of country and had themselves inherited it from the racist colonial rule of the Dutch East India Company, whose Cape settlement began on 6 April 1652. We make a distinction here between the sectarianism of white racism, which is not a historical fundamental contradiction, and despotism, which is a fundamental feature of colonialism.

The first Union Government was a coalition government. In the United Kingdom, the affairs of South Africa were handled by the Colonial Office and the Dominion Office. In 1925, however, the two offices were separated, and South Africa fell under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Office. At the time, British sovereignty was acknowledged. In the parliamentary debate on the Nationality and Flag Bill in 1927, the Interior Minister, Dr D. F. Malan, argued that 'Union nationals must also be British subjects, a smaller circle within a larger one'. (*Cape Times*, 24 February, 1927). The 1926 Imperial Conference held in London had declared the United Kingdom and the Dominions to be 'equal in status [and] in no way subordinate to one another'. The relevant clauses of the resultant Balfour Declaration were to be embodied in the Statute of Westminster in 1931, giving legal form to the freedom of action for those dominions that desired it.

General Hertzog, the then Prime Minister, hailed this, as reported in the *Cape Times* of 28 February 1931, as 'sovereign independence and finality with regard to the country's freedom'. This constitutional change was said to link the country's international status with the so-called native problem. Hitherto the British position had been that 'black interests must come first where few white men dwelt among many blacks' (*Africa and some World Problems*). In response to General Smuts' call, General Hertzog is said to have made close contact with colonial delegates at the Imperial conference, especially the Kenya colonial delegation, and 'begged that the governments concerned should consult together before any of them adopted a native policy which differed markedly from that of the Union Government' (*Cape Times*, November 1930).

The Status Act of 1934 proclaimed the Parliament of the Union of South Africa as the 'sovereign legislative body' without whose consent no future British monarch or his representative might act. The Coronation Oath Act of 1937 bound the British king 'to rule South Africans according to the statutes agreed on in the Union parliament, and according to their own laws

and customs'. This position remained until 1961, when the republican constitution replaced the monarchical status at the time of Dr Verwoerd's secession from the Commonwealth. Until then the head of state was the British monarch acting through his local representative, the Governor-General. Charles Roberts Swart was the last Governor-General of South Africa and the first republican president.

### **The British position**

It is clear from this evidence that the United Kingdom did not, in 1910, give sovereign independence to the Union of South Africa, apart from full legislative power and authority 'to make laws for the peace, order and good government' within the limits of the colonies. This was the hallmark of responsible government in British constitutional practice at the time. The colonial authority entrusted to the Governor-General of the Union of South Africa over the black people under section 147 of the constitution is clear and unambiguous. It states that 'the control and administration of native affairs and of matters specially or differentially affecting Asiatics throughout the Union shall vest in the Governor-General-in-Council who shall exercise all special powers in regard to native affairs hitherto vested in the Governors of the colonies or exercised by them as supreme chiefs of the native tribes'.

Hahlo and Kahn state, in *British Commonwealth, Development of its Laws and Constitutions, South Africa*, that the British Government had indicated in various ways that it would not reject a compact, hammered out at the white national convention, which retained the existing colonial franchise provisions in the various provinces and excluded non-whites from Parliament. They conclude that 'in native affairs the Governor-General was vested with the special powers of colonial Governors'. They add that the only constitutional development that took place to give the appearance of cut links binding the Union to British colonialism derived from the fact that the Union executive had, in accordance with British convention, secured the control of the Royal Prerogative and could exercise it through the Governor-General, without reference to the sovereign. On the question of independent sovereignty, the British contended that 'the relationship between the dominions and the imperial government could not be interpreted as contemplating an alliance of independent states but rather emphasized a declaration of autonomy for the various parts of the empire'.

This submission was advanced at a time when General Hertzog of South Africa was hailing the 1926 Balfour Declaration and the 1931 Statute of Westminster as meaning, for South Africa, 'sovereign independence and finality with regard to the country's freedom'. General Hertzog's analysis was

described in the United Kingdom as 'more sentiment than substance'. The Dominion Secretary told the House of Commons that 'nothing essentially new had taken place; the two principles of the Balfour Declaration were the political equality of the dominions within the empire and their unity under the common Crown'. There was not even unanimous agreement within the South African Government. The Interior Minister, Dr D. F. Malan, who piloted the Flag Bill, which was supposed to reflect the new status, argued that the change in the flag denoted 'the national status of the Union and the unity of the Empire'.

### **Evolution of status by convention**

The conventional evolution of the status of British dominions started at the Imperial Conference of 1911, where it was resolved that dominions should, wherever practicable, be consulted before international obligations affecting them were undertaken. They themselves conceded, however, that the final responsibility on the determination of policy matters rested with the imperial government. The declaration of war against Germany in 1914 was accepted by the dominions as automatically binding upon them, and their participation in the war resulted in the creation of the Imperial War Cabinet, in which they were represented.

At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 the imperial war cabinet converted itself into an imperial delegation with the dominions' representatives, by virtue of their role in the war, representing their own countries in their own right as well. They thus signed the Treaty of Versailles both as an imperial delegation and on behalf of their own countries and thus became original members of the League of Nations.

In 1920, Canada was permitted to have separate diplomatic representation in Washington, the Irish Free State in 1924, and South Africa in 1930 after the 1926 Imperial Conference had allowed 'freedom of action in international affairs' to those dominions which desired it. This did not confer independent status to the dominions, 'even though some dominion statesmen claimed it', like General Hertzog, for example. The status of the consular representatives of members of the Commonwealth was raised in 1943, starting with Canada, to that of ambassadors, and after the Second World War members of the Commonwealth became original members of the United Nations with independent treaty-making powers and departments of external affairs in their cabinets. In the past, foreign relations for the whole empire had been conducted from Whitehall, but after this, each Commonwealth country conducted its own foreign relations.

The report of the 1930 Imperial Conference stated that 'there would be no alteration in the common status without consultation and agreement

between the various members of the Commonwealth'. In 1947, India was allowed to remain in the Commonwealth as an independent republic. South Africa's application was rejected in 1961. It was reported that racist prime Minister H. F. Verwoerd had withdrawn the application and South Africa subsequently seceded from the Commonwealth by a unilateral declaration.

It has become patently clear that whoever recognizes South Africa's so-called sovereign independence essentially recognizes the unilateral secession in the face of bland refusal by a properly constituted Commonwealth conference. South Africa's secession was achieved through legislation enacted in the racist parliament by the simple process of replacing the words 'Governor-General' by 'State President' wherever they appeared in the constitution and laws of the country, with appropriate alterations in the mode of appointment and the repeal of the Royal Letters Patent and other accompanying constitutional instruments. This is an outline of the legal or conventional evolution of the case. Since we are not trying to win a court case, ours is a political submission based on the principle of the right of self-determination for our people. It would not matter an iota if there were a South Africa Act of 1961 in which the United Kingdom, in consultation with other members of the Commonwealth, allowed the Government of South Africa to secede formally in order to become an independent republic, because unless and until such a measure conformed to this principle of self-determination, our people would recognize, such secession on such a republican declaration.

We wish to point out emphatically that this categorical stand on the part of the United Nations, of which the member states of the Organization for African Unity are a constituent part, goes further in its theoretical positions. The United Nations has taken the position, in one of its resolutions, that where the people of a territory have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, 'each concrete case should be considered and decided upon in the light of its particular circumstances and taking into account the right of self-determination of peoples'. Another stand of historic importance in the development of the right of self-determination was to define 'colonialism and all forms of subjugation of peoples to alien domination and exploitation as a denial of that right and of fundamental human rights'.

The United Nations has further defined two basic positions. The first one is that the process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible, and therefore to avoid serious crises 'an end must be put to colonialism and all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith'. In other words, relations between free peoples are on a footing of equality. The second is the definition of the legal status of combatants 'struggling against colonial and alien domination and racist regimes' as being in the same

context as struggles 'for the implementation of their right to self-determination and independence' as well as being 'legitimate and in full accordance with the principles of international law'. Our people have consistently taken the position that white domination (what is described in United Nations documents as alien domination) is a denial of self-determination to peoples under colonial rule. The United Nations confirms that alien domination takes place where 'the dominating power is racially different from the subject population'.

We wish to recall finally that General Assembly and Security Council resolutions recognize that 'whoever possessed a right should possess the means of exercising it; moreover those peoples have the right to seek and obtain assistance of other states in their struggle and such states have the right and even the duty to give that assistance'. The black people of Azania hold that their political status is that of a colonized people. They hold that their colonizer is the alien government of South Africa, which owes its authority to British imperialism. British imperialism imposed that colonial authority through the 'Government and Parliament of the Union of South Africa [which shall have] full legislative power and authority, within the limits of colonies, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Union'. We have pointed out that it was at the express request of the white national convention that this should be so, and that the Colonial Office had indicated that it would not reject an arrangement that denied black people the franchise. We have also said that this provision was inserted into the constitution of the Union of South Africa, as Section 147, thus granting the constitutional head of the South African Government, the Governor-General, the powers of a colonial governor in the control and administration of native affairs. Our view is that the colonial authority that the South African Government was granted over the black people is present and is clearly visible in the social practice of that country, and also that the subject political status of the black people is conspicuously present in that political situation. We also hold that it is correct to define white alien domination as being consistent with colonial rule.

Finally, the concept of self-determination is a national and a natural right that is universally acknowledged. It is recognized in international law as a prerequisite for the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the main essential base for the development of friendly relations among nations, and the achievement of international peace and security.

## Notes

---

1. *Investment in Apartheid*, p. 9, Brussels, ICFTU, 1974

# **The challenges confronting South Africa**

Edmond Jouve

In recent years southern Africa has become an area of strategic importance for the Western world. The independence of Angola and Mozambique, the growth of wars of liberation and the revolt of the black peoples of the Republic of South Africa have altered the complexion of the problem. The problem posed by the Pretoria regime is in several ways becoming particularly acute. On the domestic side, in particular, the white minority must increasingly take account the 'non-whites'. According to a 1975 estimate South Africa has a population of some 25.5 million, divided into four racial groups: the white community (16.6 per cent), the black community (71.2 per cent), coloureds (9.3 per cent), and Indians (2.9 per cent). The non-whites thus constitute a sizeable reserve of manpower. According to a 1975 figure, only 573,483 out of 2,676,974 workers registered in industry in South Africa were of the white race. In spite of that, the 'homelands' in which 49 per cent of the black population lives make up only 12.8 per cent of the territory of the Republic. In this situation the Pretoria authorities first tried to relax their apartheid policy, but when disorder mounted they had to give up this move. Similarly, on the economic side the situation is no longer as propitious for them as it was before: and the hostility of the international community towards the racist regime is continually increasing. Thus South Africa has set itself the goal of meeting a challenge on three fronts: political, economic and diplomatic.

## **The political challenge**

In an interview published by the Lagos *Sunday Times* on 30 March 1975 J. B. Vorster, Prime Minister of South Africa, stated: 'My aim is to normalize relations with African countries. . . . But my government's policy remains one of separate development.' He went on to say that his country's policy of racial discrimination could at best be modified but not called in question. In essence the attitude has hardly changed since. At best the South African authorities have sought to minimize as far as possible the unpopularity of this policy. Hence, for instance, the large sums devoted by



the government to propaganda. The information budget went up from \$140,000 in 1948 to \$5 million in 1969, and for the financial year 1976–77 it was over \$15 million. But while the government authorities continue at all cost to apply the policy of ‘separate development’, the conflicts intensify, leading in turn to the intensification of repression.

*The policy of ‘separate development’*

The Republic of South Africa originally accepted the sovereignty granted to former protectorates in southern Africa. Admittedly Botswana, which has been independent since 30 September 1966, has a vast territory, but only the eastern part is fertile. Its economy consequently depends for survival on the income of the 60,000 workers—approximately one-fifth of the population—employed in South Africa. Lesotho, which has also been independent since 1966, lives on the earnings of its 100,000 immigrants. The situation of Swaziland, independent since September 1968, is not much better. South Africa protects its currency within the rand area. The former South West Africa, or Namibia, like the other countries mentioned, remains within the South African orbit. The same is true of the two Bantustans that have recently been granted ‘independence’. Transkei achieved international sovereignty on 25 October 1976. In April 1975 Chief Matanzima was accorded the privilege of raising an armed force under the command of a black officer, and on 1 October police stations in the territory were handed over to the Transkei police. Meanwhile the coloured and Indian communities were granted some minor advantages. At the end of October 1976, the Minister for Bantu Administration announced ‘independence’ ‘next year’ for a second Bantustan, Bophuthatswana. The bill granting this territory independence was published on 7 May 1977, and independence was proclaimed on 6 December 1977. The new ‘state’ consists of seven non-contiguous territories, mostly enclosed within South Africa. Chief Lucas Mangope assumed the presidency of Bophuthatswana, the provisional capital being Montshiwa. The next request for independence came in March 1978 from the Venda Bantustan, near the border with Zimbabwe. At present there are still six Bantu homelands, Basotho Qwaqwa, Ciskei, Gazankulu, Kwa Zulu, Lebowa and Venda. They have gradually been granted a certain measure of self-rule. A law enacted in 1953 provided for the gradual introduction of a Bantu homelands, Basotho-Qwaqwa, Ciskei, Gazankulu, KwaZulu, Lebowa and Venda. They have gradually been granted a certain measure of ‘regional units’ (Xhosa, Zulu or Sotho). Progress towards self-rule was speeded up by a law enacted in 1959. Bantu workers employed in the white areas were attached for purposes of administration to these national units. Regional councils were set up. These Bantustans, which are self-governing under the 1971 Bantu Homelands Constitution Act, are all destined to

become 'independent'. As they are at present, their shortcomings are that they contain only a fraction of the black population of South Africa (the majority live in the white areas), that they rest on obsolete tribal foundations, that they are not viable entities (each homeland being split up into territories often far distant from one another, and all except Lebowa having inadequate economic and financial resources) and lastly that their institutions are undemocratic. Those territories that were granted the status of independent states are not much better off, but they have sometimes tried to exercise their new prerogatives. Thus on 10 November 1976 the Transkei Government asked the Pretoria Government to recall immediately the white policemen who had remained in office as 'advisers'. An identical request was made on 20 January 1978, this time for the withdrawal of South African 'advisers' from the Ministry of Defence. After various difficulties, Transkei eventually broke off diplomatic relations with South Africa on 10 April 1978.

South Africa's policy is accompanied by 'liberalization' measures designed to act as safety-valves. Thus multiracial sports teams were sanctioned in September 1976, and on 11 August 1977 the Minister for Sport gave approval for racial mixing in sports clubs. On 11 March 1978 apartheid was abolished in theatres, and a few days later the government gave churches in urban areas permission to stop practising racial discrimination. Private bodies are moving in the same direction: thus on 3 March 1977 Pick and Pay, one of the biggest supermarket chains in South Africa, decided to treat white, black and coloured trade unions on an equal footing, and on 10 April 1977 a multiracial crowd was for the first time admitted to a football match in Johannesburg. The government did not confine itself to doing away with certain discriminatory measures: on 13 May 1977, for example, it put forward a plan for school buildings in Soweto which were to cost over a million dollars. Shortly afterwards the Minister for Agriculture, with the support of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, several newspapers and some public figures, even called for the repeal of the Immorality Act, which prohibits sexual relations between persons of different races. On 9 August 1977 the Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce suggested the abolition of apartheid in public places. Three months later the Attorney-General of the Transvaal considered instituting legal proceedings in connection with the death, while in detention, of the black nationalist Steve Biko. Some practical steps were actually taken. Passes for blacks were replaced by identity cards issued by the Bantustan authorities (4 November 1977). The ban on the newspaper *The Voice* was lifted on 30 June 1978. Following the amalgamation of the four scout movements (white, African, coloured and Indian) to form a single Scout Movement of South Africa, an African was elected president on 3 July 1977.

These developments, timid though they were, were made possible by

the major successes achieved by the party in power. On 12 May 1977 the then Minister for Foreign Affairs, Pik Botha, was elected in triumph at a by-election. On 2 September of the same year J. B. Vorster, the Prime Minister, announced the dissolution of Parliament and the four provincial councils, and elections were planned for 30 November 1977. In view of the mobilization of international public opinion against the apartheid regime, the government made every effort to obtain a new mandate from the white population. These elections resulted in a sweeping victory for J. B. Vorster and his party. The National Party won 134 seats out of 165, a gain of 19. This overwhelming support left the Prime Minister completely free to implement his racial policy, and also to draw up and bring in the new constitution. The moment he was elected, moreover, he made plain his refusal to grant political rights to the Africans. On the other hand he promised to make 'the necessary changes within the framework of separate development'.

But meanwhile the solidarity of the blacks was equal to that of the whites. At the local elections in Soweto (19 February and 15 April 1978), there was a 95 per cent abstention rate. A few months later, on 28 September 1978, the regime's 'strong man', Pik Botha, was elected by Parliament as Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa.<sup>1</sup> A former Minister of Defence, he made the country the strongest military power without of the equator by dint of a spectacular increase in arms expenditure. The new Prime Minister was one of the architects of the draft constitution. The development of the situation in southern Africa led to a speeding up of the 'process of constitutional segregation'.<sup>2</sup> On 1 August 1977 a constitutional amendment was announced to take effect at the end of 1978. This was the third amendment to the constitution, following the 1909 South Africa Act and the Republic of South Africa Constitution Act of 24 April 1961, and it provided for three of the four communities (whites, coloureds and Indians) each to have a single-chamber parliament responsible for its own affairs. Each group was also to have a government and a Prime Minister. There was, however, no provision for a federal parliament. Questions common to the three communities were to be dealt with by a cabinet committee consisting of the ministers of the three communities. In the event of a disagreement, final decision was to rest with the President of the Republic. The blacks would achieve their 'independence' in the long term and thus lose all legal links with South Africa.

But white power held firm. Thus on 10 November 1976 the Minister of Labour rejected the suggestion put forward by employers' organizations and industry for the repeal of the law reserving skilled jobs for whites. On the following day the Minister for Bantu Administration, Treurnicht, came out against any relaxation of the apartheid policy. There was worse to come. On 16 March 1977 J. S. Otto, the new deputy mayor of Johannesburg,

advocated an intensification of segregation. J. B. Vorster, for his part, announced on 19 April 1977 that the 'separate development' policy would be continued and discrimination between racial communities eliminated. But, he said a few months later, the South African Government was not prepared to accept any compromise. Consequently he rejected 'one man, one vote'. Other political figures went even further. On 2 February 1978, Connie Mulder, the new Minister for Bantu Administration, made it known that the apartheid policy would be implemented to its logical conclusion. Pik Botha stated that only force could bring the whites to accept universal suffrage for the blacks. These stances were not conducive to the reduction of strife, which indeed tended to get worse.

### *The increase in violence*

The apartheid regime was bound to meet with opposition, for opposition exists, even though it is divided. First there is a legal opposition, whose strength was clearly shown in the elections of 30 November 1977. The New Republic Party (NRP) set up on 29 June 1977 is the result of the amalgamation of the United Party and the Democratic Party. Its position on 'racial' matters is equivocal. At the constitutional level it advocates a federal system, but does not oppose the policy of Bantustans. It has ten members of Parliament (11.4 per cent of the votes). The NRP is now no longer the leading opposition party, having been ousted from this position by the Progressive Federal Party (PFP) started in Johannesburg on 6 September 1977. The PFP, which is bolder than the NRP, campaigns for a federal structure and a degree of power-sharing between whites, blacks, coloureds and Indians. On 25 June 1978 this party's Natal provincial congress came out in favour of universal suffrage.

Opposition outside Parliament is certainly more powerful than the legal opposition. Founded in 1912, the African National Congress (ANC) is the oldest liberation movement in Black Africa. The ANC was banned in South Africa after spearheading the protest movements of the 1950s. Doomed to clandestinity, it has been influenced by the ideology of the South African Communist Party. Oliver Tambo, its president, defines the ANC's attitude as follows: 'We are no longer willing to be governed. We want to govern. We are no longer willing for decisions affecting us to be taken by others. We are no longer willing to be slaves.' The ANC's rival, the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania, likewise banned since 8 April 1960, 'rejects the traditional approach which gives first priority to the liberation of the country from racist dictatorship and puts off until later the practical questions of national liberation'. The aim it sets itself is socialist revolution. The ANC and the PAC played active roles in the powerful strikes of 1972-74. Recently, a whole series of organizations banned since 1977—the South

African Students' Organization (SASO), the Black People's Convention (BPC) and the Soweto Student Representative Council (SSRC)—have found common ground in Black Consciousness. Unlike other organizations, Black Consciousness advocates non-violence; it is influenced by the South African churches opposed to the regime; it exalts 'negritude'. Its first manifesto was drawn up in 1971 by SASO, and its thinking afterwards crystallized, especially at congresses of the Black People's Convention (BPC). It rests on the idea that the non-whites are undergoing national oppression. All 'black' South Africans—negroes, coloureds and Indians—are oppressed, unless they contribute to the implementation of the apartheid policy. Conversely, all whites are in the other camp. 'Hence race differentiates friend and foe.'<sup>3</sup>

Following the intensification of repression, certain realignments emerged. On 9 October 1976, fifty African leaders held a secret meeting in Johannesburg to form a political front to defend the interest of blacks in South Africa. On 29 November 1976 a new party came into being, the Black United Front. Two months later seven Members of Parliament themselves managed to found another opposition party, the Independent United Party. On 4 May 1977 the writers of the Azanian people formed an association, while on 23 November of the same year an Action Committee was set up in Soweto claiming kinship with Black Consciousness. But the most important event was undoubtedly the founding on 30 April 1978 of the Azanian African People's Organization (AZAPO), which brought together the anti-apartheid activists of Black Consciousness.

Legal or illegal, inside or outside Parliament, organized or unorganized, the opposition in South Africa has waged many campaigns. The race riots of 16 June 1976 at Soweto, the main black township in the suburbs of Johannesburg, come to mind. This popular uprising cost twenty-three dead and over two hundred injured. The ripples spread outwards to many black townships and to other strata of the population (the satellite towns of Johannesburg and Pretoria, the Bantustans, the coloured community of Cape Town, and Indian students). The urban revolt was carried on by the Soweto Student Representative Council (SSRC) under the leadership of Taietsi Mashini. The riot was followed by strikes. On 4 August 1976 the ANC launched the first national strike, and a second general strike took place on 23 August. Over 500,000 workers from the industrial areas of Johannesburg and Cape Town stayed at home. Buses and trains ran empty. Students and workers mobilized at places of work and in the townships. Further racial clashes took place in Soweto from 23 to 27 August 1976, causing thirty-five deaths. Again on 2 September 1976 and days following several thousand coloureds demonstrated in Cape Town. Violent clashes occurred between demonstrators and the police. On 13 September the African workers of Soweto and Alexandra went on strike; two days later they were joined by the

coloureds of the Cape Town area. A third general strike broke out on 15 and 16 September 1976. One of the pamphlets distributed during the campaign reads:

In the struggle to defend their interests and secure better living conditions, the workers must set up associations of their own in the townships and at their places of work. The situation demands that the oppressed and exploited unite under the slogans 'Power to the workers' and 'Power to the people'.

For the first time since 1961, strikes were staged to achieve a national political aim. On this occasion the London *Times* wrote in September 1976: 'The rebellion, which began merely as a protest against Afrikaans in black schools, is taking on an anti-capitalist direction. For the present, strikes are what the whites fear most.' In October fresh incidents took place in Soweto: some thirty buses were set on fire, there was a bomb attack, blacks and coloureds demonstrated in the city centre of Cape Town, and schools were set on fire.

1977 was also a particularly troubled year. 'Tribal' clashes in Natal, a bomb attack in Soweto, schools set on fire in the African townships of the Cape, demonstrations against rent increases, celebrations to mark the seventeenth anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre and demonstrations by coloureds in Johannesburg occurred in rapid succession during the first six months. The government reacted by securing the sentencing of a sizeable group of demonstrators; but no lull ensued. The students set the movement going again. On 25 July they went on strike in Soweto. Next day they demonstrated in the suburbs of Johannesburg and Pretoria. On 30 July, 1 and 3 August and 7 September violent demonstrations took place in Soweto. It was against this background that the news came on 11 September of the death in prison of Steve Biko, the most prominent Black Consciousness leader. A campaign against the Minister of Justice, Jimmy Kruger, was at once launched in the opposition press; and violence broke out again. Schoolboys set fire to the administration offices of the Ciskei Bantustan. In October they boycotted the examinations in African schools at Soweto. In November and December several bombs went off, some at the Carlton Centre in Johannesburg and some at Benoni. The end of the year was especially stormy. On 12 December 1977 representatives of 350,000 South African trade unionists came out in favour of the granting of trade-union rights to blacks and the abolition of jobs reserved for whites. A week later there were the Port Elizabeth riots. And 1978 also was to have its succession of incidents of all kinds. In February a general strike broke out over wages on an industrial complex in KwaZulu. At the same time, by way of backcloth, an armed struggle was developing that was increasingly difficult to conceal. Acts of sabotage ranging from arson to bomb attacks and clashes between

guerrillas and racist troops were continually taking place. It is true that acts of this kind are frequently thwarted by one of the most efficient police forces in the world, the Bureau of State Security (BOSS) it is largely responsible for intensifying the repression.

*The intensification of repression*

The government took steps to counter the rising tide of strife. Under a law passed in 1974 it has power to ban any group suspected of engaging in subversive activities or of receiving funds from abroad. In 1975 the Christian Institute, whose members are clergymen of all Christian denominations, fell foul of this law. The 1967 Anti-Terrorism Act also occupied an important place in the legal arsenal. Enacted with retrospective effect, this law empowers police officers from the rank of lieutenant-colonel upwards to order the arrest without proof of any citizen suspected of terrorism or thought likely to provide information about the activities of terrorists. It allows unlimited solitary confinement, and provides for sentences from five years' imprisonment to the death penalty. The grip of the law has thus been gradually tightened. From the middle of August to the end of September 1975 the police arrested on average one political dissident every other day. An index of the intensification of repression is to be found in the fact that the Pretoria regime increasingly goes for whites. In this connection the most famous prisoner is no doubt Breyten Breytenbach, the painter and Afrikaans poet, who was arrested in Johannesburg on 19 August 1975. The National Union of South African Students (NUSAS) has also paid a heavy toll.

The year 1976 was even more packed with riots than the previous year. On 16 June the police opened fire in Soweto, killing a child of 13 and triggering off months of rioting and strikes throughout the country. Later, in September 1976, four young coloureds were killed by bullets during incidents with the police in the coloured suburb of Cape Town. Bloody demonstrations took place there in November. The government authorities did not confine themselves to repressing demonstrations of this kind, sometimes violently, but had many people arrested and charged. Thus on 31 August 1976 the chairman of the South African Committee for Human Rights was 'detained' by the police; and on 1 September Joe Thloloe, president of the Union of African Journalists, was also arrested. A few days later a British journalist, David Rabkin, and an assistant lecturer at Cape Town University, Jeremy Cronin, were charged under the Anti-Terrorism Act. Next day it was the turn of a black journalist on the *Rand Daily Mail* to be arrested. On 23 September 400 people suffered the same fate following disorders in the centre of Johannesburg. Two black South African actors were placed under house arrest on 2 October, and a journalist on the *Cape Times* was charged under the Anti-Terrorism Act on 9 October. Arrests became more frequent: on 14

October 1976 near Cape Town, on 19 October at Soweto, and from 1 to 3 December and on 30 December in Natal. These arrests were followed by sentences: on 29 September 1976 Rabkin and Cronin were sentenced to ten years' and seven years' imprisonment respectively for 'terrorist activities'. Indeed, repression was used in all quarters. Thus the first South African film made by blacks, *How Long*, was put under a banning order.

Repression grew still worse in 1977, as witness some newly enacted legislation. On 1 February 1977 a law was passed exempting the state and its officials from all legal proceedings in respect of actions aimed at maintaining law and order. Murders continued in large numbers. In that year alone 117 prisoners, including ten held under the security laws, were murdered. Arrests also became more frequent: 576 Africans in the Cape Town area in January, the national secretary of one of the opposition parties in the Transkei in February, the founder and five leaders of the Black People's Convention in March, three Black Consciousness leaders in July, student leaders in Soweto in August, four black priests in October, and so on. Sentences were of course meted out: five years' imprisonment for thirty-one young blacks who had taken part in the Port Elizabeth riots in 1976, life imprisonment for five members of the African National Congress, house arrest for the Secretary-General of the BPC, the anti-apartheid movement, in July, and so on. Schools were ordered to be closed: in the African townships of Cape Town on 4 February, in Soweto on 6 September and in the Venda Bantustan on 5 October. In the meantime, two publications were banned: *World* and *Week-End World*, the two biggest newspapers written and read by blacks. On the same day, 19 October 1977, eighteen organizations belonging to Black Consciousness or supporting its ideas were outlawed. Despite protests at the time, repressive measures continued in 1978. On 19 January it was announced that the opposition leader in the Transkei, Hector Ncokasi, had 'disappeared'. On 3 April 165 people were arrested in the same Bantustan. On 14 April large-scale police operations took place in Johannesburg following the murder of two white schoolboys. Other police operations were carried out in the Durban area. On 4 May some of the leaders of AZAPO were arrested. A few days later, on 15 June, the black ecumenical weekly *The Voice* was banned. White power thus replied brutally to the political challenge to it.

### **The economic challenge**

The Republic of South Africa is in a different category from other powers. Its racist policies have won it banishment from the community of 'civilized' nations. Thus it has on several occasions had an arms embargo imposed on it, or been subjected to United Nations sanctions. But this does not prevent its



trading with most of the countries of the world, including the socialist countries. Its annual balance of payments has, however, been in deficit for some years: between 1972 and 1974 it increased from 781 million to 1,561 million rands. Even so, the spectacular development has enabled this economic giant to deal with the deficit without undue difficulty.

### *An economic giant*

South African economic growth is largely the result of industrial development begun before 1961 and pursued thanks to cheap electric power abundant, poorly paid black labour, an influx of highly qualified white immigrants, the use of large amounts of capital, and low taxation. However, increases in the price of gold, raw materials and agricultural produce have in recent years brought about a marked rise in the national income. From 1972 to 1974 revenue from gold sales tripled, reaching \$4,000 million. The government levies 850 million rands per year on the profits of the gold mines alone (gold deposits represent 49 per cent of world reserves and 60 per cent of the reserves of the non-socialist world). The Orange Free State alone produces a quarter of the capitalist world's gold. As well as producing some 1,000 tonnes of gold a year, the Republic of South Africa also has diamonds (7.2 million carats), copper, iron, manganese (48 per cent of world reserves), nickel, vanadium (64 per cent of world reserves), uranium (25 per cent of world reserves), chromium and platinum (83 per cent of world reserves) and so on. In all, the Republic of South Africa ranks third for mining production behind the Soviet Union and the United States of America. South Africa leads the world in production of gold and diamonds, comes second for platinum, and is third for the production of antimony, uranium, chromium, manganese and vanadium. The Republic also has large assets in the agricultural sphere. It ranks fifth in the world for the production of maize and wool, seventh for groundnuts, ninth for sunflowers and for sheep rearing, and tenth for sugar-cane and meat.

Though badly off for oil, the Republic of South Africa has hardly suffered at all from the energy crisis. It draws 80 per cent of its energy resources from coal (from the Transvaal and Cape Province), hydro-electric power (from hydro-electric complexes on the Orange River), synthetic petrol (produced at Sasolburg) and nuclear energy. The energy deficit is largely met by imports of Iranian oil. The Republic of South Africa is today far and away the leading industrial country on the African continent. It produces 75 per cent of its coal and 80 per cent of its steel, and its growth rate is one of the highest in the world. Its mining industries employ 700,000 people. Its four main ports, Durban, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and East London, are hives of activity. Harbour complexes at Saldanha Bay and Richard's Bay are designed to free the Transvaal from undue dependence on Mozambique.

The economic growth of the country, however, requires abundant manpower. South African industrialists are increasingly obliged to call upon the black population to do jobs that in theory are forbidden to them. Furthermore, as an important survey by the British economist John Suckling shows, from 1957 to 1972 foreign technology contributed 60 per cent of the technology needed for the economic growth of the country, which is a considerable proportion. Fifty per cent of trade is carried on with the United States, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom. Imports rose by 97 per cent between 1972 and 1975, but subsequently fell. For France South Africa is a prime trading partner in southern Africa. In 1976 Pretoria accounted for about 87 per cent of French exports and 72 per cent of French imports in this part of the world. Nevertheless, France was then only South Africa's fifth largest supplier and seventh largest customer. Its share of the South African market in imports went down from 3.6 per cent in 1962 to 3.5 per cent in 1976. With imports from France worth 2,350 million francs and exports to France worth 1,540 million francs, South Africa is France's twentieth largest supplier and its nineteenth largest customer. As regards investments France occupies a more important place, for taking account of direct investments only, it comes third (after the United Kingdom and the United States). During the last ten years France has made remarkable commercial and financial penetration in sectors such as nuclear energy (in the Framatome contract for the construction of two nuclear power stations at Koelberg, near Cape Town) and major public works schemes in the Bantustans. In current francs its purchases from and sales to South Africa have gone up by 3.5 since 1971. More than three-quarters of French exports to South Africa consist of durables, machinery and vehicles. These statistics, moreover, exclude sales of military equipment such as planes, helicopters, submarines and tanks, or licences to produce this equipment locally, which ran into large amounts at least until the 1976 embargo. According to the sources, the value of these sales may have amounted to 1,250 or 2,000 million francs for the years 1970 to 1975. At that time France was the largest foreign supplier of arms to Africa.<sup>4</sup>

South Africa also maintains quite useful relations with some of its neighbours. Thus a sizeable trade goes on between the Republic of South Africa, Zaire and Rhodesia, mainly overland. Rhodesian railways transport Shaba copper, via Zambia and Rhodesia, to the ports of Durban and East London, and the volume may amount to 22,000 tonnes a month. On the return journey the trains carry various materials, particularly South African coal. South African exports to Zaire in 1976 amounted to 40 million rands, or a tenth of the country's exports to Africa. They have since risen by 10 to 15 per cent per year. In 1977 Pretoria gave Zaire a new 20-million-rand credit to cover imports from South Africa. The Republic of South Africa thus

constitutes an absolute economic empire; but nowadays this empire is in jeopardy.

### *Cracks in the structure*

Economic necessity to some extent explains the adoption of a timid policy of détente. Segregationist laws are frequently contravened by employers, despite the hostility of the white unions. Under the Job Reservations Act all skilled jobs are reserved for whites. Nevertheless, since January 1975 black nurses have worked in private clinics in Durban reserved for whites. Since that date some steps have been taken in Johannesburg to end the 'untimely humiliation' daily visited on the blacks. Harry Oppenheimer is campaigning for desegregation at work. In the building trade; transport, steelworks and the mines apartheid is sometimes frustrated. Wage differentials based on colour are tending to narrow. Thus on 1 May 1975 the wages of 150,000 black workers in the sugar industry were increased by 50 per cent. On the same date 'urbanized blacks' were granted the right to build their houses in white areas. Obviously these are in the main limited steps. But the economic situation is also causing concern, mainly because of the fall in the gold price on the world market, which has upset the balance of payments. This fall, together with the increase in the market price of oil and its derivatives and the growth of defence expenditure, led to some pessimistic forecasts. The nationalist daily *Beeld* and the Economic Research Bureau forecast a growth rate of the order of only 3 per cent for 1976. In view of inflation (17.8 per cent in 1973, 11.9 per cent in 1974 and 11.7 per cent in 1975), the rand was devalued by 17.9 per cent against the American dollar in September 1975. This step had profound repercussions: an increase in the price of imported produce, a crisis in the motor industry and the laying off of several thousand workers. To deal with this situation the government and representatives of the private sector signed an agreement in Pretoria on 7 October 1975 under which private firms would limit their profits to 15 per cent, not pass on more than 70 per cent of cost increases in their prices, and restrict wage increases to 70 per cent of the cost-of-living index.

### **The diplomatic challenge**

By and large, international opinion is obviously hostile to the apartheid policy adopted by the Republic of South Africa. At the most some countries have sought to foster a diplomatic dialogue, but that too has partly failed.

#### *The failure of the diplomatic dialogue*

Following suggestions by the Ivory Coast in November 1970 and then in

April 1971 for engaging in dialogue with South Africa, several governments supported President Houphouët-Boigny's initiative: Malawi, Madagascar, Ghana, the Central African Republic and Uganda. J. B. Vorster subsequently had an unpublicized meeting in 1974 with the presidents of the Ivory Coast and Senegal. In February 1975, the South African Prime Minister brought off another 'coup' by having a talk with William Tolbert, President of Liberia. In the previous October Vorster had been to Rhodesia and Malawi. Other high-ranking figures also went on trips. From February 1974 to April 1975 the secretary to the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs made twenty-three journeys to African countries. A Zairian minister went to Cape Town in April 1975. On 25 August of the same year the President of Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda, spent several hours with Vorster at Victoria Falls on the occasion of the Rhodesian conference. In September 1975 the Minister for Information of the Ivory Coast, Laurent Dona Fologo, made a ten-day official visit to South Africa. This was the first time that a Minister for Information of a Black African country had gone to South Africa. In Johannesburg he condemned apartheid in the following terms: 'There is at least one poison on this African soil of ours, and that is South African racism.' But he at once added: 'Disagreeing does not mean being opposed to dialogue . . . We know that the road will be a long one. The path of peace is more difficult than the path of violence.' The Ivory Coast minister's journey aroused great controversy. Some countries, such as Guinea, bitterly attacked this new attitude. According to a communiqué published by the African National Congress in Algiers on 12 September 1975, the visit was part of 'a great conspiracy to isolate the liberation struggle in South Africa and undermine the Organization for African Unity'. SASO accused the Ivory Coast Minister for Information of 'flirting with people who are interested neither in peace nor in dialogue'. The OAU thenceforward condemned all direct dialogue with Pretoria. Indeed, organizations often reacted more harshly than governments.

#### *The reaction of the organizations*

The OAU has many times devoted attention to the problems of southern Africa. Its Council of Ministers, meeting in the capital the United Republic of Tanzania from 7 to 11 April 1975, sought means of eradicating colonialism and racism in the south of the continent. In the Dar es Salam declaration on southern Africa the OUA re-examined its strategy for achieving the liberation of Rhodesia and Namibia and the abolition of apartheid in South Africa. It noted the failure of the peaceful approach advocated by the Lusaka manifesto, and stressed that the Mogadishu Declaration had called for an intensification of the armed struggle, especially in the Portuguese colonies. At Dar es Salaam the OAU suggested 'taking advantage of the freedom-

fighters' victory in Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe to shift the liberation process southwards, with special emphasis on the liberation of Zimbabwe and Namibia.' To this end the unity and solidarity of Africa must be preserved and strengthened. Having stated the grounds for the struggle, the Dar es Salaam Declaration admits that 'the strategies and tactics for achieving this goal could vary according to the situation and the time'. Eschewing dogma, the signatories to the Declaration did not choose between the path of peace and the armed struggle. Both can be used, together or separately, according to circumstances. Hence 'the problem of the liberation of southern Africa must be seen in the context of an overall strategy for the total liberation of the area, whilst at the same time recognizing that the factors peculiar to the three territories concerned—Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa—mean that the liberation movements can adopt different tactics'. The OAU fights the South African Government 'not because it is white, but because it rejects and opposes the principles of human equality and self-determination'. Contrary to the promises Vorster made in 1974, the situation has deteriorated further. The OAU therefore takes as its aim the total isolation of the regime, in particular by enforcing and strengthening the economic, political and cultural boycott of South Africa and supporting the national liberation movement 'in all its forms'. On the question of 'dialogue' with Pretoria, the OAU later moved towards an attitude of rejection. In 1978 it asked that 'stringent sanctions', including a compulsory embargo on the supply of oil, be imposed on South Africa by the United Nations Security Council. In a declaration published at the Organization's headquarters in Addis Ababa the OAU also stated that in announcing the holding of elections in Namibia in November 1978 Vorster had 'directly challenged the authors of the Western plan' for the independence of Namibia.

It will thus be seen that the OAU is involved in events in South Africa. The Security Council dealt with this matter for the first time on 1 April 1960. It requested the South African Government to give up the policy of apartheid and put an end to racial discrimination. In December of the same year, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This document solemnly proclaims the need quickly and finally to make an end of colonialism in all its forms. On 6 November 1962 the General Assembly went a step further and adopted a new resolution calling upon Member States to break off diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa and stop supplying it with arms or ammunition. A year later the Security Council recommended an embargo on arms supplies. Over the years, the United Nations has adopted an unequivocal attitude towards South Africa. By Resolution 366 of 17 December 1974 the Security Council condemned yet

again South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the adoption in the territory 'of repressive laws and practices' tainted with racial discrimination. After repeating various demands, the Security Council decided to keep the question before it. On 6 June 1975, however, a draft resolution of the Council to the effect that 'the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security' was rejected as a result of votes against by three permanent members, the United States of America, France and the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, the United Nations continued its efforts. Thus on 9 November 1976 the General Assembly adopted ten resolutions on South Africa's policy of apartheid. In particular it called on the Security Council to institute a compulsory embargo on arms for Pretoria, and condemned Israel's collaboration with South Africa. It declared that the racist regime in South Africa was illegal and had no right to represent the South African people. It authorized the Special Committee against Apartheid to organize a world conference for action against apartheid. At the same session the General Assembly voted by 110 to 8, with 20 abstentions, for a compulsory embargo on all supplies of arms to South Africa. A few days later, on 30 November, the General Assembly condemned the collaboration of all states (and hence of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States, Israel and Japan) with the Republic of South Africa. It also condemned the policy of Bantustans. The World Conference for Action against Apartheid took place in Lagos, Nigeria, from 22 to 26 August 1977, and condemned the practice in the following terms: 'Apartheid, the policy of institutionalized racist domination and exploitation, imposed by a minority regime in South Africa, is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights'. The conference considered that Apartheid 'is a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind'. Subsequently, on 4 November 1977, the Security Council was to take a major decision: it unanimously adopted a resolution imposing on all members of the United Nations an embargo on the supply of 'arms and related *matériel*' to South Africa. On 9 December 1977 the Security Council set up a committee to supervise the enforcement of the embargo on arms supplies to the Republic of South Africa. Again in 1977 and 1978 the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolutions about South Africa. Where human rights are concerned South Africa has often been in the dock at the United Nations. Thus on 31 August 1976 the Sub-Commission for Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities expressed concern at violations of human rights in southern Africa. In Geneva on 2 March 1977 the Human Rights Commission unanimously condemned the 'repressive policies of the governments of South Africa and Rhodesia'. In connection with these problems Unesco held a conference on race and racial prejudice from 13 to

20 March 1978. In an effort to make its actions square with its positions of principle, the United Nations had long before set up a Special Committee against Apartheid which had met many times since 1968; it included representatives of the liberation movements, the OAU, the anti-apartheid movements, the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations and so on. The first special session of this body was held in Stockholm, London and Geneva in June 1968, on the occasion of International Human Rights Year. Special meetings took place at the United Nations headquarters in New York in 1969, 1971, 1972 and 1973. In 1975 the committee met in Paris, at Unesco headquarters, to consider the situation in South Africa and ways of promoting a sustained campaign against apartheid. In a report adopted in September 1976 it examined the problem posed by co-operation between Israel and South Africa. The same body also called upon states not to recognize the fictitious independence of the Transkei. Lastly, South Africa left Unesco in 1955 because of interference by Member States 'in South African racial problems'. Furthermore several international organizations have expelled South Africa or compelled it to withdraw from their executive bodies. Thus South Africa was expelled from the International Union of Official Travel Organizations on 9 October 1973, from the Universal Postal Union on 27 May 1974 and from the International Hydrological Conference in September 1974. On 17 June 1977 it was also expelled from the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna.

European organizations are also not indifferent to the problems arising in South Africa. On 12 July 1977 the European Economic Community (EEC) threatened South Africa with economic sanctions if the policy of apartheid was not brought to an end. On 18 August the nine countries of the Common Market announced that they were going to use their 'economic power' to bring pressure to bear on South Africa. In the following month in Brussels the foreign ministers of the Nine adopted a 'code of conduct' for firms with subsidiaries or branches in South Africa. Other steps were subsequently taken. On 26 October 1977 a joint approach was made by the Nine to the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs about the steps taken against anti-apartheid movements. Other organizations again are closely following developments in South Africa. The problem was examined at the Summit Conference of Non-aligned Countries during the summer of 1976. The First Afro-Arab Summit Conference, held in Cairo from 3 to 9 March 1977, noted the wholehearted support of African and Arab countries for the struggle of the peoples of Palestine, Zimbabwe and South Africa. At the international Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia organized by the United Nations at Maputo from 16 to 21 May 1977, the participants were divided about the strategy to be adopted by the liberation movements of southern Africa and about the role that African states should play in the

OAU. As will be seen, organizations have often reacted sharply. For a long time now the same has not been true of individual countries.

### *The power game*

On 10 May 1977 the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs said that 'relations between South Africa and the West have become very delicate'. The same is now true also of the United States. During the cold war in the early 1950s the Americans needed to stockpile South African uranium in order to build up their nuclear arsenal. As a result South Africa became one of the first beneficiaries of the Atoms for Peace co-operation. The Republic of South Africa was thus able to acquire its first research reactor, Safari I, which came into operation in 1965. A second reactor, Safari II, was delivered three years later. The United States also supplied 120 kilograms of highly enriched uranium, and the Oak Ridge research centre was thrown open to South African scientists. Gradually, however, the United States began to be worried about the development of the situation in southern Africa. In a letter dated 10 April 1969, Henry Kissinger asked a team consisting mainly of members of the CIA to write a special report on this part of the world. The report was to cover in particular 'the complete range of strategies and political options open to the United States'. The document produced by the team on 15 August 1969, National Security Memorandum 39 (NSSM 39), is known as the Kissinger Report<sup>5</sup> and has inspired recent United States policy towards southern Africa. The United States began playing for time. Thus on 4 September 1976 talks began in Zurich between Kissinger and Vorster aimed at finding a peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa; and these talks were later resumed in Pretoria. A few months afterwards, in January 1977, American diplomacy hit the headlines again. The United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, said that the South African Government was illegal, thus compelling the White House to issue a denial. A little later the United States took a fresh initiative. On 3 May 1977 President Carter sent Vice-President Walter Mondale on a mission to Vorster in order to speed up the development of southern Africa. New talks took place to this end. From 18 to 20 May 1977 Vorster and Mondale met in Vienna, and found that there was still deep disagreement between them about the future development of the apartheid regime. Faced with the intransigence of the South African leaders, Mondale stated that the United States 'would not intervene in the last resort to save South Africa from the consequences of its racial policy'. Another warning shot followed on 1 July: Cyrus Vance, the Secretary of State, informed the South African leaders that South Africa's relations with the United States were bound to deteriorate if rapid progress were not made in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa. A new series of talks took place in



Pretoria in August 1977 between Owen and Young and several South African leaders, until on 21 October 1977 the United States recalled their ambassador in Pretoria for 'consultations' by way of a protest against the intensification of repression.<sup>6</sup> A few days later, Washington went a step further by deciding, on 26 October 1977, to back a resolution of the United Nations Security Council decreeing a complete embargo on arms for South Africa. At about the same time the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP) came out in favour of a complete withdrawal of American interests in South Africa.

France for its part has established many ties with Pretoria. During the 1960s and 1970s it even became, as a South African Minister put it, 'the RSA's best friend'. By dint of massive sales of ultramodern weapons and technology, the French Government has enabled South Africa to set up an industrial military complex. The first delivery of French arms goes back to 1961, when South Africa purchased AML-60 and AML-90 armoured vehicles and also machine-guns. The Republic of South Africa offered its raw materials (gold and uranium) in exchange for the French military equipment. France has also been a valuable ally in the diplomatic sphere. Its representative used his veto at the United Nations to protect South Africa against sanctions and even against a threat of expulsion in 1974. In 1976 a delegation of parliamentarians belonging to the presidential majority represented France at the celebration of the pseudo-independence of the Transkei. Hence it is not surprising that co-operation between the two countries should have grown. On 29 May 1976 a consortium of French companies sponsored by Electricité de France signed a contract with the South African ESCOM (Energy Supply Company) for the building of two nuclear power stations in South Africa. The OAU thereupon accused France of giving South Africa crucial help in developing a nuclear deterrent. Some months later, and for the first time ever, a French Minister for Foreign Affairs stayed in southern Africa from 14 to 19 August 1977, a few months after his British and American counterparts. On that occasion France subscribed to the main lines of the Western powers' new policy, namely to support the independence of Zimbabwe and Namibia under majority rule and to try to get South Africa to move towards a democratic multiracial regime. As the situation in South Africa has deteriorated, France has taken an increasingly hard line. The French Government, for instance, has never recognized the independence either of Transkei or of Bophuthatswana. Moreover it condemns the racial system with increasing severity. Thus on 20 September 1977 France subscribed to the 'code of conduct' that firms from European Economic Community countries operating in South Africa will have to follow. It also on voted 4 November 1977 for the Security Council resolution instituting a complete embargo on arms sales to South Africa. On

8 November France even announced that in accordance with the 4 November resolution it would not deliver the four ships under construction that had been ordered by South Africa. Admittedly there is no official relationship between France and the underground opposition in South Africa, but a French diplomat did attend Steve Biko's funeral.

Other countries maintain special relationships with the Republic of South Africa. One example is the Federal Republic of Germany, which seems to have co-operated with Pretoria in the nuclear field. Another is Israel. Since 1970, moreover, it is observable that a Pretoria-Paris-Teheran-Tel Aviv axis has grown up in the nuclear field. France and Israel supply the technology, Iran the oil and South Africa the uranium. In recent years relations between Israel and South Africa have grown even closer, as the following facts bear witness. On 8 September 1976 a South African trade mission went to Tel Aviv, and on 13 May 1977 the South African Government announced that two major scientific agreements had been concluded with Israel. A few months later Pik Botha, the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs, went to Israel, and in February 1978 it was the turn of the South African Minister of Finance to visit Israel.

It may even happen that representatives of Western countries come together to adopt a common approach to the problems posed by South Africa. Thus on 7 April 1977 a joint *démarche* was made to Vorster by the ambassadors of France, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany on the subject of Namibia. As a result negotiations about the future of Namibia were started in Pretoria on 22 September 1977 between these parties. On 30 September 1977 South Africa accepted an offer by the five above-mentioned countries to take part in continuing negotiations about a constitutional settlement of the Namibian problem in New York, starting on 17 January 1978. These negotiations were to continue for a long time: in particular, Botha and the representatives of the Five were to meet in Cape Town on 17 May 1978 to discuss once more the possibility of a negotiated settlement in Namibia.

Let us now turn to relationships between the Republic of South Africa and the rest of Africa. It is commonplace that since the independence of the Portuguese colonies, South Africa is no longer so well protected. It is no longer insulated by Mozambique and Angola as in the past. 'The only thing that concerns us,' Vorster said on this topic, 'is that these two countries should not be used as springboards against us. Moreover, they have assured us to this effect, and if they maintain this attitude all will be well.' In fact Pretoria's intervention in Mozambique's affairs during the transitional period was noticeable. 'Co-operation' between the two countries has continued. As for Angola, the Republic of South Africa on 25 January 1976 withdrew the troops it had committed deep inside the country. They have since been used

only for the protection of the Namibian border. As regards Namibia and Zimbabwe, many talks have taken place attended by the top South African leaders, and have been preceded or followed by a variety of political stands. Thus on 2 May 1977 Vorster reaffirmed that South Africa would exert no economic or military pressure on Rhodesia. On 12 August of the same year the South African leaders announced that they would make no more concessions as regards Namibia and that they would remain opposed to any pressure on Rhodesia. On 24 September 1977 Botha rejected as 'totally unacceptable' the Western plan for the South African forces in Namibia to be placed under United Nations control. Lastly, on 30 January 1978 Vorster came out in favour of an internal settlement in Rhodesia. At the same time he rejected direct negotiations with SWAPO about Namibia. On the following 2 May the Republic of South Africa asked the Member States of the United Nations to secure Namibia's peaceful accession to independence in accordance with the terms of the settlement plan put forward by the five Western powers. This plan, which the United Nations Secretary-General presented on 29 August 1978, summarizes the conclusions of the mission undertaken by Martti Ahtissari, Kurt Waldheim's representative in Namibia. It outlined the various stages to be observed in order to create favourable conditions for the holding of genuinely free and democratic elections leading to the setting up of a constituent assembly, which would in turn settle the date of independence. It provides for the presence of United Nations forces and for a seven-month transitional period before the elections. At least two gaps are apparent in this plan: nothing is said about Walvis Bay<sup>7</sup> and the nature of the relationship between Judge Steyn, Administrator-General of South Africa, and the United Nations is left vague. In the end the South African authorities declared themselves opposed to this plan, thus replying with a counter-challenge to the challenge the international community had faced them with.

In November 1974 the Prime Minister of South Africa remarked to members of Parliament: 'South Africa is at the parting of the ways, and must now choose between peace and the escalation of the conflict.' He added: 'Give South Africa six to twelve months and you will be surprised at what she has achieved!' Nothing much came of this promise. The diplomatic offensive launched by Vorster had only limited success. The 'dialogue' changed course abruptly. The regime became more repressive. Black Africa is too divided and too weak to contemplate a general confrontation. Nevertheless, South Africa is preparing for some such eventuality, in particular by building up its military arsenal to a considerable degree. This situation is also inevitably having financial repercussions. The defence budget for 1977 was 1,800 million rands.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, in April 1977 military service for whites was

extended to two years. On the day after this decision was taken it was announced that a new air base was to be set up in south-west Transvaal, near Mozambique. As to the South African nuclear deterrent, it was responsible for the taking of various stands. On 22 February 1977 an official communiqué denied rumours that South Africa might become a nuclear power. A few months later Botha described as false Soviet statements that Pretoria was developing nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, the Minister of Finance stated on 30 August 1977 that South Africa was entitled to use its nuclear potential as it wished. And while the event was in the making, on 11 November 1977 the government brought back into force the 1970 law authorizing the requisition of the private sector for purposes of national defence.

Thus violence is everywhere, and everybody is preparing for an explosion. The younger generation of black writers are also confronted with this phenomenon, and their work bears witness to it. This is true of Ezekeil Mphahlele, author of the novel *At the Bottom of Second Avenue*. It is true also of Dennis Brutus, author of *Sirens, Knuckles, Boots, Letters to Martha* and *A Simple Lust*. The actor and playwright Cosmo Pieterse, for his part, sets out to make known South African poets in exile, including Bessie Head, who has been living in Botswana since 1964. Thus from now on there are writers on the spot to hymn the long march of a people who, having long suffered in silence, have decided to take up arms against the most formidable of their foes.

## Notes

---

1. On 29 September 1978 J. B. Vorster (in power since 1966) was elected President of the Republic by a special session of Parliament held in Cape Town.
2. D. Breillat, 'Vers des changements institutionnels après les élections du 30 novembre 1977 en Afrique du Sud', *Pouvoirs*, No. 5, 1978, p. 167.
3. R. Lefort, 'La Conscience noire, de la non-violence à l'interdiction', *Le Monde diplomatique*, November 1977.
4. For further details see: E. Jouve, *Relations internationales du Tiers Monde*, Paris, Éditions Berger-Levrault, 1976.
5. The gist of this document was published in B. Cohen and B. Schissel, *Afrique australe, de Kissinger à Carter*, Paris, Éditions de l'Harmattan, 1977.
6. The ambassador returned to his post on 6 November 1977.
7. A decree of 1 September 1977 repealed the 1922 Act placing the Walvis Bay enclave under the administration of South West Africa and attached the enclave to the Cape Province of South Africa.
8. In 1977/78 the defence budget rose by 21.3 per cent.

## Bibliography

---

### BOOKS

- ADLER, T. (ed.). *Perspectives on South Africa*. Johannesburg, University of Witwatersrand, African Studies Institute, 1977.
- BERNETEL, P. *Les enfants de Soweto*. Paris, Stock, 1977.
- BRAUN, M. *Das Schwarze Johannesburg: Afrikaner in Getto*. Frankfurt-am-Main, Verlag Otto Lembeck, 1973.
- BREYTENBACH, B. *Feu froid*. Paris, Christian Bourgeois, 1976.
- CADOUX, C. *L'Afrique du Sud*. Paris, Librairie Générale de Droit et de Jurisprudence, 1966.
- CERVENKA, Z.; ROGERS, B. *The Nuclear Axis*. London, Julian Freedman Books, 1978.
- COHEN, B.; SCHISSEL, H. *Afrique australe de Kissinger à Carter*. Paris, Éditions de l'Harmattan, 1977.
- CORNEVIN, M. *L'Afrique du Sud en sursis*. Paris, Hachette, 1977.
- DAVENPORT, T. R. H. *South Africa*. London, Macmillan, 1977.
- DAVIDSON, B.; WILKINSON, A. *Southern Africa: The New Politics of Revolution*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1976.
- DENOON, D. *Southern Africa Since 1800*. London, Longman, 1972.
- FIRST, R.; STEELE, J.; GURNEY, C. *The Southern African Connection: Western Investment in Apartheid*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1973.
- JOHNSTONE, F. A. *Class, Race and Gold: A Study of Class Relations and Racial Discrimination in South Africa*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- KESTERGAT, J. *25 millions de Sud-Africains, malades de l'apartheid*. Paris/Brussels, Elsevier, 1977.
- LACHARTE, B. *Luttes ouvrières et libération en Afrique du Sud*. Paris, Syros, 1977.
- LEFORT, R. *L'Afrique du Sud: histoire d'une crise*. Paris, F. Maspero, 1977.
- LEMON, A. *Apartheid: A Geography of Separation*. Westmead, Saxon House, 1976.
- LESOURD, J. A. *La République d'Afrique du Sud*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.
- LEVER, H. *The South African Voter*. Cape Town, Juta & Co., 1972.
- LIMP, W. *Anatomie de l'apartheid*. Paris, Casterman, 1972.
- NOLUTSHUNGU, S. C. *South Africa in Africa*. Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1975.
- SAUNDERS, C.; DERRICOURT, R. (eds.). *Beyond the Cape Frontier: Studies in the History of the Transkei and Ciskei*. London, Longman, 1974.
- STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE. *Southern Africa: the Escalation of a Conflict. A Politico-Military Study*. New York, Praeger, 1976.
- THION, S. *Le pouvoir pâle*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1969.
- VAILLANT, F. *Poètes noirs de l'Afrique du Sud*. Paris, Éditions Présence Africaine, 1975.
- WERE, G. S. *A History of South Africa*. London, Evans Brothers, 1974.
- ZIEGLER, J. *Main basse sur l'Afrique*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1978.

### ARTICLES

- Afrique du Sud: les équivoques de la détente. *Civilizations* (Brussels), Vol. XXVII, 1977, p. 3.
- Anzania News*. Official organ of the Pan-Africanist Congress of Anzania. P.O. Box 2412, Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania.
- Apartheid, Afrique du Sud. *Nigéria demain*, August 1977 (special number).
- BERBIER, M. L'ONU et le Tiers-Monde. *Annuaire du Tiers-Monde—1977*, p. 370. Paris, Éditions Berger-Levrault, 1978.
- BOURDET, C. Où serait aujourd'hui l'Afrique du Sud sans la France? *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), April 1976.

- BREILLAT, D. Vers des changements institutionnels après les élections du 30 novembre 1977 en Afrique du Sud. *Pouvoirs*, 1978, No. 5, p. 167.
- CADOUX, C. Apartheid. *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, Vol. 2, p. 134, Paris, Éditions de l'Encyclopaedia Universalis, 1968.
- DECRAENE, P. La république sud-africaine au point de non-retour. *Le Monde* (Paris), 13-18 August 1975.
- . Un réquisitoire contre l'apartheid. *Le Monde* (Paris), 19-20 October 1975.
- GLÉLÉ, M. La Déclaration d'Alger et l'Afrique. In: A. Cassese and E. Jouve (eds.), *Pour un droit des peuples*, p. 203. Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1978.
- HUTMAN, T.; KRAMER, R. Le poids des investissements américains en Afrique du Sud. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), June 1978.
- JOUVE, E. Afrique du Sud: une ouverture calculée. *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, p. 133. Paris, Édition de l'Encyclopaedia Universalis, 1976.
- . L'émergence d'un droit des peuples dans les relations internationales. In: Cassese and Jouve, op. cit., p. 105.
- . L'OUA et la libération de l'Afrique. *Annuaire du Tiers-Monde*. Paris, Éditions Berger-Levrault, 1976.
- LEFORT, R. La conscience noire de la non-violence à l'interdiction. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), November 1977.
- LORY, G. M. La mosaïque des groupes dans le régime de l'apartheid. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), April 1978.
- MARTIN, D. Les moyens du changement en Afrique australe. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), July 1977.
- MATTELEART, A.; MATTELEART, M. Les colons de l'apartheid. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), September 1977.
- MEILLASSOUX, C. La crise du pouvoir en Afrique du Sud. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), September 1977.
- République d'Afrique du Sud (statistiques). *Universalis*. Paris, Éditions de l'Encyclopaedia Universalis, 1977.
- SCHISSEL, H. Comment l'Afrique du Sud a pu mettre au point 'sa' bombe nucléaire. *Le Monde diplomatique* (Paris), September 1978.
- Southern Africa at Grips with Racism. *The Unesco Courier*, November 1977 (special number.)
- VORSTER, J. Interview exclusive. *Le Figaro* (Paris), 26 March 1975.
- WAKSAM SHINCA, D. Pretoria y sus aliados. *Cuadernos del Tercer Mundo* (Mexico City), No. 12, May 1977.

# **Zimbabwe: the Internal Settlement in historical perspective**

David Chanaiwa

This study provides historical perspectives on the current Internal Settlement agreed upon on 3 March 1978 by Ndabaningi Sithole, founding president of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU); Bishop Abel Muzorewa, founding president of the United African National Council (UANC); Senior Chief Jeremiah Chirau, president of the Zimbabwe African Peoples' Organization (ZAPO); and Ian Douglas Smith, the Prime Minister.<sup>1</sup> It is important for scholars, as well as layman supporters, protagonists and observers, to understand the historical antecedents, because in reality the Internal Settlement is essentially the climax (or anticlimax) of a prolonged, faction-stricken, nationalist struggle against settler colonialism in the British colony of Southern Rhodesia. The settlement should be analysed primarily in relation to the politico-military climate of the settler colonial society from which it evolved. When we put it in its cultural-historical context and in juxtaposition to the settler interests and institutions that it is attempting to replace, then we perhaps can understand why the African nationalists behaved the way they did.

We shall attempt therefore to probe beyond the optimistic claims and promises currently being made in Salisbury by the signatories, as well as the anti-settlement rhetoric of the out-manoeuvred Patriotic Front exiles, to discover the truth about the Internal Settlement. In particular, we shall investigate the historical roles of ideology, factionalism, personality clashes and military action in the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe. The author is aware that in a discussion of contemporary and especially emotive, controversial issues like the Internal Settlement, there is a risk of being misconstrued and, thus of stepping on somebody's toes. Nevertheless, it is hope that this account will be of some use to the various parties and points of view deeply involved in the controversy.

## **The Internal Settlement in detail**

After three months of negotiations, Sithole, Muzorewa, Chirau and Smith finally agreed upon: (a) African majority rule based on universal adult

suffrage; (b) an African Independence Day on 31 December 1978; (c) removal of racist legislation and practices; (d) a Bill of Rights; (e) a 100 member Parliament of which 72 would be Africans, 28 whites; (f) a Transitional Government, consisting of an Executive Council and a Ministerial Council, under which Africans and Europeans would share power equally.<sup>2</sup>

The agreement stipulates: 'There will be a common voters' roll, with all citizens of 18 years and over being eligible for registration as voters, subject to certain recognized disqualifications'.<sup>3</sup> It further stipulates :

There will be a justiciable Declaration of Rights which will protect the rights and freedoms of individuals and, *inter alia*, will provide for protection from deprivation of property unless adequate compensation is paid promptly, and for protection of pension rights of persons who are members of pension funds.<sup>4</sup>

Section E of the agreement states that Independence Day shall be 31 December 1978. These stipulations, together with the stated duties of the power-sharing Transitional Government, generally were perceived by the signatories as major European concessions to the African nationalists. For instance, adult suffrage was lowered from 21 to 18 years in order to accommodate the youths 'who have been doing the fighting'.

The signatories agreed that the Transitional Government would be responsible for the release of political detainees, for the review of sentences of political prisoners, the removal of racial discrimination, for working out a cease-fire, and for rehabilitating victims of the war. It would also be responsible for drafting the Zimbabwean Constitution in accordance with the agreement, for organizing voter registration with a view to holding 'free and democratic' elections at the earliest possible date, and for providing a climate conducive to political campaigning and fair elections.<sup>5</sup>

They agreed that the Transitional Government would be comprised of an Executive Council and a Ministerial Council. The Executive Council consists of Sithole, Muzorewa, Chirau and Smith, who take turns in chairing the meetings 'in such sequence and for such period as that Council may determine'. As stated, 'The Executive Council will be responsible for ensuring that the functions given to, and the duties imposed on, the Transitional Government. . . are dealt with as expeditiously as possible.'<sup>6</sup> The Council is the policy- and decision-making body of the Transitional Government, and it reaches its decisions by consensus. It may refer matters to and review decisions and recommendations by the Ministerial Council.

The Ministerial Council consists of an African and a European minister for each portfolio. The European partners are appointed in equal shares by Sithole, Muzorewa and Chirau. The chairmanship alternates between an African and a European minister according to the sequence and duration



determined by the Ministerial Council. The black/white ministerial partners for each portfolio, or group of portfolios, share responsibility and operate according to the cabinet system. They jointly initiate legislation, supervise the preparation of legislation recommended by the Executive Council and implement Executive Council decisions applicable to their departments. The whole Ministerial Council also makes recommendations to the Executive Council 'on any other matter it thinks fit', and it reaches its decisions by a simple majority, subject to review by the Executive Council.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, the present Rhodesian Parliament will remain intact during the life of the Transitional Government, but can convene only at the request of the Executive Council, to pass laws deemed necessary for facilitating the transition. That Parliament will be responsible for enacting legislation for the registration of voters, for the removal of racial discrimination, approval of the 1978/79 budget and the new Constitution and nomination of the sixteen candidates for eight of the twenty-eight seats reserved for Europeans.

The most controversial aspects of the Internal Settlement are those dealing with the Legislative Assembly, the Judiciary and Civil Service, as well as the 'protection from deprivation of property unless adequate compensation is paid promptly' clause of the Bill of Rights. The signatories agreed upon a 100-member Legislative Assembly, 72 of whom will be Africans elected by all eligible African, white, coloured and Asian voters enrolled on the common roll, and 28 will be Europeans representing whites, coloureds and Asians.<sup>8</sup> Twenty of the twenty-eight Europeans will be elected on a preferential voting system by European voters enrolled on the common roll. The remaining eight will be elected by all eligible African, white, coloured, and Asian voters from sixteen candidates nominated by the current Rhodesian Parliament for the forthcoming election (1978), and by the twenty-eight Europeans' MPs for the second general election (1983).

These reserved European seats shall be entrenched for 'a period of at least ten years or two Parliaments, whichever is the longer'. At that time, the African government in power shall appoint a Commission, to be chaired by a judge of the High Court, which will review the situation. By then, amendment to the Constitution will require a simple majority of the legislative Assembly. Prior to ten years, the twenty-eight seats can be abolished by a constitutional amendment 'receiving the affirmative votes of not less than seventy-eight members' of Parliament. The agreement further stipulates that the twenty-eight members 'will be prohibited from forming a coalition with any single (African) minority party for the purpose of forming a Government'.<sup>9</sup>

This issue of white parliamentary representation was indeed the most difficult and controversial item throughout the negotiations.<sup>10</sup> The signa-

tories were quite conscious of the contradiction between the principles of majority rule, universal adult suffrage and non-racialism and entrenched white representation. Both the Sithole and Muzorewa delegations strongly objected to racial representation because it 'smacks of racial discrimination in an independent African state based on one man one vote' and because it maintains 'an independent European community in an independent African state'.<sup>11</sup> At first they were hoping to accommodate the Smith delegation by means of the safeguards pertaining to the Bill of Rights, the Judiciary and Civil Service. However, it soon became apparent that they had to reconcile their commitment to non-racialism, universal suffrage and African majority rule with an equal European commitment to special representation and protection under majority rule.

The Smith delegation was very adamant about white representation as a 'confidence builder'. They pointed out that whites were very apprehensive about majority rule and adult suffrage, both of which 'are quite revolutionary concepts to the white man'. Since they had endorsed 'the revolution of majority black rule', they needed safeguards to retain 'white confidence'. 'We [whites] concede majority rule by adult suffrage in return for one-third white representation in Parliament,' they insisted. They talked of 'fears of whites of the unknown black rule' and of 'a great unknown' future. Smith claimed that the majority of the whites wanted a 50/50 representation, and that he had persuaded them to settle for a one-third blocking mechanism, which was the barest minimum he could accept. He and Chief Chirau, who apparently harbours deep fears of African majority rule and, especially, of the freedom fighters, wanted thirty-three reserved seats to be elected only by the Europeans.

As a compromise, Sithole proposed twenty seats to be elected by Europeans only for the first parliament, or five years. He also proposed that removal of the twenty seats before five years would require an amendment by 84 of the 100 MPs. Muzorewa proposed thirty-three seats to be elected by all eligible African and European voters, and a two-thirds majority to amend the Constitution. He strongly objected to an all-European election because of his commitment to the 'fundamental principle of a non-racial system'. In the end, the signatories agreed to what one delegate appropriately called the 'Whitestan policy' of the twenty-eight reserved seats.

The signatories further agreed on what they referred to as basic national safeguards: namely, the bill of rights, and independence and security of tenure for the judiciary, the public (civil) service board, the civil service, police force, defence forces, and prison service. They stipulated that 'pensions which are payable from the Consolidated Revenue Fund (Retirement Fund) will be guaranteed and charged on the Consolidated Revenue Fund and will be remittable outside the country'.<sup>12</sup> They also

agreed that 'citizens who at present are entitled to dual citizenship will not be deprived of their present entitlement'.<sup>13</sup> These safeguards and the twenty-eight seats were to be entrenched provisions for the first ten years of majority rule, to be amended only by a bill that receives a 78 majority of the 100-member Parliament.

## **Reaction to the Internal Settlement**

The opponents of the Internal Settlement generally share a common psychological consensus of suspicion that the agreement was another one of Smith's treacheries and shrewdnesses, and that Sithole and Muzorewa were unwittingly duped into selling the Zimbabwean liberation struggle down the drain. They dismiss the agreement as 'false decolonization' and as a neat 'neo-colonialist arrangement'. They quickly point to the entrenched twenty-eight European seats, bill of rights, judiciary, public service board, pensions and dual citizenship as concrete evidence of the neo-colonialist manoeuvres to create a socio-economic atmosphere conducive to continued settler exploitation of the Zimbabwean masses under the disguise of majority rule. They argue that white settlers and their neo-colonialist allies have finally realized the effect of the armed struggle, of sanctions, white emigration, and political uncertainty upon the economy—all of which have diminished capitalist investment in Zimbabwe. Consequently, they have decided to overcome political uncertainty by a seemingly radical transfer of power to Africans that in reality consolidates the settlers' economic position. These critics prefer a total revolutionary demolition of the edifices of the settler society.

Predictably, the most vociferous attacks have been made by the Patriotic Front, the front-line states, and the Organization of African Unity. Both Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe, the co-leaders of the Patriotic Front, have denounced the agreement as 'the biggest sell-out in African history' and as a 'political and legal swindle'.<sup>14</sup> They have vowed to fight on until 'total military victory'. They have characterized it as 'completely bogus' because it 'leaves both political and military power in the hands of the settler minority'.<sup>15</sup> They particularly claim that the settlement 'perpetuates minority rule for another ten years or possibly twenty or sixty years' and that the projected general election 'would be impractical undemocratic, and can only be conducted under the canopy of the Smith regime'.

Diplomatically, the Patriotic Front has lobbied heavily at the United Nations and in African capitals against international recognition of the Internal Settlement, the projected majority rule and the lifting of economic sanctions, in order to weaken the Transitional Government, the Zim-

babwean economy and, thus, sabotage the settlement. They first advocated a British transfer of power directly to Nkomo and Mugabe on the disputable premise that they alone have been conducting the armed struggle. Lately they are advocating another Geneva-type all-party conference, based on the Anglo-American formula, to work out a new agreement in which they will be fully involved. Failing that, they are threatening a convulsion more catastrophic than the Angolan civil war.

Second only to the Patriotic Front in denouncing the agreement have been the African presidents of the front-line states, especially Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia. Retrospectively, their strategic positions as host countries of the freedom fighters have tempted them to apply neo-colonialist-type intervention in Zimbabwean nationalist politics.<sup>16</sup> They literally blackmailed all the factions to unite under the umbrella of Muzorewa's African National Council and leadership in December 1974, and to attend the infamous Victoria Falls conference aboard a South African train in 1975. They patronized the formation of the Zimbabwe Peoples' Army (ZIPA) in 1976 and barred all the politicians from entering the military camps in Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania to counter the factionalism and ineffectiveness of the political leadership. At present, they are working on behalf of the Patriotic Front to pressure the United Kingdom, the United States and the signatories of the Internal Settlement into holding an all-party conference on the basis of the Anglo-American formula.

Historically, decisions by front-line states to recognize and support one faction over the others often have determined the life span and viability of most factions outside Zimbabwe. For instance, it is common knowledge that the Patriotic Front came into existence in October 1976 on the advent of the Geneva Conference, primarily through the pressure and good offices of the front-line presidents, particularly Kaunda, in order to strengthen Nkomo's chances of becoming the first president of the then projected independent Zimbabwe. Nkomo, the president of ZAPU, then joined with Mugabe, then the secretary-general of ZANU, as co-leader of the Patriotic Front. So far, Nkomo and Mugabe have failed to resolve the issue of which of them is to be the president or vice-president of the Patriotic Front, and they have failed to unite their private armies.

However, the front-line states and the OAU legally recognized Nkomo and Mugabe, the Patriotic Front and their respective ZIPRA and ZANLA armies as the sole spokesmen of the Zimbabwean masses. The front-line states have applied 'big stick diplomacy' to ostracize and undermine Sithole and Muzorewa in the OAU and at the United Nations. Consequently, Sithole and Muzorewa have good reasons for resentment and hostility, if not vengeance, towards the front-line states, especially Zambia and Mozam-

bique. The front-line presidents also have ample reasons for apprehension over the Internal Settlement and the projected majority rule by 1 January 1979, because of their past insults against Sithole and Muzorewa.<sup>17</sup> Undoubtedly, if Kaunda and Machel support the Patriotic Front in an armed struggle against the Internal Settlement, and especially against an independent Zimbabwe, Sithole and Muzorewa will escalate the war onto Zambian and Mozambican soil. Realistically, both the Zambian and Mozambican armies would be easily wiped out by the Zimbabwean army. As Muzorewa has stated, 'No one [Zambia, Mozambique or Patriotic Front] can win fighting against Zimbabwe. They could have won fighting Smith in the past, but not against Zimbabwe.'<sup>18</sup>

As reported in *Africa Confidential*, Sithole actually prefers military confrontation to square his historic rivalry with Nkomo:

I get messages from my people. They say let him do it [civil war], and personally I think that would be the easiest and quickest way to solve the problem of Joshua—by direct confrontation.<sup>19</sup>

When warned by Owen that Nkomo is like 'the Duke of Wellington [*sic*] who has marched his men up the hill just to come down without them', Sithole immediately corrected Owen: 'No, that is not so. It is I who have my men up the hill. After all, my men have borne the brunt of the war while his men have stayed in the valley—Lusaka.'<sup>20</sup>

Implicitly, Sithole also will fight any front-line state that supports the Patriotic Front.

Ironically, Zambia, which has taken the toughest anti-settlement position, is the weakest of the front-line states. Domestically, its economy is crippled while political unrest is increasing. There is a severe shortage of maize and wheat. Pre-emptive air strikes by Zimbabwe upon Patriotic Front bases in the heavily populated districts of Barotseland and Livingstone would devastate both the population and the agricultural base of the country, and probably destroy whatever remains of the Zambians' confidence in their own government. Kaunda, who is at present one of Africa's most pro-West presidents, would have to rely on Soviet—Cuban or Chinese soldiers and military hardware. Obviously, he would face pressures from these socialist countries to adopt radical socio-economic policies in return for support, at a time when his neo-colonialist economy is in deep trouble.

Both Zambia and Mozambique also have hot potatoes in their hands in the form of the Patriotic Front. Zambia is faced with a fast-growing, better-trained and better-armed foreign army on its soil, which is loyal to Nkomo, 'a head without a state'. There is a possibility of the Lebanese—PLO equation, whereby Zambia and Mozambique would not be able to evict the Patriotic Front exile armies even if they decided to in their own national

interests. Besides, Nkomo and Mugabe themselves may eventually engage each other in a military showdown on Zambian/Mozambican soil to resolve their impasse over the leadership of the Patriotic Front.

The United Kingdom and the United States have expressed concern over the Internal Settlement, primarily because of the international outcry from the United Nations, where the Security Council has declared 'illegal and unacceptable any internal settlement under the auspices of the illegal regime', and from Africa. They are afraid that the agreement may not be internationally acceptable and may not end economic sanctions against Zimbabwe, because it excluded the Patriotic Front. They foresee the possibility of a civil war between the externally based armies of the Patriotic Front, fighting separately from Zambia (Nkomo) and Mozambique (Mugabe), and the internally based Zimbabwe army. They are particularly afraid that the Patriotic Front and the front-line states will invite Soviet—Cuban soldiers into southern Africa, and thus precipitate a world-wide confrontation that will spill over into South Africa.

Consequently, London and Washington are advocating another Geneva-type all-party conference that will produce constitutional arrangements that will protect settler-minority rights and allow for a peaceful and stable majority rule. Their major objective is to devise a stratagem that will prevent a Soviet—Cuban intervention on the side of the Patriotic Front, by forging an Anglo-American constitution to which all the African nationalists of Zimbabwe will agree. The agreement will then facilitate an African neo-colonialist inheritance of the white settlers' socio-economic structure without a civil war.

Failing the all-party conference, London and Washington would prefer a Nkomo—Muzorewa coalition against Sithole and Mugabe, on the precarious assertion that 'Nkomo has the guns and no people while Muzorewa has the people and no guns'. They are also persuading Sithole and Muzorewa into accommodating Nkomo into the Internal Settlement. Owen told Sithole:

We are not rigid. I don't rule out accepting the internal talks if you did exclude the external nationalists, provided there had been an effort to include at least Joshua. . . . I am not saying that it is absolutely necessary for the P.F. to be in. That would be giving them a veto. We must make a more genuine effort to include them. This is why I have never condemned the internal talks. I think it is a very important step in the right direction.<sup>21</sup>

Owen also assured Sithole not to worry about the 'noise [civil war] that he [Nkomo] makes', because 'he now wants direct negotiations with Smith on the Anglo-American proposals', but 'his problem is that he cannot be seen to be breaking from Robert Mugabe before he gets a concrete offer'.<sup>22</sup>

## **The Internal Settlement in practice**

As of now, the Transitional Government is nearly three months old and functioning as well as could be expected in any dual exercise of political power and authority by the colonizer and the colonized. The Ministerial Council consists of nine African and nine European partners. The pairing has produced some old political couples, making personality clashes and tensions inevitable. For instance, defence is shared by John Kadzviti (Sithole's appointee), an experienced ZANU field commander of the armed struggle, and Roger Hawkins, a white conservative. Such tensions in the sensitive portfolios of justice, law and order, and public service led to the celebrated resignation of Bryon Hove (Muzorewa's appointee). Sithole's appointees share defence, foreign affairs, information, immigration, agriculture, and tourism. Muzorewa's share finance, commerce and industry, transport and power, mines, roads and traffic, posts, justice, law and order, and public service. Chirau's share education, health, manpower and social affairs, water development, lands, natural resources and rural development, internal affairs, local government, housing and works.

The Transitional Government has already implemented most of its charges except the general election and independence celebrations. It has already released over 90 per cent of the estimated 1,000 political detainees who have been languishing in gaol as 'security risks' under the notorious Law and Order Maintenance Act.<sup>23</sup> It has stopped execution of political prisoners on death row at the Salisbury Central Prison. The Executive Council has appointed a commission to work out a cease-fire with the freedom fighters. It has granted amnesty to the cadres who want to retire or to join the projected Zimbabwean national army. It has dismantled the notorious Selous Scouts, the Grey Scouts, and the Special Air Service units that had been created by Smith to carry out acts of terrorism and sabotage against the mass supporters of the freedom fighters. The Executive Council has also agreed upon a list of officers in Smith's army, including the controversial Major-General Walls of the Hove affair, who are to be retired. Sithole and Muzorewa are already arranging for the return of their own soldiers and commissioned officers, who have been training in several foreign countries, so that they can be integrate a them into the Zimbabwean army, which is already 82 per cent African.

Politically, the Executive Council has lifted Smith's restrictions on political activities, has drawn up the electoral districts and registered over 3.5 million African voters for the forthcoming general election. Individually and jointly, Sithole and Muzorewa are going around the country telling the masses to support the settlement, register to vote, and prepare for a peaceful election. Their expectations are that once they have conducted a successful

general election and established a majority-rule government, international recognition and lifting of sanctions will soon follow.

Sithole and Muzorewa, the main targets among the quadrumvirate which Nkomo and Mugabe pejoratively call 'The Gang of Four' have insisted that the Internal Settlement is 'the best and final plan' for securing a relatively peaceful transition to African majority rule under one-person one-vote. Their sentiments were expressed amply by George Nyandoro, a veteran nationalist leader, once a staunch lieutenant of Nkomo under the African National Congress, the National Democratic Party, and ZAPU, and now the Secretary of Foreign Affairs in Muzorewa's UANC:

Our agreement provides a relatively painless way for our people to achieve majority rule. Substantively, we have achieved a formula that supersedes what Africa wanted us to accept at Victoria Falls, in the Nkomo-Smith talks of 1976 and at Geneva.<sup>24</sup>

They quickly point out that under negotiations, as opposed to a total military victory that would have given them the right to dictate terms, they had to accommodate some of the fundamental demands of the other delegations as best they could. Instead, they agreed to what they considered to be 'a balanced and fair package in which, though no delegation achieved all their demands, everyone saw hope for the future.'<sup>25</sup>

They attach no particular significance to the figure twenty-eight of the European seats, because 'a blocking mechanism is a blocking mechanism whether you do it with one, five or thirty-three seats'. Instead they emphasize that the measure is only temporary and that if African Members of Parliament work together they can easily amend the Constitution early next year. They also quickly remind us that the guarantee of tenure and independence of the judiciary, civil service, and defence forces and of retirement benefits to civil servants was stipulated in every other negotiated settlement in the former British colonies across Africa, including Ghana, Kenya, Zambia, Botswana and the United Republic of Tanzania. In fairness to the signatories, any wholesale confiscation of pensions would not only have caused an exodus of civil servants, but would also have established an image of bad faith and bad statesmanship that would, in turn, undermine the future African government's borrowing power in the international monetary system for a country that will need foreign aid to recover from the ravages of war and sanctions. With regard to dual citizenship, they point out that, according to the British Nationality Act (1964), any citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies who acquires the citizenship of another member of the Commonwealth is entitled to regain United Kingdom citizenship at any time.

Both Sithole and Muzorewa have always been contemptuous of the Patriotic Front and front-line states. They perceive the whole Nkomo/



Mugabe affair as a political marriage of convenience imposed upon the Zimbabwean people by the front-line presidents, especially Kaunda, who according to Sithole wants 'to see Mr Nkomo become the first president'.<sup>26</sup> They treat the Nkomo/Mugabe diplomatic manoeuvres and threats of civil war as mostly the bravado and propaganda of desperate losers in the historic factionalism and power-struggle of the Zimbabwean nationalist movement. They dismiss as fatuous and irresponsible those who advocate a British transfer of power to Nkomo and Mugabe on what they call 'the fictitious argument' that the Patriotic Front has been conducting the armed struggle. Sithole, in particular, argues that he has been the president of ZANU which inaugurated the armed struggle in the 1960s, when Nkomo was the moderate, rejecting violence.<sup>27</sup> He quickly points out that Nkomo attempted his own internal settlement with Smith in 1974 and 1976, in which he not only made less extensive demands than Sithole and Muzorewa have, but also manipulated the exclusion of Sithole, Muzorewa, Mugabe and the freedom fighters from those negotiations. As Muzorewa stated, to them, those outsiders who believe the Nkomo/Mugabe 'propaganda' simply do not understand 'the dynamics of Zimbabwean politics'.

Both Sithole and Muzorewa, and even Chirau and Smith, have derided Nkomo and Mugabe for being, according to Sithole, 'so much afraid of free elections that they have become, what you say, the fly in the ointment, or in the oil'.<sup>28</sup> They perceive the Patriotic Front's refusal to participate in the projected general election as political opportunism stemming from Nkomo's realization that he lacks popular support. They argue that the whole armed struggle has been waged for the goal of majority rule based on universal adult suffrage, and that therefore the masses, who have shared in the fighting and suffering and have endured the dangers and deprivations of life in the so-called protected villages, should have the right to choose their type of leadership and government. They believe that it would be politically and morally wrong for the British to impose the Patriotic Front faction over the other factions, and especially over the masses, without 'democratic' elections. They point out that their Internal Settlement guarantees freedom of political activities for all factions, and promises an election in which the Transitional Government will have a strong incentive to see to it that the greatest number of Africans participate peacefully and fairly, in order to gain international recognition on 1 January 1979.

### **The Internal Settlement in historical perspective**

We now shall provide some of the historical background of the current Zimbabwean political crisis. As a starter, it is important for the reader to

appreciate the fact that until 1964 Nkomo, Sithole, and Mugabe were close comrades in the National Democratic Party (NDP) and its successor, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU); and that from 1964 to 1974 Sithole and Mugabe were the president and secretary-general, respectively, of ZANU, which broke away from ZAPU. Remember that James Chikerema and George Nyandoro, who are now among the leading figures in Muzorewa's UNAC and arch-rivals of Nkomo and Mugabe, were once very loyal lieutenants of Nkomo in the African National Congress, the NDP, and ZAPU and arch-rivals of Sithole's and Mugabe's ZANU. Also remember that Nkomo, Sithole, Mugabe, Chikerema, Nyandoro and their respective subordinates all agreed to abandon their ZAPU, ZANU, and FROLIZI factions and unite under the African National Council and Muzorewa's leadership under the Lusaka Declaration 7 December 1974 but have subsequently resumed their old factions and rivalries.

With respect to negotiations, Nkomo attempted to negotiate unilaterally a settlement with the same Ian Smith in late 1975 and early 1976, when Sithole and Muzorewa were exiled in Ghana and Mozambique, respectively, during which he offered terms less beneficial to the African masses than those in the Internal Settlement. Together, Nkomo, Mugabe, Sithole and Muzorewa attended the abortive Victoria Falls Conference sponsored by South Africa's J. B. Vorster and the front-line states, and the unproductive Geneva talks. Now they have all endorsed the Anglo-American plan as a basis for any further negotiations; this plan differs from the Internal Settlement only in specifics such as the reserved twenty-eight seats out of 100 for whites, dual citizenship and independence day.

At first, the picture emerging from this historical scenario suggests that the nationalist liberation struggle in Zimbabwe has been more of politics of leadership, factionalism, power struggle, and of political alliances and deals than of genuine ideological differences over 'revolutionary' versus 'neo-colonialist' changes, as the Patriotic Front proponents and sympathizers would like us to believe. Apparently, the whole world is currently bogged down in choosing sides from among various Zimbabwean African factions and personalities who are rivalling fiercely over the spoils of a dying settler colonialism. What we need is the historical perspective to enable us to distinguish between current propaganda and campaign rhetoric stemming from the lust for power, from frustration and personal vendettas, and the underlying ideological realities of African nationalism in Zimbabwe.

The first truly mass-oriented African nationalist movement in Zimbabwe was the Southern Rhodesia African National Congress (ANC) formed on 12 September 1957.<sup>29</sup> The ANC essentially was a merger between the old African National Congress of Bulawayo—an élitist organization formed in 1934 on the pattern of the African National Congress of South

Africa—and the Youth League of Salisbury, the first mass organization, formed in 1954, primarily to promote African interests under the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Right away the leaders—Chikerema, Nyandoro and Paul Mushonga for the Youth League and J. Z. Moyo, Francis Nehwati and Knight Maripe for the old African National Congress—could not agree on a chairman.

As a compromise, they accepted a 'neutral chairman', Joshua Mgabuko Nyongolo Nkomo, who was promoted by the conservative delegates led by Chad Chipunza, a leading figure among the Africans who have participated in the settler parliament under the 1961 Constitution. Subsequently Nkomo was elected as the president of ANC; Chikerema as the vice-president, Nyandoro as the secretary and Mushonga (now dead) as the treasurer; Moyo (also dead) and Nehwati were executive members.<sup>30</sup> Since 1947, Nkomo had been a prominent trade-union leader in the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union and then in the Trade Union Congress. By 1957 he had supported federation, joined the white-led United Federal Party, lost to Masotsha M. Hove in a bid to be the first African member of the federal parliament from Matabeleland. He was the Bulawayo chairman of the white-led Federation of African Welfare Societies and a member of the Inter-Racial Association.

The basic aim of the ANC was non-racialism. As stated in the preamble of its Constitution:

Its aim is the national unity of all inhabitants of the country in true partnership regardless of race, colour and creed. It stands for a completely integrated society, equality of opportunity in every sphere, and the social, economic, and political advancement of all.<sup>31</sup>

The party was vehemently opposed to racism in land tenure and use, in residence, education, local government, social services, industry, trade unions, and the armed forces. It was 'equally opposed to tribalism and racialism'. It accepted whites, coloureds, and Asians as members and recognized their rights 'to retain permanently the fullest citizenship'. It encouraged 'all members in their daily lives to offer to all people, regardless of race, colour, creed, and class, or political affiliation' good examples in habits of friendship, good manners, honesty, hard work, temperance, economy, simplicity and avoidance of violence.<sup>32</sup>

The ANC affirmed 'complete loyalty to the [British] Crown as the symbol of national unity' and urged the United Kingdom 'to exert its influence to the utmost in favour of the creation of a non-racial, integrated society with a government responsible to the people, as the first essential step towards the granting of greater independence'.<sup>33</sup> It did not advocate African

majority rule. Instead, it recommended a 'parliamentary democracy, based on universal adult suffrage', with an emphasis on 'now'.

Economically, the ANC primarily demanded equal opportunity within the socio-economic structure of the settler society. It advocated 'individual initiative and free enterprise', the 'fullest freedom for the economic use of land by competent people regardless of race' and a 'system of freehold land tenure' where the 'large and small farmer are permitted to farm side by side to their mutual advantage'.<sup>34</sup> It urged the settler government to facilitate the immigration of 'people with capital, skills, and techniques' provided that 'these immigrants are of good character', and that 'there will be no discrimination as to race or colour'.<sup>35</sup>

The first major characteristic of the ANC, and thus of modern African nationalism in Zimbabwe, is that it was formed much later than nationalist movements in the rest of colonial Africa. By 12 September 1957, Ghana was independent, Mau Mau had just ended, the francophone colonies were operating under the *Loi Cadre* formula of self-government, and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was four years old. An other characteristic of the ANC was that it was born out of the euphoric optimism and multiracialism expressed in the principle of partnership, upon which the Federation was based.<sup>36</sup> Many African teachers, ministers, clerks and businessmen did not join the ANC. Instead they sat on the fence or joined white-led liberal parties—the United Federal Party (UFP) and the Central African Party (CAP)—which advocated a qualitative franchise to keep the government 'in responsible and civilized hands', meaning white supremacy. These parties believed in creating an African middle class, through African education, the civil service and private land-ownership in the African Purchased Areas.

The third major characteristic was that the ANC was a reformist, gradualist, non-violent movement. It concentrated on the educationalist expose of the failures and hypocrisy of partnership, of racial discrimination, of poverty and sickness, under the false hope that an informed liberal white electorate would reciprocate with fair, non-racial legislation and practices. The public rallies of the ANC mainly consisted of successive speeches against the Land Apportionment Act, the Land Husbandry Act, passes, the franchise, partnership, unemployment, housing, sanitation and police brutality. The ANC also engaged in Gandhian style non-violent demonstrations and sit-ins in hotels, restaurants, churches, sports fields, and railway stations. Although there were frequent echoes of one-man one-vote at ANC rallies, the major outcry was for removal of racial discrimination and for multiracial democratic rule.

The fourth characteristic was that the basic objectives and organizational structure of the ANC have been transmitted throughout the various

successive movements up to the present Internal Settlement. The significant difference between the ANC and the current ZAPU, ZANU, and UANC is the change from non-violence and gradualism to the armed struggle, and from a united movement to factionalism. The constitutions are for all practical purposes identical.

On 25 February 1959, Edgar Whitehead's settler regime banned the ANC, conducted an Operation Sunrise raid and imprisoned 500 party officials to appease an apprehensive white electorate. Nkomo escaped imprisonment because he had 'mysteriously' left the country for London. Both the United Federal Party and the Central African Party then made concerted efforts to 'eradicate African nationalism' through membership drives and patronages among African professionals and businessmen. There was a brief upsurge of African membership in white-led parties. Africans almost took over leadership of the Central African Party led by Garfield Todd,<sup>37</sup> the most outstanding being Stanlake Samkange, who became the vice-president.

Then, on 1 January 1960, three young men—Michael Mawema, Nazario Marondera and Sketchley Samkange, Stanlake's young brother—convened a meeting in the African township of Highfields, Salisbury, which led to the formation of the National Democratic Party.<sup>38</sup> Mawema, the president, had completed a primary teachers' certificate, but he left teaching to be a social-welfare worker on the Rhodesia Railways, where he became an active member of the Railway African Workers' Union. In 1958, he was sent to Israel by the ANC for a ten-month study of the kibbutzim. Mapondera, the secretary, had worked in the ANC publicity office, and Samkange, the treasurer, had two years of secondary schooling. Morton Malianga, Enos Ngala, Willie Masarurwa, and George Silundika were the other executive-committee members.

The NDP adopted the ANC constitution *in toto*. But the youthful Mawema and his executive initiated a much higher level of enthusiasm, dynamism and forcefulness than that of the ANC. Their major emphasis then was on one-man one-vote and on parliamentary representation. They rapidly built a much broader-based mass organization and spread it from the primarily urban centres of the ANC to the rural areas. They were very persistent and forceful with their demands, demonstrations and delegations. They established an NDP office in London to inform the British Government and public about the colonialist conditions of Southern Rhodesia, and to lobby for a constitutional conference to establish 'self-government for all the inhabitants'.

Several other factors contributed to their rapid success, among which were the external 'wind of change' from other parts of Africa, the notorious Land Husbandry Act, which was causing havoc and unrest in rural areas, the failure of partnership and federation, and especially the accompanying

disillusionment with white leadership among African professionals and businessmen,<sup>39</sup> most of whom then turned to African nationalism. Among the most prominent new members was Ndabaningi Sithole, who then was a teacher, president of the African Teachers' Association, and a member of the Central African Party, and had just published his book *African Nationalism*. The others were Robert Mugabe, Stanlake Samkange, Dr Tichafa Parirenyatwa, Barrister Herbert Chitepo, Dr Chidzero, Enoch Dumbutshena, and Dr E. Pswarayi.<sup>40</sup> Nkomo, who had thus far taken refuge in London, came back into Zimbabwean politics. Undoubtedly, these high-level élites brought talent, vigour and prestige to the NDP.

As usual, the settler attempted to destroy the movement so as to pacify a restless white electorate. In June, Whitehead imprisoned Mawema, Sketchley Samkange and Leopold Takawira for supposedly contravening the Law and Order Maintenance Act. The imprisonment precipitated so many demonstrations, riots and damage that Whitehead was forced to release the leaders and to promise a conference, which eventually led to the 1961 Constitution. The projected conference and the possibility of multiracial self-government prompted a scramble for offices among the top élites. Mawema and his youthful colleagues were unceremoniously deposed. At a convention held at (ironically) the Goodwill Centre in Salisbury in October 1960, Nkomo was elected president of the NDP *in absentia*, Sithole the treasurer, and Mugabe the publicity secretary. Poor Mawema and his other 'radical' colleagues formed the Zimbabwe National Party, which was easily overshadowed and destroyed by the NDP. Since then, university-educated élites have dominated the leadership of nationalist movements in Zimbabwe.

### **The 1961 Constitution**

The history of the NDP was centred around the 1961 Constitution. The United Kingdom convened the expected conference in London on 16 December 1960, under the chairmanship of Duncan Sandys, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations.<sup>41</sup> The NDP delegates were Nkomo and Sithole, with Chitepo and Silundika as advisers. The dominant delegation was the UFP, led by Whitehead, which insisted on the removal of the reserved clauses on racial discrimination, foreign affairs and national defence contained in the 1923 Constitution, in order to obtain complete independence for the settlers. Nkomo and Sithole apparently concentrated on preventing white independence rather than on obtaining African majority rule. They pressed for a multiracial, white-led, self-government based on universal adult suffrage, for African parliamentary representation and for removal of racial discrimination.

When the conference was concluded in Salisbury on 7 February 1961, Nkomo and Sithole had put their signatures to a Legislative Assembly of fifty white and fifteen African seats; a cumbersome A-roll/B-roll voting mechanism; a Constitutional Council of two Europeans, two Africans, one coloured, and two persons with legal qualifications 'to advise the Legislative Assembly'; and a Bill of Rights patterned after that of Nigeria.<sup>42</sup> The so-called Declaration of Rights claimed the sanctity of life, property, freedom, privacy and due process of law; but also emphatically exempted existing discriminatory legislation and all laws pertaining to 'defence, public safety, public order, public morality or public health'. Thus, the notorious Land Apportionment and Law and Order Maintenance Acts were immune from the Bill of Rights. Furthermore, amendments to the Constitution required only a two-thirds majority of Parliament.

Initially, Nkomo thought that the Constitution was 'a great step in the right direction' and that the Bill of Rights was 'a yardstick for any government that is moral'.<sup>43</sup> Speaking at an NDP rally in Salisbury on 19 March 1961, he said, 'We were able to move the mountain which had been set before us an inch by getting the declaration of human rights and the protection of the courts enshrined in the new Constitution.'<sup>44</sup> Mugabe, then the publicity secretary, claimed that major NDP objectives had been met by the 'enshrinement of a declaration of rights, the outlawing of discrimination, and the protection of the rights by the courts'.<sup>45</sup>

But even by 1961 standards the constitution was terribly inadequate. By then most other British colonies had obtained either complete independence or transitional government; former French colonies were celebrating independence by the month; Zaire was independent; and the armed struggle was already under way in Angola. Locally, the British-sponsored Monckton Commission had pronounced that the Federation was going to be dismantled in 1963; the 1961 McLeod Constitution of Nyasaland (Malawi) gave voting rights to any adult who was literate in any language and had paid taxes for ten years, as well as twenty African seats out of thirty-three. In Northern Rhodesia, the constitution gave fifteen seats to Africans and fifteen to whites, and left fifteen open to anyone. The NDP, on the other hand, had allowed the removal of the reserve clauses, thus further weakening British trusteeship in Rhodesian politics, without entrenching themselves into the self-government. Whites controlled African education, employment, wages and, therefore, the franchise. More importantly, Nkomo's, Sithole's and Mugabe's faith in settler colonial courts, and their ability to apply the laws impartially, was awfully naïve, as their own subsequent imprisonment without trial was to prove.

Predictably, some Africans within and without the NDP denounced the Constitution as a 'sell-out'. The most famous response and perhaps the most

accurate analysis of the constitution was the telegram sent to Salisbury by Leopold Takawira, the NDP representative in London: 'We totally reject Southern Rhodesian constitutional conference agreement as treacherous to the future of the three million Africans. Agreement diabolical and disastrous. Outside world stocked by NDP's docile agreement.'<sup>46</sup> Retrospectively, the NDP leaders had not been fully aware of the extent to which the African population was opposed to settler rule. In the same fashion as they behaved at the Victoria Falls and Geneva Conferences, they did not consult the masses before, or inform them during, the negotiations. The Zimbabwean nationalist leaders have tended to presume to know what is good for the people, and often have surprised the masses with *faits accomplis*.

However, the following day Nkomo called a press conference to denounce the Constitution. There was a special party convention in March 1961, where the NDP leadership expected to denounce the Constitution, but recommend participation. But the delegates voted for total boycott of it. On 23 July 1961, the NDP conducted its own referendum on participation versus boycott, and the results were 467,189 for boycott, 584 for participation.<sup>47</sup> Consequently, the rest of 1961 was a period of confusion; on the one hand, the top leadership had been forced to reverse and thus ridicule itself in the face of an unpopular decision, and on the other, the masses were not politically activist enough to demand the resignation of the culprits. Instead, the leadership and their most enthusiastic supporters organized against voter registration and against participation in the forthcoming elections of 1962. The Whitehead regime had been counting on the new African middle-class voters to stand for the fifteen seats and to vote UFP against the conservatives of the Dominion Party. The UFP machinery then mounted a Build-a-Nation and Claim-Your-Vote campaign among African professionals and businessmen. Having been frustrated in the UFP-versus-NDP confrontation, the Whitehead Government banned the NDP on 9 December 1961, when Nkomo was away attending the independence celebrations of the then Tanganyika. In the 1962 election, the UFP was defeated by the Dominion Party led by Winston Field, which was soon renamed the Rhodesia Front, and Field was replaced by Ian Smith.

A few days after the NDP was banned, the same people formed ZAPU and endorsed the same executive, with only the addition of Dr Tichafa Pairenyatwa, who resigned his government post as a medical officer to become a politician. During its ten months' existence, ZAPU pursued the same objectives and employed the same tactics as the NDP. But there were some executive members and followers who were questioning the efficacy of the non-violent, constitutional, and multiracial orientation of the movement, as well as Nkomo's leadership, especially as the frustrated settler regime became increasingly intimidating, provocative and ruthless against African



politicians. The settler policemen were empowered under the Law and Order Maintenance Act to order an African politician to stop in the middle of a speech and to get off the platform if they judged the speech to be subversive. Then the anger and especially jeering of the crowd also were treated as crimes because they 'undermine the authority of law officers'. Consequently the police would disperse the audience with tear-gas and dogs. Often, officious and racist policemen would order the speaker off the podium just to embarrass him or her or to incite the crowd, and thus precipitate a riot.

One of the leading critics of the pacifist approach was Dr Pari (as Parirenyatta was commonly called). He recommended underground armed struggle under the umbrella of ZAPU, and less élitism among the top leadership. Unfortunately, Dr Pari died mysteriously and prematurely on 13 August 1962, fifteen miles outside Bulawayo, in what supposedly was a car/train accident. His death is still a Sherlock-Holmes-type mystery as it is not known whether he died from the accident or from foul play by either colonialist policemen or fellow African nationalist rivals. About the same time, a General Chedu (*Chedu* in Shona translates into 'ours') was claiming to have formed the Zimbabwe Liberation Army and was calling upon fellow Africans to join in the armed struggle. There were several cases of telephone wires being cut and white homes being petrol-bombed. No identification of General Chedu or his followers has ever been established. However, on 19 September 1962, ZAPU was banned.

There was little else but disappointment, leaderlessness and confusion between September 1962 and June 1963, when the ZAPU/ZANU split finally occurred. No General Chedu and no underground Zimbabwe Liberation Army emerged; the top leaders were under restrictions, except for Nkomo, who had taken refuge in London again; and the Dominion Party (Rhodesia Front) won the settlers' election. Briefly, the causes of the ZAPU/ZANU, Nkomo/Sithole split were: (a) the long-range frustration over the lack of progress towards universal adult suffrage, majority rule and non-racialism; (b) the inevitable scapegoat syndrome among frustrated people; (c) the differences over non-violence versus armed struggle, and internal struggle versus government-in-exile; and (d) a general disillusionment with the leadership, especially Nkomo's. Some followers wanted a change of methods or leadership, others wanted both.

As it happened, the change was brought about by the leadership, when it failed to agree on new directions. Simply put, the Nkomo faction at that stage was inclined to be more cautious, non-violent, and pro-government-in-exile; while the Sithole/Mugabe faction wanted a more radical, underground struggle. The immediate cause was the famous Cabinet Exodus of 1963, when the old ZAPU executive met at Mbeya, in the United Republic of Tanzania, supposedly to form a government-in-exile. The plan quickly

fizzled out when there was no support from independent African states, whereby Nkomo, sensing the imminent 'crisis of confidence' in his leadership, hurriedly flew to Rhodesia, leaving his lieutenants, some of whom had brought their families, stranded.

At first the Sithole/Mugabe faction intended to depose Nkomo on account of his 'ineffective, blind, spineless leadership and intolerance of criticism', and to appoint Sithole as acting president until the next ZAPU congress. On 9 July 1963, at Dar es Salaam, none other than Mugabe, Nkomo's current co-leader of the Patriotic Front, announced the decision and went on to expound on Nkomo's 'fumbling and blunderous leadership', on behalf of the Sithole/Mugabe faction. He stated that they had deposed Nkomo because:

Mr Nkomo's numerous political blunders, his miscalculations, lack of foresight and judgment, his lackadaisical politics and complete lack of dedication and seriousness of purpose, plus his total incorrigibility have more than hampered and militated against the liberation struggle of our country.<sup>48</sup>

From Salisbury, Nkomo deposed Sithole, Mugabe, Takawira, Ngala, Malianga, Hamadziripi and Nyagumbo from the executive and declared them 'enemies of the people'. On 8 August 1963, ZANU was formed with Sithole as president and Mugabe as general-secretary. Thus, the historic rivalries, assassinations, and vendetta among Zimbabwean nationalists had begun. Nkomo quickly reconstituted ZAPU into the short-lived PCC.

Locally, most Africans were waiting for some change, if not a miracle, to achieve majority rule. ZANU rhetoric tended to be militant and the leadership more educated. Nkomo labelled his opponents intellectuals, 'sell-outs' and 'Tshombes'. Between August 1963 and 26 August 1964, there was an unfortunately wasteful and suicidal spectacle of ZAPU/ZANU fratricide, thuggery and intimidation that has left bitter memories and acrimony among factional followers and neutrals. Predictably, the Smith regime, which was getting ready for its Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) from the United Kingdom took full advantage of the situation to further divide Africans, turn the colony into a police state, and convince the Western world that Africans were not yet ready for independence. By August 1964, both ZAPU and ZANU had been banned and both leaderships put under detention, which lasted through December 1974.

The factions were then forced to go underground and into exile in Zambia, Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania, where they began the armed struggle under acting councils. ZAPU was under Chikerema until he broke away to lead another faction, the Front for the Liberation of Zimbabwe (FROLIZI) in 1971, when it came under J. Z. Moyo (now

deceased). ZANU was under Chitepo until 1974, when he was assassinated in an apparent Manyika/Karanga power struggle.<sup>49</sup> Simultaneously, individual members of the front-line states, the OAU, and the United Nations took sides and participation in the liberation politics of Zimbabwe.

Retrospectively, the split did not originate from ideological, ethnic or regional clashes, as some latter-day partisan intellectuals would like us to believe, but from personality clashes and especially the power-hunger of both the top leaders and their subordinates. The factions have appealed to 'tribalism', 'revolutionary' versus 'neo-colonist' ideologies and regionalism to advance themselves and to mobilize factional cohesion and enthusiasm.<sup>50</sup> The case with which the top leaders and especially the subordinates have switched party membership and allegiances, such as Mugabe's switches from Nkomo to Sithole, back to Nkomo and probably back to Sithole again, and Chikerema's and Nyandoro's switches from ZAPU to FROLIZI to Muzorewa's UANC, suggest political opportunism rather than ideological commitment. Currently, Sithole and Mugabe have simply split ZANU followers between themselves without raising any basic ideological differences.

The split was unfortunate because leaders who basically share a common ideology of non-racialism, universalism, constitutionalism, European parliamentary democracy and non-violence, who therefore would make one of the finest teams in African politics, have destroyed each other with irrepressible hostilities and bad publicity. Nkomo, Sithole and Mugabe share a common comradeship going back to the NDP, the 1961 Constitution, ZAPU, and detention camps. Even their respective factions, structurally and ideologically, are replicas of each other. There are Marxist, Leninist, Maoist, Fanonite, capitalist and traditionalist intellectuals, as well as bourgeois, peasants, chiefs, policemen, whites, coloureds, and Asians in each of them. In terms of the first presidency of Zimbabwe, there will be no real difference between Sithole, Muzorewa, Mugabe, Nkomo, or any coalition, except in matters of style, efficiency, eloquence, tolerance and charisma. As reported in *Africa Confidential*, Sithole is prepared to accommodate Nkomo provided the latter stops threats of a civil war and comes home without conditions. 'I say Joshua should return, I have nothing against him, I have a warm spot for Mr Nkomo. I want to see him back.'<sup>51</sup>

However, once started, factionalism acquired an existence and force of its own. Verbally and in print, the factions have waged scandalous warfare against each other, often to their mutual self-destruction.<sup>52</sup> In fact, they applied to each other most of the antinationalist characterizations employed against all of them by the settler press. Each faction has accused the other of ineffectiveness, neo-colonialism, corruption, tribalism, nepotism, power-hunger and bad faith, and of deceiving the masses. Each of them has

claimed to be the only 'revolutionary' party and to have sole majority support (without polling or election). With respect to the armed struggle, each faction has exaggerated its number of freedom fighters, its victories and strength, while emphasizing the weakness and failures of its rivals. Ironically, one of the major strengths of the Internal Settlement is the fact that Sithole, Muzorewa and Smith basically share similar political images of Nkomo and Mugabe, just as Nkomo and Smith shared similar views about Sithole, Muzorewa and Mugabe in their 1975/76 negotiations.

Consequently, the exigencies of factionalism have led to the hardening of personal feelings and attitudes towards each other among the leader and thus have diminished the chances for open-mindedness, compromise and unity. Mugabe's inclusion in the Internal Settlement is virtually foreclosed because of what Sithole perceives as the former's betrayal, arrogance and attempt at usurpation of Sithole's presidency of ZANU. Sithole told Owen point-blank, 'As for Mugabe, I find it very difficult to forgive him.'<sup>53</sup>

Factionalism first necessitated and, in turn, depended on the politics of symbolism. To resolve the contradiction between their politics of factionalism, which emphasized party solidarity and distinctions, and the prevailing settler colonialism at home, which denied them power, authority, offices and status, the politicians evolved a make-believe state system of their own in which individuals lived, travelled and acted like African presidents, cabinet ministers and ambassadors at home and in foreign capitals. Thus until the Internal Settlement, Zimbabwe had ZAPU-Nkomo, ZANU-Mugabe, ANC-Sithole, and UANC-Muzorewa forms of 'governments-in-exile' complete with four presidents, vice-presidents, shadow cabinets, diplomatic representatives with passports and immunities, Zimbabwe (state) houses, security services and limousines. In this exercise, foreign nations, and especially the front-line states, have been responsible for providing their favourite factions with the money and facilities. Currently, for example, we not only have Nkomo, Mugabe, Sithole and Muzorewa claiming sole title to be the first president of Zimbabwe, we also have one individual for each of the four factions parading as the first minister-designate for foreign affairs, defence, education, etc., or the Zimbabwean ambassador designate to the United States, the United Nations, the United Kingdom, China, Gabon, the United Republic of Tanzania, and so forth. Consequently, some individuals have acquired personal vested interests in factionalism, to the extent that the rivalry, antagonism and intransigence nowadays have been exacerbated and intensified because independence day appears to be very close and inevitable.

Since the differences between these symbolic functionaries were so unsubstantive and so interchangeable, every little detail of protocol, alliances, friendships, marriages and ethnic origin immediately acquired

exaggerated meanings for the purposes of embarrassing or alienating opponents while impressing and solidifying supporters. By the same token, African majority rule for Zimbabwe became a zero-sum equation of political electioneering in which the winner takes the whole pie. For Sithole and Muzorewa, accomodating Nkomo or Mugabe into the Transitional Government would mean sharing lucrative political offices with the latter at the expense and alienation of their loyal lieutenants who had stood by them throughout the bitter factionalism. For Nkomo and Mugabe, too, accomodation is painful and embarrassing because they would have to betray each other, their lieutenants and cadres.

It is therefore erroneous, simplistic and partisan to describe the Internal Settlement as the product of Smith, or of the British, American and South African governments. That would be giving credit to be myth of white superiority and doing injustice to the intelligence, integrity, and dedication of African leaders. Sithole and Muzorewa certainly are not 'sell outs' and 'neo-colonialist puppets', any more than Nkomo and Mugabe are mere puppets of the front-line states, or of the Cubans. Sithole and Muzorewa are political victors in a historic and fierce power struggle among the African nationalists of Zimbabwe. Put in perspective, the Internal Settlement embodies the major historical objectives of the African nationalist movement of Zimbabwe. Sithole and Muzorewa achieved what the nationalist constitutions always have stipulated and advocated. They certainly did not betray the followers of Nkomo and Mugabe, because these two have subscribed to the same goals as are found in the Internal Settlement. Even the armchair revolutionaries should not claim betrayal, because neither Sithole nor Muzorewa, Nkomo nor Mugabe, has ever promised them a truly revolutionary change in Zimbabwe.

Furthermore, within the context of the socio-economic institutions of the settler society and its extensive colonialist culture, the Internal Settlement suggests a very dramatic change. The majority rule, universal suffrage, non-racialism, and the Bill of Rights that it contains in reality are the expressions of a deep and fundamental cultural heritage of the African people of Zimbabwe and not simply products of immediate wartime compromises or of Sithole's and Muzorewa's lust for power. Rather, these ideals have always been perceived by Zimbabwean Africans as the antitheses of settler colonialism, racism and privileges, and have been converted into African nationalism to justify and fortify the process of liberation. The historical primacy of the Western-educated élites, including Christian ministers like Sithole and Muzorewa, was guaranteed by the African masses, who saw in the non-racialism, constitutionalism and courage of both the politicians and the cadres the embodiment and promotion of their own ideals and desires for independence, freedom, identity and unity.

The masses supported the leadership on the deposition of Mawema and his colleagues and on the 1961 Constitution. They turned out in large numbers to welcome their leaders back from the Victoria Falls and Geneva Conferences; and thus far they have gone along with the Internal Settlement. In fact, the major concern of the average Zimbabwean is not over the shortcomings of the Internal Settlement, nor over what Sithole or Muzorewa is going to do to whites or to the economy, but over the possibility of a violent settlement of old wounds and animosities between Nkomo, Sithole, Mugabe and Muzorewa and their lieutenants. At this stage, I will venture to say that, given mass participation in a democratic election in Zimbabwe, the masses will get the leaders they deserve.

### **The armed struggle**

Full-scale armed struggle was born out of the ZAPU/ZANU split and rivalry. For the first time the colonized Africans of Zimbabwe had fought, bombed and killed in the name of liberation, anti-colonialism and freedom. Even at the peak of the unfortunate fratricide in 1963 and 1964 an underground movement calling itself the Voice of Women, but actually consisting of young men, was already engaging in petrol bombing of electrical installations, homes, and railways.<sup>54</sup> Factional rivalry and the power struggle generated vigour and direction for militant mobilization of supporters on a mass basis. Nearly every Zimbabwean African has had to reckon with factionalism and take sides among rival leaders. Although fratricide unfortunately has been destructive, the consequential necessity to 'deliver the goods', in order to gain, impress and sustain mass support at the expense of the other factions, has given rise to effective guerrilla movements. ZAPU, ZANU, FROLIZI and ZIPA cadres often engaged in heroic battles and strategies with their minds on maximum publicity.

However, ZAPU and ZANU cadres historically have operated and perceived themselves as subordinate, auxiliary, power-base factors for the feuding political leadership. For ten years (1964–74), the cadres and their 'acting' leaders—Chitepo for ZANU, Chikerema and later Moyo for ZAPU—acknowledged Sithole and Nkomo respectively as the *de jure* commanders-in-chief from behind bars. They consulted with Sithole and Nkomo on all major policies and especially on foreign affairs. But Sithole, Nkomo and their lieutenants did not undergo any revolutionary ideological transformation in prison. They still remained, and came out, committed to non-racialism, majority rule on the basis of universal adult suffrage, and equal economic opportunity.

In fact, we can venture to say that the Zimbabwean political leadership

historically has played a conservative role in incorporating, eliminating or sabotaging the truly revolutionary elements in the struggle, especially when the politicians felt threatened. We have already discussed the case of Mawema (1960), and mentioned General Chedu and his Zimbabwe Liberation Army (1963), as well as the Voice of Women (1964), which were all disowned by the national political leadership. The latest is the case of ZIPA, formed in March 1975,<sup>55</sup> three months after the Lusaka Declaration of unity among the politicians.

According to its spokesman, Dzinashe Machingura, ZIPA was a voluntary merger of the military wings of ZAPU (ZIPRA) and ZANU (ZANLA) after the cadres had 'realized the incompetence of the ANC leadership', and was formed 'for the purpose of rescuing the Zimbabwe liberation struggle from the chaotic situation that had been created by the ANC leadership'.<sup>56</sup> ZIPA believed in a total military victory that would establish 'a just and popular socio-political order serving the interests of the people of Zimbabwe', and it was opposed to 'personality politics'. ZIPA concluded that the disunity among the politicians was caused by 'political ambition and power struggle'. 'Ideologically they belong to the same camp'.<sup>57</sup> It was more than just the traditional army because it had the intention of 'shouldering both the military and the political tasks of the revolution'. For that purpose it established the Chitepo College in Mozambique, headed by Dr Jo Taderera, where military-trained cadres of above average education underwent six months of study of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology in groups of 350, to be sent into the battle as political commissars.

Soon, ZIPA was recognized and patronized by the front-line states as a counterforce to the feuding politicians. ZIPA was then able to receive international recognition and support independently of the traditional political leadership. The front-line states barred Nkomo, Sithole, Mugabe and Muzorewa from the ZIPA camps unless they united. Suddenly, politicians were scrambling for survival. The soldier-politician leadership of ZIPA was not only truly revolutionary but also formidable, considering that none of the politicians had had military training, knowledge or field experience with the cadres. For a while it was feasible that ZIPA would soon replace the traditional politicians to become an independent politico-military vanguard for a revolutionary struggle. This was mutiny in the eyes of the politicians.

Unfortunately, the ZIPA high command operated under a democratic collective leadership and thus had no internationally recognized political figure to counter the traditional politicians. Thus it left itself open to infiltration and, lately, incorporation by Nkomo and Mugabe, and to being represented by these two at negotiations. The result has been perhaps the

saddest commentary on the Patriotic Front. Machingura and the rest of his colleagues in ZIPA who have refused to be subordinated to Nkomo and Mugabe have all been imprisoned in Mozambique by Frelimo soldiers.<sup>58</sup> These include the leading revolutionaries, such as Machingura, Elias Hondo, Dr Jo Taderera (Chitepo College), Joseph Chimurenga, Shumba Chigowe (former ZANU chief of intelligence), Mukudzei Mudzi (external affairs), Crispin Mandizvidza, Webster Gwauya, Charles Dauramanzi, Rugare Gumbo, Henry Hamadziripi and many cadres. In short, the Patriotic Front and the front-line states have joined forces in destroying ZIPA.

### Conclusion

The constitutions of all the major nationalist movements of Zimbabwe, from the ANC, NDP, ZAPU, ZANU, FROLIZI to UANC, have never stipulated or advocated significant revolutionary change of the socio-economic system of the settler society. Furthermore, none of the current rivals for the first presidency of Zimbabwe—Sithole, Muzorewa, Nkomo and Mugabe—has ever advocated a revolutionary transformation of the settler society. It is therefore erroneous to equate the armed struggle of Zimbabwe with those of Algeria, Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique.

Real revolutionary change in a settler-colonialist and multi-ethnic society like Zimbabwe would necessitate the dismantling of the socio-economic structures, institutions and values of the settler society. It would require a proletarian economic democracy of mass-controlled resources, means and goals of production, distribution and services, in order to satisfy human needs and to end economic insecurity and exploitation. It would demand that the African masses cease to be exploited as commodities to be bought on the labour market and compelled by circumstances of poverty to work as lowly paid appendages to the other tools owned privately by the European or African bourgeoisie. This of course means a classless society in which mass-controlled and oriented institutions would abolish domestic and neo-colonialist forms of capitalistic formations and values.

Thus revolutionary change in Zimbabwe would mean what ZIPA correctly called 'the total transformation of the Zimbabwean society'.<sup>59</sup> It means 'a national democratic revolution to overthrow national oppression' by 'a small minority, racist, reactionary clique of whites',<sup>60</sup> and an activation of the 'innovative and creative potential of the masses of Zimbabwe' by re-instituting 'the political rights, the economic rights, and the cultural rights of the Zimbabwean people'. This would necessitate a total military victory; a revolutionary process of nationalization of land, resources, labour, production, and distribution; and a revolutionary Africanization of the the armed



forces, the civil service, the judiciary, education, social services and values.

Politically, revolutionary change in Zimbabwe should guarantee full democratic rights for all citizens, based on mass participation in the electoral process, the civil service, defence, judiciary, economy, education, etc. It requires a guarantee to every citizen, irrespective of ethnic origin, party membership, education and kinship, the right to life, job, education, health, and freedom of expression. It would be politically tyrannical and wrong for any self-appointed or foreign-imposed faction of soldiers, politicians, or ethnic group arbitrarily to disenfranchise the very masses who have won independence by their own sweat and tears. Their rights should neither be usurped nor treated as gifts to be determined unilaterally by the 'state', let alone by élites factions.

But, as we have seen, until their imprisonment in 1964, Nkomo, Sithole and Mugabe believed in the impartiality of colonial courts and judges, failing to grasp the obvious reality that the judiciary, like the army, police, parliament, education and economic structures, was an instrument of settler self-interest and socio-economic formations. Even after they came out of their ten-year imprisonment, they formulated their objectives at the successive negotiations at Victoria Falls, Geneva, Salisbury and Malta in terms of the transfer of power—meaning national independence, flag, anthem and a twenty-one-gun salute for the president, as well as a seat at the OAU and the United Nations. Concerning the Geneva Talks, the Patriotic Front stated that 'the objective of the conference has been solely the transfer of power from the minority racists to the people of Zimbabwe', which they defined as 'the transfer to the majority of all the instruments and machinery of state power'.<sup>61</sup> They have perceived the struggle as a franchise war and victory as majority rule, one-man-one-vote, equal opportunity, and non-racialism—without elaborating on the new socio-economic mechanisms, institutions and values necessary for an effective transformation of the settler colonialist society.

The scenario of the Geneva Talks was that Smith would (voluntarily) surrender power to a British Resident Commissioner who would be the commander-in-chief and the administrator, with the assistance of a United Nations observer and peace-keeping force, and would supervise the writing of the constitution and the election. There would have been a cease-fire and lifting of sanctions.<sup>62</sup> Thus, up to this day, the political leadership has not yet reckoned with the demands and realities of a liberation struggle against settler colonialism, which only can be effectively eliminated by total military victory, accompanied by a cultural revolution. Any negotiated settlement of Zimbabwean African-European confrontation would have neo-colonialist elements because, as Pieter van der Byl, the outspoken settler Minister of Foreign Affairs, amply informed the nationalists at Geneva:

Whichever way you like to look at it, the [white] Rhodesian Government nonetheless exists and therefore we form half the conference because we are the effective power and no agreement can possibly be implemented unless we choose to go along with it.<sup>63</sup>

By its very nature, negotiation is a give-and-take exercise.

The political leadership of Zimbabwe has used the armed struggle only as a pressure technique of sabotage, carefully engineered to instill fear, suffering and economic loss among the settlers, so as to convince them that colonialism and racialism do not pay, and thus to pressure Smith and the United Kingdom to transfer power to the African majority in the typically Ghanaian, Zambian, Tanzanian, and Kenyan pattern of decolonization. As exemplified by the Patriotic Front today, the nationalists have offered the masses, the cadres, the front-line states, the Cubans and Russians as baits and power-factors to negotiate constitutional arrangements with the United Kingdom or Smith, in order to assume the reins of power at the expense of their rivals. Consequently, the various factions have threatened to intensify the war and to produce consequences 'too ghastly to contemplate', and have cried 'wolf' in the form of Cubans, while privately pleading with the United Kingdom or the United States of America to intervene.

## Notes

- 
1. I have dealt elsewhere with the early stages of African resistance to settler conquest and occupation, as well as to colonial administration. I am here dealing with post-Second World War stages of the African liberation struggle against settler rule. See David Chanaiwa, *The Zimbabwe Controversy: A Case of Colonialist Historiography*, Syracuse, Eastern African Studies Program, 1973; *Profiles of Self-Determination, African Responses to European Colonialism in Southern Africa, 1652—Present*, Northridge, Calif. State University Foundation, 1976; and 'The Premiership of Garfield Todd: Racial Partnership versus Colonial Interests', *Journal of Southern African Affairs*, Vol. I, No. 1, December 1976.
  2. For the texts of the Internal Settlement see *Rhodesian Constitutional Agreement, 3rd March, 1978*, Salisbury, Government Printer, 1978, No. 44. Also U.S. Department of State, Bureau of African Affairs, *AF Press Clips*, Vol. XIII, No. 10, 7 March 1978, p. 3.
  3. *Rhodesian Constitutional Agreement*, Section A, Article I, para. a, p. 2.
  4. *Ibid.*, Article 2, p. 3.
  5. *Ibid.*, Sections B and C, pp. 3-4.
  6. *Ibid.*, Section D, Article I, pp. 4-5.
  7. *Ibid.*, Section D, Article 2, p. 5.
  8. *Ibid.*, Section A, Article I, paras. b, c and d, pp. 2-3. The term *European* as used in this Agreement includes whites, coloureds and Asians.
  9. *Ibid.*, Section A, Article I, para. e, p. 3.
  10. All references to the negotiation proceedings are based on confidential correspondence between the author and personal acquaintances very close to the situation. Some of the information was also obtained from the national African-managed and edited newspaper, the *Zimbabwe Times*, which reported some of the proceedings.

11. Personal correspondence and *The Zimbabwe Times*.
12. *Rhodesian Constitutional Agreement*, Section A, Article 6, p. 3.
13. *Ibid.*, Section A, Article 7, p. 3.
14. Godwin Matatu, 'A Consensus of Suspicion', *Africa*, No. 80, April 1978, p. 21. Also David B. Ottaway, 'Rhodesians Sign Pact on Black Rule', *Washington Post*, 4 March 1978, reproduced in *AF Press Clips*, Vol. XIII, No. 10, 7 March 1978, p. 1.
15. Matatu, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
16. For a detailed analysis of the regional policies of the front-line states, consult Agrippah Mugomba, *The Foreign Policy of Despair*, Nairobi, East African Literature Bureau, 1977; and especially 'Zimbabwe, Détente and Neo-Colonialism in Southern Africa', in David Chanaiwa (ed.), *Profiles of Self-Determination*, pp. 415-47.
17. See, for example, 'Rhodesia: Fraught with Imponderables', *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 19, No. 6, 17 March 1978, pp. 1-3. Also, Richard R. Leger, 'All-Parties Rhodesian Peace Conference Eludes Team of U.S.' *AF Press Clips*, Vol. XIII, No. 17, 26 April 1978.
18. Matatu, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
19. 'Rhodesia II: What Owen Really Told Sithole', *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 19, No. 17, 31 March 1978, p. 3.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
23. Matatu, *op. cit.*, p. 22, and *The Times* (London), 13 April 1978.
24. Matatu, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
25. Personal correspondence.
26. Personal interview with Sithole by the author and Dr Agrippah Mugomba at the University of California, Santa Barbara, on 20 November 1977. See also Munger Africana Library Notes, *Zimbabwe's Year of Freedom—Ndabaningi Sithole*, No. 43, January 1978; and *Africa Confidential*, 31 March 1978.
27. *Zimbabwe's Year . . .*, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
29. For details of African nationalism in Zimbabwe during the post-Second World War era, consult Eshmael Mlambo, *Rhodesia: the Struggle for a Birthright*, London, C. Hurst and Co., 1972; Larry W. Bowman, *Politics in Rhodesia*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1973; George M. Daniels (ed.), *Drums of War: The Continuing Crisis in Rhodesia*, New York, The Third Press, 1974; Enoch Dumbutshena, *Zimbabwean Tragedy*, Nairobi, East African Publishing House, 1976; and Ndabaningi Sithole, *African Nationalism*, London, Oxford University Press, 1968.
30. Davis B. C. M'Gabe, 'The Nationalist Movement of Dzimbabwe', in Daniels, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-8.
31. 'Southern Rhodesia African National Congress, Statement of Principles, Policy and Program, September 1957', in T. R. M. Creighton, *The Anatomy of Partnership*, p. 235, London, Faber and Faber, 1960.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 246.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 245.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
36. For details on the Federation and Partnership consult Creighton, *op. cit.*; Mlambo, *op. cit.*; and Nathan Shamuyarira, *Crisis in Rhodesia*, London, André Deutsch, 1965.
37. For details about Todd's premiership and African nationalism, David Chanaiwa, 'The Premiership of Garfield Todd', *op. cit.*
38. M'Gabe, *op. cit.* pp. 29-37; Mlambo, *op. cit.* pp. 136-61.
39. Consult Shamuyarira, *op. cit.* and Chanaiwa, 'The Premiership of Garfield Todd', *op. cit.*

40. M'Gabe, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-37; and Mlambo, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-61.
41. *Southern Rhodesia Constitution, Part. I, Summary of Proposed Changes*, Cmnd. 1399, and *Part. II, Detailed Provisions*, Cmnd. 1400, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1965.
42. *Ibid.*, Part I, pp. 3-14.
43. Mlambo, *op. cit.*, p. 156.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
45. *Daily News*, 8 February 1961.
46. John Day, 'Southern Rhodesia African Nationalists and the 1961 Constitutions', *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 7, 1969, p. 230.
47. *Democratic Voice* (NDP newspaper), August 1961.
48. 'Nkomo Sacked as ZAPU Leader, Sithole Takes Charge until Congress', *Tanganyika Standard*, 10 July 1963.
49. Zambia, Commission on the Assassination of Herbert Chitepo, *Report*, Lusaka, Government Printer, 1 July 1975.
50. Julian Henriques, 'The Struggles of the Zimbabweans: Conflicts Between the Nationalists and with the Rhodesian Regime', *African Affairs*, Vol. 76, No. 305, October 1977, pp. 495-518.
51. *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 19, No. 7, 31 March 1978, p. 2.
52. For example, see *The Zimbabwe Review*, official organ of ZAPU.
53. *Africa Confidential*, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
54. Mlambo, *op. cit.*, p. 195.
55. The Minnesota Coalition on Southern Africa, *Zimbabwe People's Army* Minneapolis, Minn., 1976; *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 19, No. 7, 31 March 1978; Henriques, *op. cit.*; *Observer*, 7 March 1976; and *Guardian*, 9 March 1976 and 29 June 1976.
56. Minnesota Coalition, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
58. *Africa Confidential*, Vol. 19, No. 7, 31 March 1978, pp. 1-2; and 17 March 1978, pp. 1-3.
59. Minnesota Coalition, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
61. *Africa*, No. 65, January 1977, p. 19.
62. *Ibid.*, and No. 74, October 1977.
63. *Ibid.*, No. 65, January 1977, p. 21.

**Part II**  
**The decolonization**  
**of the Horn of Africa**

# **Decolonization in the Horn and the outcome of Somali aspirations for self-determination**

Said Yusuf Abdi

## **Introduction**

Except for the struggles in southern Africa, the conflicts in the Horn are the most explosive in Africa. The Horn has been a meeting place of peoples and cultures since time immemorial and as such the scene of continuing processes both of conflict and assimilation.<sup>1</sup> Modern Somalia is deeply involved in some of these conflicts, notably with its neighbours, Ethiopia and Kenya. This can only be understood as part of a pattern of interrelationships of broad geographical extent and historical depth, a pattern of tensions between nationalities, historical oppressions, struggles against domination, and economic injustices and their opposition.

In these few pages I want to discuss briefly four topics: first, Somali history before colonialism; second, the experience of partition and colonial domination; third, continuing fragmentation and territorial dispersion of Somalis due to decolonization; and finally, those factors that contribute significantly to the solution of the Somali dispute and conflicts in the Horn as a whole.

## **The situation before European colonialism**

Before being colonized in the second part of the nineteenth century, Somalis in the Horn formed a well-defined, autonomous community with a distinctive way of life, language and culture.<sup>2</sup> At the time, i.e. before 1880, the land of the Somalis was known to the outside world as the land of Punt. The Somalis recognized themselves as a well-integrated nation, unified by language, religion, culture, a shared economy and a decentralized political system based on the assembly of clan members (the Shir) common among all the clans. There is ample early historical documentation of the Somali nation, its culture, economic relations, social and political organization, its contiguous habitation, common linguistics, and co-operation against external forces.<sup>3</sup> The Somalis possessed precisely that degree of culturally based national

unity to which the Ethiopians and Kenyans today aspire. From Djibouti in the north to the Tana River (now in Kenya) in the south, to the Awash in the now disputed Ogaden region, they shared a common language, enjoyed a rich oral literature centred on poetic forms, organized communal life around similar egalitarian social institutions, common ancestry and known genealogical relationships.<sup>4</sup>

Related and intertwined with Somali history has been Ethiopian political history. In the fourth century a military aristocracy arose in what is now north-central Ethiopia, whose leaders expanded their rule by conquest over the centuries, incorporating a host of different peoples and ethnic groups in the process. During a series of cyclical expansions and withdrawals, marked by resistance from other nationalities in the Horn, Ethiopia's centre of power moved steadily southward until it reached the present capital of Addis Ababa. An important mark in the long history of successful Ethiopian expansion pertinent to present happenings occurred in 1527, when the Somali leader Ahmed Guray, while resisting Ethiopian expansion, came close to extinguishing the culture of the highlands and replacing it throughout the Horn of Africa with a Somali-dominated state. But the Amhara ruling class survived this threat with Portuguese support, and the Somali expansion was pushed back. Thus the Somali–Ethiopian conflict dates from the early sixteenth century, when cannon supplied by Portugal furthered Ethiopian expansion.

While the fluctuating power of Ethiopia made it impossible for a clear line to be drawn, it was generally true up to the 1970s that the Ogaden (or western Somalia) lay outside the Ethiopian kingdom. Turkey, which earlier had staked a claim to various Red Sea ports, transferred its authority to Egypt's Khedive Ismail in 1866. Then Egypt, after expanding into a few Somali ports like Zeila, Bulhar and Berbera, moved inland to establish a garrison in the ancient commercial city of Harrar. The Egyptians nominated as sultans Somali headmen elected through clan assemblies. But the Egyptians withdrew as a result of the Mahdi revolt in the Sudan in 1886, which required a concentration of Egyptian resources and caused a drastic curtailment of commitments elsewhere. Weak and unarmed, Harrar then, as before Egyptian occupation, was forced to engage itself time and again in defensive armed struggle against the expansionist aggression of Ethiopia.

### **The impact of colonialism**

European contacts with the Horn, except for the early involvement of the Portuguese, were limited until 1869, when the opening of the Suez Canal focused attention upon the area's strategic importance. Somalis became

drawn into a theatre of colonial competition between the United Kingdom, France and Italy. The existing artificial frontiers in the Horn are the result of the European scramble for African territories, when British, French and Italian interests converged competitively in and around the Horn. But two African powers were involved. These were Egypt, though its presence was brief (1866–86), and later and more crucially, Ethiopia. The European scramble coincided with a consolidation of power in Ethiopia under Menelik II and the extension of the central authority. The expansionist campaigns of this emperor took place while the Europeans were partitioning the Somali coast.

Menelik's expansion into Somali-inhabited territories began in 1886, soon after the Egyptian withdrawal from Harrar. This brought into the open the nearly five hundred years of intermittent traditional conflicts of the Somalis with the occupants of the Ethiopian plateau. Harrar, under the Egyptians, had acted as a buffer between the Ethiopians and the Somalis. But the Ethiopians having seized the city (entirely inhabited by Somalis up to then) in 1887, Menelik appointed his cousin, Ras Makonnen, as governor, and set up a stockaded camp to the east at Jijiga. The Somalis, with their large herds, were attacked by parties sent out to raid for meat for the hungry garrison at Harrar. They were forced to pay tribute and to provide livestock for the Ethiopian forces. The Italians, who meanwhile had established themselves in Eritrea, sought arms for Ethiopia under the impression that the Italo-Ethiopian Treaty of 1889 (the Ucciali Treaty) made Ethiopia an Italian protectorate.

In 1890 Italy had sponsored Ethiopian participation in the Brussels General Act, which empowered Ethiopia as a state to import munitions legally, thus legitimizing the active arms trade it had been carrying on for some years with French merchants. The influx of modern weapons completely destabilized the relationship between indigenous forces, enabling Menelik to consolidate his control over the plateau as part of his own imperial mission. In ten years, Menelik doubled the size of the Ethiopian kingdom. The importation of arms resulted in the occupation of the lands of various nationalities not previously part of the empire. However, the British, who were holding the Somali coast, did not allow the importation of arms, and the Somalis, for all their attempts at resistance, were helpless before the Ethiopian soldiers. In addition, the Ethiopians, using their new Italian arms, routed the Italian army at the Battle of Adowa in 1896, resulting in their recognition by European powers as a force to be reckoned with.

The following year, 1897, was a banner year for Ethiopia. Each of its European colonial neighbours pressed for Ethiopian friendship and each contracted with Ethiopia for its claim in Somalia. Though a great year for Ethiopia, it was thus a bad one for the Somalis, who were neither consulted



before nor informed after the agreements. The year 1897 remains the crucial one in the imperial history of the Horn of Africa, and the boundary agreements made then have left a legacy of indetermination and confusion that still poisons relations between Ethiopia and Somalia, and between Somalia and Kenya. By the end of the nineteenth century the Somali people in the Horn were subjected to a multitude of foreign masters. They were divided five ways into British, French and Italian Somalilands, an enclave in Kenya, and another in Ethiopia. The Somalis were carved up in such a way as to leave the great interior to Ethiopia, the coastal blocks to Italy and the United Kingdom, and a small but commercially important piece to France. From 1897 to 1935, with the exception of a 1908 convention between Italy and Ethiopia, clarifying boundaries in certain areas and leaving others vague, the colonial powers retained the political frontiers dividing the Somali people. These boundaries left members of each of the major clans in two or more different jurisdictions.

The 1936 Italo-Ethiopian War, escalating from the Walwal incident (a dispute over Somali wells and pastures), resulted in Italy overrunning Ethiopia and, with the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939, British Somaliland as well. All the Somalis, except those in northern Kenya and French Somaliland, were placed under a single administration. When the Second World War ended in 1945, power passed from the Italians to the British military administration, which was in *de facto* control of all the Somalilands. This would have been a propitious time to unite this culturally, religiously and linguistically homogeneous nation. Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, in 1946, proposed such a union (a rare example of British departure from anti-Somali policies). But his vision carried little weight with the Ethiopians and the French, and the territories, by 1950, returned to the status quo ante. Bevin's proposal was flawed by the provisions requiring Ethiopian agreement and proposing a British trusteeship. Owing to big-power politics within the four-power commission (United Kingdom, France, the United States, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), and deference to Ethiopian claims over Somali interests, the plan failed. More threatening, set against the favourable omens for a unified Somali nation, was the return of Haile Selassie, with his ambitions over Eritrean and Somali territories.<sup>5</sup>

After ceding western Somalia (the Ogaden) in 1948 to Ethiopia, but retaining certain residual rights of supervision over Somali clans in the Haud, the eastern section of the Ogaden, the British Government made a last futile effort to fulfil its original protective treaties with the Somalis by offering to purchase the southern and western grazing areas of the Somali clans, but Haile Selassie rejected the idea. Another significant postwar event for the Somalis was the attempt by the Western Allies to reward and encourage their

former Italian enemies for their departure from fascism, and to discourage any move by them towards communism, by arranging for the return of the former Italian Somaliland to their administration as a United Nations trusteeship to be led to independence over a ten-year period.

### **Somali aspirations during decolonization**

From the beginning of colonization, Somalis had fought without cease for national unity and independence against an overpowering flow of events which resulted in administrative fragmentation of their people. After first vainly appealing to the British and other colonial powers for redress, a sense of peril and injury impelled them to unite under the leadership of Sayid Mohammed Abdullah Hassan, a great Somali poet who had become a national hero.<sup>6</sup> In 1900, only three years after the crucial and tragic events of 1897, a revolt under Sayid Mohammed's leadership marked the first phase of twenty years of armed Somali resistance. From 1900 to 1920, he fought all invaders: Ethiopians, British and Italians. He held the British at bay for twenty years by his great tactical ability and political skill. His aim was the liberation of all Somalis from every alien power. But superior technology in the form of twelve aeroplanes and coastal gunships, the first to be deployed in Africa, caused him to abandon his fortresses, and dispersed the resistance.

However, the Somali resistance to colonial rule continued through successes and failures. It is beyond the scope of this paper to detail both the peaceful and armed perpetual resistance of Somalis in defending themselves and their common civilization against foreign overlordship. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, fruitless petitions to the four-power commission and to the British government by such Somali nationalist groups as the Somali Youth League (formerly the Somali Youth Club) and the National United Front (NUF), bore no fruit. The Somali National League (SNL) in British Somaliland, of which the National United Front had been an organ, then formed a platform calling for immediate independence, while the NUF, which broke away, called for a transitional period of self-government. In an election for a general assembly in early 1960, the SNL, in liaison with the United Somali Party, won thirty-two out of thirty-three seats. The British then accepted their demands and set the date for independence in that same year. Meanwhile, in the Italian trusteeship, the United Nations deadline for independence had arrived, and the Somali Youth League dominated the elections held there. With independence approaching in both territories, the two assemblies reached an accord for unification which was implemented on the day (1 July) that independence came to the south (five days after the northern territory). This unification was not an act of territorial aggrandize-

ment, aggression or expansionism. It was a positive contribution to peace and unity in Africa and was made possible by the application of the principle of the right of self-determination. Two Somali entities divided by colonialism united, pursuant to accords negotiated during the months preceding independence. Fusion of the Protectorate and the Trust Territory was the first step towards the achievement of Somali national unity, and the Somalis were determined it would not be the last.

Since independence, Somalia has championed the cause of self-determination of their co-nationals in Ethiopia and Kenya. Through the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the United Nations and other international forums, through direct negotiations with respective governments, through intermediaries such as Kenneth Kaunda and Julius Nyerere, Somalis have tried to publicize their strong argument for self-determined, unified administration for the culturally homogeneous and territorially contiguous Somali people. Internally, in the Ogaden (western Somalia to the Somali people) and former Northern Frontier District of Kenya (now the North-eastern Province), Somalis have been engaged in armed struggle, fluctuating with the amity or enmity of their antagonists.<sup>7</sup> The majority of the Somalis in the Ethiopian section, especially in the lower and drier areas, never came under effective Ethiopian administration, whose officials could not control the semi-nomadic, culturally proud and resistant Somalis.

After the achievement of independence in two parts of their old political domain, Somalis became more resolved to see their other partitioned kin freed. From the inception of Somalia's autonomy, border clashes began with Ethiopia, but these were relatively low-keyed. However, since Kenya had not yet achieved its independence, the major emphasis in these years was to obtain self-determination for the Somalis annexed to Kenya in the Northern Frontier District.<sup>8</sup> Historically, the NFD had a long history of separate administration, though it was governed with Kenya. Before Kenya's independence, a referendum was carried out by the British, which showed that the NFD population almost unanimously favoured secession from Kenya with the object of ultimately joining the Somali Republic. But the British colonial government refused to abide by this verdict, and the wishes of the Somali population in the NFD were ignored. In addition to insisting that the NFD remain with Kenya, the British also cut off from the new region other ethnic groups akin to the Somalis who shared the same aim. When attempts were made by the Somalis to take arms to liberate themselves, Kenyans, with British aid, used ruthless counter-insurgency techniques to crush Somali nationalism. But for four years, beginning from the period immediately prior to Kenya's independence in December 1963, Somalis waged an armed struggle and launched a series of attacks on Kenyan government installations, including police posts at Rhamu and Liboi, and

penetrated deeper into Kenya with attacks on Marsabit, Isiolo, Lamu and other settlements. In both 1963 and 1967 there were moves towards peaceful negotiations between Somalia and Kenya, though they came to nothing. When the Ogaden war broke out in 1977, however, Kenya became afraid that if it were successful Somalia's next target would be north-eastern Kenya. Thus the Kenyan Government has taken steps reminiscent of those of the early 1960s when Somalis were engaged in guerrilla war in the North-eastern Province. The Kenyans tightened security, lobbied against Western support for Somalia in the Ogaden, and restricted the mobility of the Somali population.

Meanwhile, the French began to lose their hold on French Somaliland, whose principal economic significance was the railway line to Addis Ababa, and therefore the main port for much of Ethiopia. While the population, as the colonial name indicated, was mainly Somali, members of a related but distinct ethnic group, the Afars, had also migrated into the territory from the north and south. Both the French and the Ethiopians, under whose jurisdiction most Afars lived, cultivated Afar leaders in an effort to blunt Somali demands for unification with other Somalis, and to delay independence. In 1967, after a visit by General de Gaulle, the territory was renamed the Territory of the Afars and Issas, and an election for a local parliament held, in which the Somalis complained of widespread disfranchisement and ultimately boycotted the elections. Finally in 1975 independence was granted to the area, now named the Republic of Djibouti. I have discussed this aspect of decolonization in the Horn more fully elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> At the moment, the achievement of self-determination, and a relatively amicable relationship between the two major groups, has blunted demands for Somali unification, though these might arise in the future as a result of irreconcilable contradictions between the two major ethnic groups.

The Somalis' desire to regain their lost independence constitutes a grave future problem for the Somali, Kenyan, Ethiopian and Djiboutian governments. The background history we have recounted must be set against some of the recent difficulties and explosive confrontations in the Horn. The conflicts with Ethiopia and Kenya are no different from the struggles that brought about the end of the British, French and Portuguese empires. The demands for self-determination and independence being voiced by the Somalis are no different in essence (though shades exist) from those being voiced in Namibia and Zimbabwe, with the single exception that the colonizing powers are not Europeans.

### **Conclusion: Somali nationalism and possible future courses of colonial disengagement**

Adequate, concrete and specific terms of settlement for the Horn dispute will only be forthcoming if there is serious willingness and commitment from all parties involved to understand how the unabating and insistent desires of Somalis in the Horn can become the eye in the storm.

First a strong concern of the states in the Horn should be to avoid client-state relationships with the big powers. A key element in the strategy of the superpowers, former colonial powers and emerging powers is to expand military assistance and other economic aid to the Horn in order to create powerful client states. These practices exaggerate regional and local tensions and increase turmoil. Horn problems could be perceived as another test for superpower confrontations. The long-term effect of external power involvement may well be to intensify domestic conflicts in individual states, exacerbate regional tensions and heighten the chances of direct great-power involvement. Superpower policies must be neutralized and made more sensitive to the local nature of conflict formation in the Horn. Raymond L. Thurston, who served as United States Ambassador to Somalia from 1965 to 1968, advocates in relation to American policy that:

The prime objective of the United States should be to remove the Horn of Africa from the zone of strategic and ideological confrontation between the superpowers and to permit the peoples of the area to develop in freedom within boundaries in accordance with ethnic, religious and linguistic, i.e. national, realities. If the United States continues to content itself with pious expressions of hope for a settlement between the disputants and unimaginative support for the territorial status quo in the Horn, it must be prepared to accept an eventual pattern of power, not only in the Horn but in other parts of Africa, adverse to its long-run interests and in the interests and welfare of Africans themselves.<sup>10</sup>

Soviet justifications for protecting Ethiopian territorial integrity are an opportunistic exploitation of African sentiments opposing territorial changes. It should not be forgotten that the USSR supported secession of East Pakistan (Bangladesh) from Pakistan. Soviet and American policies, in order to advance their discordant interests, intensify Horn conflicts. They superimpose their superpower rivalry on conflicts of a local nature.

Secondly, it must be recognized that the OAU's realistic insistence on colonial territorial boundaries encourages the maintenance of political incongruities that weaken Africa and hamper its development. Much Ogaden Somali and Eritrean blood has been shed by their enemies in the name of the OAU principle. African governments are silent and reluctant to discuss these questions meaningfully. Inter-African disputes, foreign intervention, and

nationality repression are all side-stepped by the OAU. The OAU has become a club of governments that depend upon the maintenance of colonial boundaries as a part of the status quo. It is imperative, for it to be an effective peacemaker and unifier of Africa, to recognize that the principle of self-determination applies with equal vigour to all peoples, dependent or independent.

Thirdly, international organizations and world opinion can initiate and implement policies conducive to the resolution of the Horn conflict. The provisions of the United Nations Charter for the direction of international interest upon the conditions of all oppressed nationalities annexed against their wishes would apply with complete propriety to the regions and peoples of Somalia. The Somali position is obviously supported by the rights collated under the heading of self-determination that have been endorsed, not only by all nationalists, but also by the United Nations Charter and repeatedly by the General Assembly, which in Resolution 545 of 5 February 1952 pronounced that the Covenant on Human Rights must contain the provision that 'all peoples shall have the right to self-determination'. Certainly this should apply to a historic nation. In effect, in the draft to the Covenant of Human Rights presented in 1964 to the United Nations, Article I affirms the right of peoples to self-determination, thus giving the principle priority even over the historic Rights of Man, which the United Nations set forth in its declarations of 1948.<sup>11</sup> The Somali demands in western Somalia (Ogaden) and the North-eastern Province in Kenya are thus in accordance with present international law, which recognizes the right to self-determination for people under colonialism. United Nations actions and support for this principle of self-determination would relieve oppressed peoples, liquidate of all forms of colonialism and strengthen the organization's status and operative mechanism.

Finally, long-term, positive and ultimately successful policy for the resolution of the Somali problem may be one that would lead to a resolution of the outstanding problems of the entire Horn. This may involve creation of national political autonomies for all major nationalities within their economically functional, culturally homogeneous, territorially contiguous and administratively effective entities, within larger regional, economic, political and cultural groupings, the form of which could be negotiated through grass-root movements. The Horn of Africa is a natural economic unit, and its people have a great deal in common. Co-operative plans in agriculture as a result of long-term schemes for the development of the Juba and Webi Shebell rivers, efforts for improved range management, co-partnership in oil research, collaboration in the development of the interior and more effective utilization and exploitation of the Red Sea and Indian Ocean, and mutual desires to recast all forms of social underdevelopment,

would all help to meet the needs for the people in the area. Age-old hostilities siphon off most resources into armaments and make the peoples pawns in conflicts among powers that do not consider the interests of the people in the Horn. Higher levels of co-operation are needed in this era of power blocs, where small nations cannot be economically viable, to resolve the Horn's problems and place its people's economic and political destinies in their own hands.

## Notes

---

1. The Horn is more a metaphor, based on the sharp eastward thrust of the African continent near the equator, than a political entity. With no precise western or southern boundaries, it is conveniently thought of as embracing Somalia, Ethiopia (including western Somalia and Eritrea), Djibouti, the north-eastern part of Kenya and sometimes the Sudan.
2. See I. M. Lewis, 'Somaliland Before Partition', *The Modern History of Somaliland* pp. 18-39, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1965.
3. Among these, I recommend especially *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, by a Greek mariner (A.D. 60); the writings of Arab medieval scholars, including Al-Yaqubi (ninth century), Al-Masudi (A.D. 933), Al-Istakhri (960), Ibn Hawgal (977), Al-Barruni (1030), Al-i-drissi (1154), Yaqut (1229), Ib-Said (1344), Ibna Battuta (1331), Al-Harrani (1344), and *The Book of the Zengi*; Chinese contacts with Somalis recorded in Tuan Cheng-shih's *Yu-Yang-tsa-tsu* (ninth century) and in the journals of Cheng-Ho, who made three visits to Somalia in the early 1400s; and some records of Portuguese visits from the late 1400s onwards. Some of the more distant history of the Somalis has been reconstructed from oral sources, genealogical accounts and linguistic analyses. Other Western publications about early history may be found in I. M. Lewis's annotated bibliography in his *Peoples of the Horn of Africa*, London, Lowe and Brydone, 1955.
4. Despite the Somalis' common ancestry and cultural bonds they were divided into five large clan families, Hawiye, Darod, Isaaq, Dir, and the Digil-Rahanweyn (which were closely akin). These bigger clans were subdivided into smaller clans and in turn into patriarchal families. Although distinctions and allegiances based on clan-group affiliation are now illegal in the Somali Republic, such distinctions in past history were occasionally sources of internal friction and segmentation. In discussing Somali unity, the author does not ignore or de-emphasize George Simmel's thesis that contradiction and conflict are operative in unity at every moment of its existence. Internal quarrels among Somali groups have always been present and could persist in the future. But dominating everything else, Somalis are united in language, culture, egalitarian social, political and economic institutions, common ancestry, and millennial habitation of contiguous areas.
5. Key words from Haile Selassie's mobilization proclamation in 1935 were: 'Italy prepares a second time to violate our territory . . . soldiers, gather around your chiefs and thrust back the invader. You shall have lands in *Eritrea* and your *Somaliland*.' (Emphasis added.)
6. Of the many writings on Sayid Mohammed, two Western references, which despite their derogatory titles try to detail his campaigns, are Douglas Jardine, *The Mad Mullah of Somaliland*, London, 1923, and Robert L. Hess, 'The Poor Man of God: Muhammad Abdulla Hassan', in Norman R. Bennett (ed.), *Leadership in Eastern Africa: Six Biographies*, Boston, Boston University Press, 1968. Again see 'The Dervish Fight for Freedom: 1900-20', in Lewis, op. cit.

7. For the western Somali struggle, see Hussein M. Adam and Bobe, 'The Western Somali Liberation Front', *Halgan*, September 1977; 'An Interview with WSLF', by an unnamed American professor, in *The Horn of Africa*, Vol. 1, No. 2, April/June; and 'Voices of the Ogaden', *West Africa*, 6 February 1978.
8. For early Somali dissatisfaction in the Northern Frontier District see E. R. Turton, 'The Isaq Somali Diaspora and Poll-Tax Agitation in Kenya, 1936-41', *African Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 292, July 1974. Ample additional documentation exists in the *East African*, *Somali*, *Ethiopian* and some *Soviet* and *Western* newspapers and periodicals of the time.
9. Said Yusuf Abdi, 'Independence for the Afars and Issas: Complex Background, Uncertain Future', *Africa Today*, Vol. 24, No. 1, January/March 1977; and 'Mini-Republic of Djibouti: Problems and Prospects', *The Horn of Africa*, April/June 1978.
10. Raymond L. Thurston 'The United States, Somalia and the Crisis in the Horn,' *The Horn of Africa*, April/June 1978, p. 20.
11. 'All people have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.'



# The survival of the national culture in Somalia during and after the colonial era

B. W. Andrzejewski

While various aspects of the history of Somalia have received attention in scholarly literature,<sup>1</sup> the process of the country's cultural decolonization has not been discussed anywhere in detail. This process consisted in preserving and strengthening the national culture against the inroads of colonial influences, which Jaamac Cumar Ciise, a Somali historian who until 1972 wrote in Arabic, has aptly described as *al-isti'mâr al-fikrî*, 'the colonization of thought'. In the following passage from a work published in 1965 he elucidates the meaning of this phrase in his usual vivid style, portraying some unnamed, sophisticated colonial leader as he addresses his colleagues and recommends the most effective treatment of the subject population:

The Western people colonized the Eastern people by power, but power does not endure: it moves from one nation to another. In my opinion it is the colonization of thought that endures. Publicize the good qualities which you have and the shortcomings they have, and conceal your shortcomings and their good qualities. After that they will look upon you with admiration and upon themselves they will look with contempt.<sup>2</sup>

This overvaluation of what is foreign and undervaluation of what is Somali has also been referred to more recently as *gumeysi maskaxeed*, 'the colonization of the brain', in the Somali mass media.

Let us examine now the main aspects of cultural colonization in Somalia. Before 1940 very little modern education had been introduced anywhere in the Somali-speaking territories, but the Second World War brought substantial changes in this field. A modern type of education gradually began to develop, which in the 1950s had reached a point where a network of government schools up to secondary level had been built up, both by the British and the Italian administrations, while in Mogadishu steps were also taken to develop some branches of higher education, such as law, economics and public administration. The medium of instruction was English or Italian, according to the language of the administration, and the curricula were inspired almost entirely by the British and Italian education systems, with only minor concessions to the culture of the students, such as the

teaching of the Islamic religion and Arabic and the inclusion of some elements of local history or folklore with a minimalistic bias. The highest goal presented to the students was the passing of the foreign examinations that would allow them to enter foreign universities, and as a result those young people who went to school knew a great deal about the cultures their expatriate teachers brought to them and very little about their own. In fact, their constant preoccupation with the passing of examinations related to these curricula made it difficult for them to absorb even the rudiments of their own national culture from their parents and kinsmen. Furthermore, young Somalis learning such subjects as mathematics, science or technology through the medium of foreign languages soon discovered that the concepts used in these branches of knowledge had no words in Somali that could express them, and they were thus left with the impression that their mother tongue was inadequate and inherently inferior to the foreign languages they learned. This was sometimes aggravated by the lack of linguistic sophistication of some expatriate teachers, who spoke of Somali as being merely a 'dialect' and not a language. Even worse was the situation with regard to the teaching of literature, for very few expatriate teachers had a knowledge of the Somali language and even fewer were acquainted with its poetry. Their Somali students were often so alienated from their own cultural background and so ignorant of their own poetic idiom that the more naïve among them imagined that the poems of foreign writers, which they studied for advanced examinations, were aesthetically superior to those of even the best poets of Somalia.

Success within this educational system offered substantial rewards in terms of opportunities for government and business employment and scholarships for higher education abroad. These incentives increased with the approaching date of independence and strengthened the motivation to obtain good examination results and to become proficient in a foreign language. The foreign type of education also favoured the imitation of foreign styles of life among the alumni of the government schools, and such styles often led to a desire for the elevated standard of living enjoyed by the expatriate employees whom they were to replace.

It may seem paradoxical that the degree of cultural colonization increased in Somalia after 1960, the year of independence, and continued to do so until the revolutionary government took over in 1969 and began to take steps designed to halt it. There can be little doubt that one of the main causes of the continuation of the totally foreign system of education even in independent Somalia was the lack of a national orthography for the Somali language, and for this shortcoming the foreign administrations were not directly responsible. Already in the early 1920s an excellent and highly efficient system of writing Somali had been invented by Cismaan Yuusuf

Keenadiid, using completely new symbols, while in 1932/33 a system using the Arabic alphabet was developed by Maxamed Cabdi Makaahiil. In 1951, a two-year research project was completed on a Roman orthography for Somali at the Department of Education in the British Protectorate, and this was later developed further by two eminent Somali scholars, Muuse Xaaji Ismaaciil Galaal and Shire Jaamac Axmed. Yet all these systems, and several others, met with the fierce hostility of one or other sections of the Somali public, and only the revolutionary government was able to resolve these conflicts and to introduce a national orthography in Roman script.<sup>3</sup>

Nearly thirty years of a foreign type of education in this crucial period in the development of the country would most probably have caused irreversible damage to the Somali national culture had it not been for the zeal and the dedicated labours of Somali poets, playwrights and collectors of oral literature.

### The role of poets

Since as far back in history as oral traditions can reach, the Somali people have had a vigorous poetic art. Before the Second World War two types of oral poetry were practised, the classical genres and the so-called 'miniature' genres. The former, among which the *gabay*, the *jiifto*, the *guurow*, the *geeraar* and the *buraanbur* are the best known, were in the main the poetry of the public forum, which commented on current events and often influenced them. The best practitioners of these genres had such prestige and popularity that they could, through oral transmission, reach the large masses of the public even over great distances. The miniature genres, though equally cherished, were concerned with matters of lesser import, such as entertainment at dances or providing relief for monotonous pursuits, for instance watering camels, weaving mats, poundings cereals, rowing or long-distance marching.

In the public recitation of the classical genres there is one feature that is not always present in the oral poetry of other countries: the reciters regard verbatim memorization of the poet's words as the ideal, and their reputations depend on this, for among their audiences they are likely to find people who have memorized the particular poem previously and will hotly challenge any deviations from what they believe to be the original version. Memorization is helped by the fact that classical poems are seldom longer than 500 lines, with about 200 lines as the average, and that they have an alliteration that is the same in all the lines; poems with short lines must have at least one word beginning with the chosen sound in each line, while poems with longer lines divided by a caesura must have such a word in each half-line. In addition to

this constraint, classical poetry has strict quantitative patterns which, though not easy to handle, act as a further mnemonic aid. All these features of the classical genres have without doubt contributed to the richness of the poetic language, which on the one hand preserves many lexical and grammatical archaisms and on the other contains words newly coined by the poets to meet the demands of alliteration and scansion.

To practise the rich and beautiful classical poetry or even to understand and enjoy it, the listener has to develop a thorough familiarity with its special vocabulary and idiom, much of which is connected with pastoral life. Young people in government schools, preoccupied with the passing of foreign examinations, had no time, and young workers in the fast-growing townships were too far removed from the traditional environment, to keep in touch with the poetic heritage of their country, and a total cultural split might have occurred had it not been for the modern poets who arose to meet the challenge of the times. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a new type of poetry began to be practised, mainly in towns, and it acquired the name of *heello* from the meaningless words '*heellooy, heelleellooy*' that always preceded its recitation as a kind of signature tune. The *heello* soon attracted poets of talent and reached great heights of aesthetic achievement, even though it relaxed greatly the constraints of scansion characteristic of the classical genres. It freed itself to a large extent from the burden of an archaic vocabulary and idiom and thus became readily intelligible to people who no longer had their roots in rural life. It is worthy of note that the *heello* poets, far from being antagonistic to the poets using classical genres, admired them greatly and often drew their inspiration from them, especially in the field of poetic imagery. Some of the *heello* poets also composed occasionally in the classical genres, thus becoming living bridges between the gradually diverging cultures of rural and urban Somalia.<sup>4</sup>

The success of the *heello* was also due to the fact that, although it began as love poetry, it soon became the poetry of the public forum and its overt love themes were put to use as convenient covers for disseminating patriotic political propaganda so well disguised that it often deceived the censors. It also provided excellent programme material for broadcasting, or for entertainment in cafés, restaurants or even barbershops, as the poems were normally sung to the accompaniment of instrumental music. By the late 1950s, one could find more *heello* poets and performers at broadcasting stations than news-readers or commentators, while from time to time, especially on solemn occasions, practitioners of the classical genres were invited to broadcast.

The association between poets and broadcasters had more than one beneficial consequence. As poets had always been regarded as the guardians of the purity of the language, they quite naturally took over the role of arbiters

of excellence at the broadcasting stations. Professional broadcasters not only deferred to their judgement but asked for their advice in the exacting task of translating world news bulletins for the general public, most of whom were pastoralists and subsistence farmers. The Somali language had to expand its vocabulary either by borrowing from foreign languages or by coining new words from existing resources, and the daily contact with poets made the second of these two choices inevitable. During the period between 1940 and 1972, the broadcasters created a whole new vocabulary of modern terms, mostly of pure Somali origin, by combining existing roots and affixes in new ways, compounding words, reviving archaisms and shifting the semantic ranges of ordinary words to new, specialized meanings.<sup>5</sup> They were so efficient in their work of modernizing the language that when written Somali was introduced in 1972 the newly born press had at its disposal all the modern terms necessary for writing about current affairs at home and abroad with ease and with the certainty of being understood by the general public, who even in the remotest districts had always listened to the radio.

The broadcasters also set the pattern of lexical expansion, which was followed by Somali educationalists, after the introduction of the national orthography, in the creation of a new vocabulary for mathematics, science and linguistics. The new terms again show their creators' reliance on the rich resources of the Somali language, and include only a modicum of borrowed international terms, such as the words for 'logarithm', 'atom' and the elements.<sup>6</sup> It is not surprising, given the Somali cultural scene, to find that a professor of mathematics at the National University, Maxamuud Nuur Caalim, is also a poet and composes poems in alliterative verse that comment on or explain mathematical operations.

At times the influence of poets in the process of cultural decolonization has been direct. In 1960 one of the leading poets, Cali Sugulle, openly censured the preference given in government employment to people who knew English or Italian well, and questioned the value of a foreign type of education. The refrain of the poem appealed so much to the Somali public that it has acquired the currency of a proverb: 'Does knowledge mean knowing a foreign language?' In other lines he uses such strongly emotive statements as: 'We are slaves to the language of foreigners/Demented by thirst we have lost our way.'<sup>7</sup>

### **The role of playwrights**

A relatively recent innovation, barely thirty-five years old, is the Somali theatre, which provides highly popular entertainment, especially in towns, and

successfully competes with feature films, as these are all foreign. The important, serious parts of plays are in alliterative verse, but these are interspersed with light, often humorous scenes in prose; the plots usually deal with topical subjects or everyday situations, and contain didactic and reformist messages, which many playwrights like to put over through satire.<sup>8</sup> Among their favourite targets is the indiscriminate use of foreign words and phrases by some townspeople, whom they depict as pompous fools, as in a scene from the popular play *Shabeelnaagood* (Leopard among the Women) by Xasan Sheekh Muumin. A Somali woman doctor comes to visit a girl and talks to her mother in a ridiculous mixture of Somali and English, finally even admitting, during a discussion of the girl's diet, that he has forgotten the Somali name of one of the favourite local dishes, for which the mother roundly scolds her.<sup>9</sup>

Sometimes playwrights show the tragic effects of imported customs in a direct way, and a play by Cali Sugulle, *Kalahaab iyo kalahaad* (Wide Apart and Flown Asunder), centres on the evil effects on the hero of drinking alcohol.<sup>10</sup> Straightforward protest can also be found, and in *Samawada*, which takes its title from the name of the heroine, Axmed Cartan Xaange attacks the arrogance of foreign teachers. In one scene his heroine, who is a schoolgirl engaged in a clandestine patriotic movement during the early stages of the post-war Italian administration, walks out of the classroom angered by these words of her teacher:

In matters of culture there is no country and no nation which excels Italy. We brought the light of knowledge to the whole of Europe. The light which we have raised high has illumined every region, including Africa. Julius Caesar, Michelangelo, Dante, Garibaldi—who has not heard about these immortal men! It has been the good fortune of Somalia to have been linked with Italy!<sup>11</sup>

## **The role of collectors of oral literature**

While the activities of poets and playwrights had an immediate influence on the process of cultural decolonization, the work of the collectors of oral literature had a delayed but no less beneficial effect. In the early 1950s a number of Somalis had become increasingly aware that this great national heritage was in danger, especially in its older layers, of being considerably eroded. Working in their spare time and at their own expense, and using the various scripts available to them at the time, they began to write down materials from poetry reciters and narrators; by the mid-1950s they were greatly aided in their task by the advent of portable tape-recorders. When Somalia became independent several collectors were offered employment in

the newly formed Cultural Department of the Ministry of Education so that they could continue this useful work; in 1973, responsibility for it was transferred to the Academy of Culture, a research and publishing institute set up by the Somali government after the Ministry of Education was reorganized.

Although the work of collecting oral literature was thus aided and subsidized by the state, there were also still some private collectors, who were often no less efficient than their professional colleagues. Since 1950, a very large body of works has been written down, and after the introduction of a national orthography some of it began to appear in books, journals and newspapers. Even more importantly, these materials became available for the education system when the Somali language and literature became subjects in schools, adult evening classes and at the National University.

At the very beginning of this campaign of preserving oral literature a wholesome theoretical approach developed in Somalia, thanks to the labours of such scholars as Muuse Xaaji Ismaaciil Galaal, Shire Jaamac Axmed, Xirsi Magan, Jaamac Cumar Ciise, Cumar Aw Nuux and others.<sup>12</sup> They were aware that collecting just the oral texts, especially in the case of poetry, would not be enough, since though the words would be preserved their true meaning might be lost. As most oral poets of the past who used the classical genres were deeply involved in the public affairs of their time, their works are full of references to people, places and events that no longer form part of general knowledge, while their language is often archaic and includes words that are no longer understood or need elucidation. To cope with all these problems, the Somali collectors also gathered factual information about history, obsolete customs, topography and the meaning of archaic words, and thanks to their labours extensive commentaries are available in Somali schoolbooks on the older works of oral literature.

The verbatim mode of memorizing oral poetry enables the names of individual authors to be known and preserved, and in fact there has always existed in Somali culture an unwritten copyright law that makes it obligatory for poetry reciters to name the poet at each performance of his work. The collectors took cognizance of this valuable convention, and today works of the Somali oral poets are presented in schools, colleges and by the mass media not as nameless items of traditional folklore, but rightly as individual, historically attested pieces of art poetry. In classrooms, young Somalis now have a basis of comparison with the foreign authors who, during the period of cultural colonization, formed their exclusive reading matter. This is not only intellectually beneficial but gives them a sense of cultural self-reliance and strengthens the links between the new generation and the traditional culture, which is still to a large extent preserved in the rural areas.

## Notes

In the list of references that follows these notes Somali names are given in their customary order and are not inverted, since surnames are not normally used in Somalia. Somalis writing in a foreign language usually adapt the spelling of their names to the pronunciation conventions of that language and this, combined with the lack of an official Somali orthography before 1972 and the need of transliteration from non-Roman scripts, can lead to confusion. In this article, the spelling of Somali names according to the Somali national orthography is regarded as standard. Spellings that diverge from this are cross-referenced in the list of references. The orthographic version is given first and the sign // is placed before the divergent version.

In the notes, bibliographical reference items are identified by the name of the author and the year of their appearance. In the case of non-Somali authors only the surname is cited, while Somali names are given in full. Somali government publications in which authors are not named are entered under the heading 'Somalia' in lieu of name. Translations of titles given in brackets are explanatory; they do not appear on the title-pages of the works concerned.

1. Among the most significant works on Somali history are four by Jaamac Cumar Ciise (1965*a*, 1965*b*, 1972, 1976), the first three of which are in Arabic and the last in Somali. There are also two other historical works in Somali those by Axmed Faarax Ibraahin (1974) and Faarax Maxamed J. Cawl (1978); the latter is a popularizing book that makes good use of oral poetry as source material. Foreign works concerned with Somali history that are particularly noteworthy are those by Cerulli (1957, 1959), Hess (1966), Kostecki (1966), Lewis (1965) and Martin (1976); bibliographies given in them can be further supplemented by consulting Maxamed Khaliif Salaad (1977) and Castagno (1975).
2. Jaamac Cumar Ciise (1965*a*, p. 12). The original text runs as follows:

استعمار الغربي الشرقي بالقوة والقوة لا تدوم بل تنتقل من أمة إلى أخرى ، اما الاستعمار الدائم في رأيي فهو الاستعمار العسكري ،  
فانتشروا محاسنكم ومساوتهم وادفئوا مساوتكم ومحاسنهم وبعد ذلك ينظر اليكم بين الاكابر وينظرون الى أنفسهم بعين  
الاحتقار .

3. Information concerning methods of writing Somali which preceded the national orthography can be found in Andrzejewski (1954, 1974, 1978), Andrzejewski, Strelcyn and Tubiana (1969), Cerulli (1959, 1964) and Moreno (1955). Accounts of the dispute about the choice of script are provided in Andrzejewski (1964), and in greater detail in Xuseen M. Aadan (1968) and Laitin (1977). The introduction of the national orthography and its positive results are described in Andrzejewski (1974, 1977*a*), Cumar Cismaan Maxamed (1975) and Somalia (1974*a*, 1974*b*, 1974*c*). Note that Somali is now the official language in Somalia and the medium of instruction in schools.
4. For general accounts of Somali poetry see Andrzejewski (1972), Andrzejewski and Lewis (1964), Axmed Cartan Xaange (1973), Axmed Cartan Xaange, Muuse X. I. Galaal and Cumar Aw Nuux (1970), Cerulli (1964), Cabdisalaan Yaasiin Maxamed (1977) and Finnegan (1978). Special attention is given to classical genres in Andrzejewski and Lewis (1964) and to miniature ones in Andrzejewski (1967), Cumar Aw Nuux (1970) and Johnson (1972); modern poetry is described in detail in Johnson (1974) and Cabdisalaan Yaasiin Maxamed (1973). A description of Somali scansion is found in Johnson (1978). The verbatim mode of memorization and transmission of oral poems aimed at by Somali reciters has recently attracted theoretical interest. It was previously assumed by some scholars that in all oral poetry only the themes and some recurrent formulae were transmitted from mouth to mouth and that every new performance was to a large extent an improvisation. The universality of this assumption is challenged in Finnegan (1977), where Somali poetry, together with that of other cultures, provides the basis for discussion.



5. For details see Andrzejewski (1971).
6. These methods are described in Andrzejewski (1977a, 1978).
7. Johnson (1974, p. 110). In the original the refrain is *Af qalaad aqoontu miyaa?* The two lines cited are: *Af shisheeye addoon ayaynu addoon u nahee!* *Waan asqaysannahee*. Note that the second line admits of more than one interpretation and this accounts for some divergence in my translation from that of Johnson
8. An account of the Somali drama and its development is given in the introduction to Xasan Sheekh Muumin (1974).
9. Xasan Sheekh Muumin (1974, Scene 5).
10. This play was performed in Mogadishu in 1966. A tape recording of its performance is available in the Tape Library, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
11. Cumar Cartan Xaange (1968, p. 14). The original text is as follows: *Xagga ilbaxnimada dal iyo dad ka horreeya italiya ma jiro, reer Yurub oo idil annagaa ku shaacinnay iftiinka aqoonta. Ilayskaannu saruu qaadnay ifkiisii geyi kastuu gaarey, Afrikana haku jirtee. Julio Cesare, Michelangelo, Dante, Garibaldi—yaa nafloo aan ka sheekaqabin madhintaalkaas! Cawiyo ayaan bay lahayd Somaliya markay ku xiriirsantay italiya.*
12. The work of Somali collectors is described in Andrzejewski (1975, 1977b) and Johnson (1973).

## References

- 
- A. ARTAN. c. [1973]. *Somali Folklore; Dance, Music, Song*. Mogadishu, the National Theatre.
- ABDISALAM YASSIN MOHAMED. 1973. *Political Themes and Imagery in Modern Somali Poetry*. Plainesfield, Vt., Vermont College. (B.A. thesis)
- . 1977. *Sufi Poetry in Somali: Its Themes and Imagery*. London, University of London. (Ph.D. thesis.)
- AHMED ARTAN HANGE, MUSA H. I. GALAAL, OMAR AU NUH. 1974. Fol'klor v žizni somalijcev [Folklore in the Life of the Somalis]. *Učënyje zapiski Sovetsko-Somalijskoj Ekspedicii*. Moscow, Akademija Nauk SSSR, Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka', pp. 296–306. Translated and edited with a commentary by E. S. Serr.
- ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. W. 1954. Some Problems of Somali Orthography. *Somaliland Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 34–47.
- . 1964. Speech and Writing Dichotomy as the Pattern of Multilingualism in the Somali Republic. *Colloque sur le multilinguisme: Deuxième Réunion du Comité Inter-africain de Linguistique, Brazzaville 16–21.VII.1962*, pp. 177–81, London, Scientific Council for Africa and Committee for Technical Co-operation in Africa, Publication No. 87.
- . 1967. The Art of the Miniature in Somali Poetry. *African Language Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 5–16.
- . 1971. The Role of Broadcasting in the Adaptation of the Somali Language to Modern Needs. In: W. H. Whiteley (ed.), *Language Use and Social Change: Problems of Multilingualism with Special Reference to Eastern Africa. Studies Presented and Discussed at the Ninth International African Seminar at University College, Dar es Salaam, December 1968*, pp. 262–73. London, Oxford University Press.
- . 1972. Poetry in Somali Society. In: J. B. Pride, and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*, pp. 252–9. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- . 1974. The Introduction of a National Orthography for Somali. *African Language Studies*, Vol. XV, pp. 199–203.
- . 1975. The Rise of Written Somali Literature. *African Research and Documentation*, No. 8/9, pp. 7–14.

- . 1977a. Five Years of Written Somali: A Report on Progress and Prospects. *I.A.I. Bulletin: African Studies, Notes and News*, Supplement to *Africa*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 4–5.
- . 1977b. The Somali Academy of Culture. *I.A.I. Bulletin: African Studies, Notes and News*, Supplement to *Africa*, Vol. 47, No. 1, p. 7.
- . 1978. The Development of a National Orthography in Somalia and the Modernization of the Somali Language. *Horn of Africa*.
- ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. W.; LEWIS, I. M. 1964. *Somali Poetry: An Introduction*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- ANDRZEJEWSKI, B. W.; STRELCYN, S.; TUBIANA, J. 1969. Somalia: The Writing of Somali. *Somaliya: Antologia Storico-Culturale*, No. 7/8, pp. 215–34. Mogadishu, Ministero Pubblica Istruzione, Dipartimento Culturale. (Reprinted from Unesco Report WS/0866.90.CLT., Paris, 1966.)
- AXMED CARTAN XAANGE//A. ARTAN//AXMED CARTAN XANGE.
- AXMED CARTAN XAANGE, MUUSE X. I. GALAAL, CUMAR AW NUUX//AHMED ARTAN HANGE, MUSA H. I. GALAAL, OMAR AU NUH.
- AXMED CARTAN XANGE. 1968. *Samawada* [a woman's name]. Mogadishu.
- AXMED FAARAX IBRAAHIN. 1974. *Taariikhda guud ee Afrika bilowgeedii ilaa qarnigii 19aad* [General History of Africa from the Beginning to the Nineteenth Century]. Mogadishu, Madbacadda Qaranka Soomaaliyeed.
- CABDISALAAN YAASIIN MAXAMED//ABDISALAM YASSIN MOHAMED.
- CASTAGNO, M. 1975. *Historical Dictionary of Somalia*. Metuchen, N.J., The Scarecrow Press.
- CERULLI, E. 1957, 1959, 1964. *Somalia: Scritti vari editi ed inediti*. Rome, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato.
- CUMAR AW NUUX//OMAR AU NUH.
- CUMAR CISMAAN MAXAMED//OMAR OSMAN MOHAMED.
- FAARAX MAXAMED J. CAWL. 1978. *Garbadaubkii gumeysiga* [The Manacles of Colonialism]. Mogadishu, Akadeemiyaha Dhaqanka, Wasaaradda Hiddaha iyo Tacliinta Sare.
- FINNEGAN, R. 1977. *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- FINNEGAN, R. (ed.). 1978. *The Penguin Book of Oral Poetry*. London, Allen Lane, Penguin Books.
- HASSAN SHEIKH MUMIN. 1974. *Leopard Among the Women: Shabeelnaagood—A Somali Play*. Trans. with an introduction by B. W. Andrezejewski. London, Oxford University Press.
- HESS, R. L. 1966. *Italian Colonialism in Somalia*. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
- HUSSEIN M. ADAM. 1968. *A Nation in Search of a Script: The Problem of Establishing a National Orthography for Somali*. Makerere, University of East Africa. (M.A. Thesis.)
- JAAMAC CUMAR CIISE//JĀMA' 'UMAR 'ISĀ.
- JAAMAC CUMAR CIISE. 1976. *Taariikhdiidii Daraawiishta iyo Sayid Maxame Cabdulle Xasan (1895–1921)* [The History of the Dervishes and Sayid Maxamed Cabdulle Xasan (1895–1921)]. Mogadishu, Akadeemiyaha Dhaqanka, Wasaaradda Hiddaha iyo Tacliinta Sare.
- JAMA' 'UMAR 'ISĀ. 1965a. *Ta'riikh al-Sūmāl fī 'l-'usūr al-wustā wa 'l-hadītha* [The History of Somalia in Medieval and Modern Times]. Cairo, Matbatat al-Imam.
- . 1965b. *'Uzama' al-ḥarakat al-siyāsiyya fī 'l-Sūmāl* [The Leaders of Political Action in Somalia]. [Mogadishu.]
- . 1972. *Thawra 21 Uktūbir 1969: Asbābuhā, ahdāfuhā, munjazātuhā* [The Revolution of 21 October 1969: Its Causes, Aims and Achievements]. Mogadishu, Wazārat al-Tarbiyya wa 'l-Ta'līm.
- JOHNSON, J. W. 1969. A Bibliography of the Somali Language and Literature. *African Language Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 279–97.

- . 1972. The Family of Miniature Genres in Somali Oral Poetry. *Folklore Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 79–99.
- . 1973. Research in Somali Folklore. *Research in African Literatures*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 51–61.
- . 1974. *Heellooy heelleellooy: The Development of the Genre Heello in Modern Somali Poetry*. Bloomington, Indiana University Publications. (Distribution: Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, N.J.)
- . 1978. Somali Prosodic Systems. Paper delivered at the Ninth Annual Conference of African Linguistics, 7–9 April. East Lansing, Michigan State University.
- KOSTECKI, A. M. 1966. *Somalia: Zarys historyczno-polityczny* [Somalia: A Historico-political Outline]. Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- LAITIN, D. D. 1977. *Politics, Language and Thought: the Somali Experience*. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
- LEWIS, I. M. 1965. *The Modern History of Somaliland: From Nation to State*. London, Weidenfeld Nicolson. (Republished in a revised and enlarged version in 1979 by Longmans, London.)
- MARTIN, B. G. 1976. *Muslim Brotherhoods in 19th-century Africa*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MAXAMED KHALIF SALAAD//MOHAMED KHALIEF SALAD.
- MOHAMED KHALIEF SALAD. 1977. *Somalia: A Bibliographical Survey*. Westport, Connecticut and London, Greenwood Press.
- MORENO, M. M. 1955. *Il somalo della Somalia*. Rome, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato.
- OMAR AU NUH. 1970. *Some General Notes on Somali Folklore*. Mogadishu.
- OMAR OSMAN MOHAMED. 1975. *From Written Somali to Rural Development Campaign*. Mogadishu, Somali Institute of Development Administration and Management.
- SOMALIA. 1974a. *Five Years of Revolutionary Progress*. Mogadishu, Ministry of Information and National Guidance.
- . 1974b. *Our Revolutionary Education: Its Strategy and Objectives*. Mogadishu, Ministry of Information and National Guidance.
- . 1974c. *The Writing of the Somali Language: A Great Landmark in Our Revolutionary History*. Mogadishu: Ministry of Information and National Guidance.
- XASAN SHEEKH MUUMIN//HASSAN SHEIKH MUMIN.
- XUSEEN M. AADAN//HUSSEIN M. ADAM.

# **Decolonization of Ethiopia, 1940–55**

Richard Pankhurst

## **Introduction**

Ethiopia, though among the oldest states on the African continent, and one of the few African members of the pre-war League of Nations, faced major but still often little appreciated problems of decolonization in the decade and a half covered by this paper. The struggle for decolonization or, as it was then regarded, the resumption of national sovereignty, as well as the restoration of what it considered lost territory, was in fact a major feature of Ethiopian Government policy after the Second World War, and one to which most other considerations were subordinated.

The paper seeks to show that decolonization in Ethiopia was by no means the swift and automatic process often assumed, but a protracted one, carried out in several stages and only in the face of considerable external opposition.

## **The Second World War**

The Second World War, as far as Ethiopia was concerned, began on 3 October 1935, when the army of Mussolini's Italy invaded the country from the north (Eritrea) and south (Italian Somaliland). Though confronted with the most powerful army up to that time deployed on the continent, the Ethiopians offered stiff resistance to the invaders, who, enjoying vast superiority of fire-power and making extensive use of aircraft, high explosives and poison gas, nevertheless advanced. The forces of Emperor Haile Selassie were defeated in April 1936, after which the Ethiopian ruler fled into exile (where he was to address the League of Nations in Geneva). The Italians entered Addis Ababa on 5 May, and four days later Mussolini proclaimed the creation of a fascist empire in East Africa.

Though the Italians had captured the Ethiopian capital in little more than half a year of operations, they encountered vigorous resistance in the interior, particularly in Shoa, Gojam and Begemder, where patriot leaders were quick to emerge. An attempt on the life of the Italian viceroy,

Rodolfo Graziani, by two Eritreans in Addis Ababa in February 1937 was followed by ferocious retaliation in which several thousand Ethiopians were massacred. This and other acts of fascist terrorism increased popular resistance. Graziani found it impossible to crush the Ethiopian patriots. He was accordingly replaced by the Duke of Aosta, who attempted a somewhat more liberal policy in the hope of placating opposition. But the patriots continued their struggle.

The world had meanwhile recognized the Italian 'conquest' of Ethiopia, the United Kingdom, for example, doing so in November 1938. The patriots were, however, still in the field. Their presence prevented the realization of all but a few of Mussolini's dreams of empire, and placed the fascist regime in East Africa in an unenviable position should the Duce ever decide to embroil himself in a major European conflict.

After the outbreak of the European war, in September 1939, the Emperor, then in exile in the United Kingdom, offered his services to the British Government, but the latter, anxious to avoid offending Mussolini, vouchsafed no reply.

A major change in the situation was, however, brought about by Mussolini's decision, on 10 June 1940, to declare war on the United Kingdom and France. This action gave immediate comfort to the Ethiopian patriots. After four years of lonely struggle they saw that they at last had allies, or, more exactly, that their enemies, the Italians, had new enemies. Letters from the British in the Sudan soon reached the Patriots promising them help 'to destroy the common enemy'.<sup>1</sup> Similar messages were received from the French at Djibouti. The massive Italian armies in East Africa found themselves, on the other hand, isolated from their home country and faced with mounting insurrection, fanned by the British and French, which was soon to spread to Italy's 'native' forces.

Despite promises of Allied support, it was not long before the Ethiopians discovered that the restoration of pre-war sovereignty—decolonization, as it would now be called—was far from easy, for the British Government, though anxious to embarrass the enemy by what they regarded as insurgency, showed no willingness to withdraw their recognition of the Italian 'conquest'. Many British colonial officers in the Sudan, Kenya and elsewhere had, moreover, as Alan Moorhead, a contemporary writer, noted, 'a great deal of sympathy for the Italian settlers and administrators . . . who in the few years they had been in Abyssinia were making a titanic effort to produce another model colony.'<sup>3</sup>

The British, it soon became clear, were most reluctant to accord the Emperor or his government any recognition. Pressure of military events, and in particular fear that the Italians would advance into the Sudan and Kenya, where scarcely any defences were in readiness, nevertheless necessitated

some accommodation with the Ethiopian monarch. After several weeks of delay the British Government somewhat reluctantly allowed him to fly, on 25 June, to the Sudan, where he received a minimum of official attention, though numerous Ethiopian refugees flocked to welcome him.

Support for the idea of Ethiopian independence, and memories of what was widely considered as the 'betrayal' of Ethiopia by the League in 1935-36, was, however, a major influence among many people in the United Kingdom. On 11 July, a month after Mussolini's declaration of war, Colonel Wedgwood, long one of the staunchest friends of Ethiopia in the House of Commons, asked what was for the British Government an embarrassing question, namely:

whether contact has been made between the British Government and Ethiopia; whether the Emperor's Government of Ethiopia is admitted to the full status of an ally in the present war, with assurances that Ethiopian independence will be assured when the war is won, and whether in consequence contact will be made with General Abeba Aragai, who is commanding the Ethiopian Forces in the field, and with Ras Birru, formerly War Minister in Abyssinia, who recently flew from Jerusalem to the Sudan to join the Ethiopian Forces on the Emperor's behalf, in order that the British and Ethiopian Forces may co-ordinate their activities against the Italians in Ethiopia.

The British Government, unable to ignore the question but unwilling to commit itself to Wedgwood's views, arranged for it to be answered by the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, R. A. Butler, who replied, with as little precision as possible:

Yes, sir. While the Right Hon. and gallant Gentleman will readily understand that it will not be possible to go into detail in answering his question, I can assure him that His Majesty's Government realize the importance of co-ordinating all activities likely to damage the enemy's military effort in North and East Africa and Abyssinia.

Military necessity was, moreover, contributing towards increased co-operation between the British and Ethiopians. On 21 August, a small Anglo-Ethiopian mission, Mission 101, led by a British officer, Brigadier Sandford, entered Ethiopia. Two months later, in October, a British ministerial conference held in Khartoum decided, after much 'stormy'<sup>3</sup> discussion, that the Emperor would be allowed a consignment of arms, albeit a small one, and that Ethiopians fighting against the Italians should be termed 'patriots', and no longer rebels against Italian rule. A request by the Emperor for a formal alliance between the United Kingdom and Ethiopia was, however, rejected. Several weeks later, another British officer, Colonel Orde Wingate, was flown into Gojam with promises of speedy, though limited, aid.

Despite such promises—and Butler's parliamentary answer to Wedgwood—the British Foreign Office scarcely envisaged any real restoration of Ethiopian independence. A Foreign Office memorandum of as late as 9 December, which examined the history of the country in essentially colonialist terms, went so far as to observe:

It is difficult to believe that the restoration of the former Ethiopian Empire as an independent state is a practicable aim. The Empire survived as long as it did only because the three Great Powers bordering on it—Great Britain, France and Italy—were unable to agree on its control.

Turning to British policy for the future the memorandum continued: 'A solution might be to aim at the restoration of the ex-Emperor as the ruler of a native African state under European protection.' Conscious that this was a matter to be decided at a later date, the memorandum sagely added: 'It is not necessary to decide now what European power would exercise the protectorate.'<sup>4</sup>

British opposition to the idea of a return to pre-war Ethiopian sovereignty also found expression in the dispatch to Cairo of Colonel Brocklehurst, a British officer favouring the establishment of a separate Galla state somehow affiliated to the United Kingdom. This mission was, as noted by a historian of this period, Leonard Mosley, backed by 'certain elements in Kenya and Rhodesia who were already dreaming of a post-war East African Federation—under British colonial control—and were not averse to including in it a large slice of land from southern Ethiopia, where the earth was fertile and hospitable.'<sup>5</sup> The project was, however, abandoned on the personal intervention of Winston Churchill, to whom the Emperor telegraphed to complain that it would have divided the country in the face of the Italians.

An interesting sidelight to the British Government's reluctance to concur in the immediate decolonization of Ethiopia is provided by the BBC's refusal throughout the year, and indeed the first four months of 1941, to broadcast the Ethiopian national anthem in its programme on the national anthems of the Allies, which included those of France, Poland, Luxembourg and other countries in alliance with the United Kingdom. The official thinking behind this refusal was revealed in a Foreign Office memorandum of 4 December 1940, which significantly observed:

The effect of the outbreak of war was not to terminate Italian sovereignty over Abyssinia, which still exists in law, nor to turn the country automatically into an independent sovereign State; what has happened is that we are free from any obligation not to disturb the existing legal position and have our hands free to make such settlement of the future of Abyssinia as we may think fit and may be in a position to effect.

I should personally have doubted whether anything which has so far happened entitles the Negus (and still less Abyssinia as a State), to be regarded as an 'Ally'.<sup>6</sup>

In Africa, meanwhile, preparations for an Allied offensive were in progress. What was soon to be known as the Liberation Campaign opened on 19 January 1941, when the northern Allied army crossed the frontier from the Sudan. On the following day, the Emperor, with Wingate as his principal adviser, entered Ethiopia, also from the Sudan. He had but a small army, referred to by Wingate as 'Gideon Force', but was soon to be joined by numerous Patriots. Four days later the southern Allied army struck from Kenya. The stage was thus set for an Allied offensive that was to sweep the Italians out of East Africa within a matter of months.

The strategy and tactics of the campaign were determined almost entirely by the British, who from the outset planned to assume the dominant role for themselves and to assign the Emperor and the Ethiopians only a minor and ancillary one, largely relegated in fact to operations in the geographically most difficult terrain. Arms were allocated, and aviation deployed, on the same basis.

The Allied attack proved so successful that the British Government found itself obliged to commit itself to a definite policy for Ethiopia much sooner than was originally expected, for it became clear that the Italians would soon be expelled. On 4 February the Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, for the first time gave public recognition to the principle of Ethiopian independence when he declared: 'His Majesty's Government would welcome the reappearance of an independent Ethiopian State and recognize the claim of the Emperor Haile Selassie to the throne.' The statement went on to affirm:

The Emperor has intimated to His Majesty's Government that he will need outside assistance and guidance. His Majesty's Government agree with this view and consider that any such assistance and guidance in economic and political matters should be the subject of international arrangement at the conclusion of the peace. They reaffirm that they have themselves no territorial ambitions in Abyssinia. In the meantime, the conduct of military operations by Imperial forces in parts of Abyssinia will require temporary measures of military control. These will be carried out in consultation with the Emperor, and will be brought to an end as soon as the situation permits.<sup>7</sup>

The infringements of Ethiopian sovereignty so delicately hinted at were, it should be noted, soon to be imposed by the British military authorities unilaterally, and were deeply resented by the Ethiopians, who were later to note that no comparable policy was adopted in the case of European countries freed from Axis domination.

In East Africa, meanwhile, the Allied offensive was gaining momentum. Patriot successes, and the resultant disintegration of Italian morale,



soon enabled the Ethiopians to advance at a much more rapid rate than the British had anticipated—or indeed thought desirable. The result was that when the Emperor's army seized the central Gojam town of Burye at the beginning of March the British withdrew the support of the Royal Air Force. Had continued air cover been available the Ethiopians would almost certainly have crushed the Italian army in Gojam, but Wingate radioed to Khartoum in vain. 'It is no exaggeration to say', he afterwards observed, 'that the capture of this force would have made possible an immediate and successful advance to Addis Ababa. But the appeals were ignored.'<sup>8</sup>

There would seem to be no gainsaying the opinion of Leonard Mosley that the reason for the refusal to supply further aerial support was essentially political. The question, he says, was

who was to capture, Addis Ababa. . . . The Kaid, Khartoum, and his forces at Keren could never get there in time. But what about Wingate and Gideon Force—the patriot Army with the Emperor himself as its titular commander? 'My dear fellow,' said the officials in the Sudan, 'can you imagine what such a thing might mean? If the habashis are allowed to take over their capital for themselves, they will not only rape and riot, but they will never be the same again. . . . Keep them back, for heaven's sake, keep them back.'

So the aid to Gideon Force, at the moment when it might have exploited its success and surged through to Addis Ababa did not come. The capture of a black man's kingdom was to be a white man's job, and it was handed to the South African Army. Wingate's repeated messages, asking for a few more supplies, were ignored.<sup>9</sup>

The South Africans duly entered Addis Ababa—where they continued the colour bar earlier established by the fascists—on 6 April, and on the same day the Emperor's army, only a day's drive to the north, occupied Debra Markos, the principal town in Gojam. Despite the latter achievement, no mean feat in the absence of air support, the Ethiopians had been outdistanced in the race for the capital. The British rather than the Ethiopian conception of decolonization had triumphed.

After the South African occupation of Addis Ababa, the British authorities determined to delay the Emperor's advance from Debra Markos. As Mosley records, 'on 6 April, a radio message reached Gideon Force from Wingate's superiors in Khartoum. It informed him that the South African troops were entering Addis Ababa. It ordered him to halt all further advances.'<sup>10</sup>

Discussing the subsequent course of events, Mosley, who drew on the reminiscences of Wingate's Palestinian aide Akavia, continues:

His first reaction was one of chagrin and anger. 'He knew we could have done it ourselves, and that it would have been morally right,' said Akavia. But almost immediately afterwards he recovered enough to send a message of congratulations,

plus a request. He asked for a plane to be sent at once, so that Haile Selassie could be flown to his capital and so receive the homage and welcome of his people.

The request was refused. He was peremptorily ordered to keep the Emperor where he was. When he protested he was told: 'There are 5,000 Italians in Addis Ababa. White people. If the Emperor arrives, the natives will panic. They will go wild and start looting and raping, and the Italians will all be killed. So keep the little man out.'<sup>11</sup>

Wingate then received orders 'to halt any impulse of the Emperor to approach Addis Ababa', and, as General Cunningham put it, to use 'everything short of force'.<sup>12</sup>

The Emperor was in fact kept from entering the capital for a full month, but at the end of April he impatiently decided to march on Addis Ababa in the face of British disapproval, though, as Mosley says, 'with the active though strictly unofficial approval of Wingate'.<sup>13</sup> General Cunningham had no choice but to acquiesce in the move, for as Lord Rennell of Rodd in an official account of the period was later to admit, 'for the Emperor to be in the country . . . and not in his capital, could only create an embarrassing situation for all concerned'.<sup>14</sup>

The Emperor duly re-entered Addis Ababa on 5 May, but scarcely as an independent sovereign, for the capital and indeed all 'liberated' territories were now under British occupation.

### **British military administration, 1941–42**

The British military presence, though euphemistically foreshadowed by Eden as one of 'temporary . . . guidance and control', meant in fact a virtually total curtailment of national sovereignty, and was accepted by the Ethiopian Government only because it had effectively no way to object. The country, far from being restored to its former rulers, was placed unilaterally under an Occupied Enemy Territory Administration (OETA). This administration was run from Nairobi, then a centre of colonial and white-settler rule, and was headed by Sir Philip Mitchell, a South-African-born colonial official, formerly British governor of Uganda, and no friend of African independence.

The extent to which Ethiopian freedom of action was impaired by this British occupation became apparent as early as 11 May 1941, when the Emperor appointed his first post-war Cabinet of seven Ministers, which prompted a visit by Sir Philip's representative, Brigadier Lush, who bluntly declared: 'His Majesty cannot fully resume his status and powers as Emperor until a peace treaty has been signed with Italy. Until that happens the King of Italy remains the legal ruler of Ethiopia.'<sup>15</sup> Though the Emperor refused to

annul his appointments he was later prevailed upon to re-name them Minister Designates.

Ethiopia, though liberated from the Italians, was thus under continued foreign domination, so much so indeed that a United States memorandum of 18 June described the British occupation as being 'tantamount to a protectorate over Abyssinia'.<sup>16</sup> In British colonial and military circles it was moreover widely assumed, and hoped, that this situation could be rendered permanent. Gordon Waterfield, an Englishman then resident in Addis Ababa, recalled:

British officers in charge of the political administration, a rapidly growing organization, were talking openly of establishing control over Ethiopia on the Sudan model with political officers throughout the country. . . . All the old arguments were brought up about the benefits of British control. They did not like to see the Italian improvements, which had cost millions of pounds, go down the drain under an Ethiopian administration; besides that, Ethiopia was regarded as a rich pendant to the Sudan, including as it did Lake Tsana and the Source of the Blue Nile.<sup>17</sup>

Sir Philip Mitchell himself broadly shared such sentiments. He pressed the Emperor to agree to abide by British advice 'in all matters touching the Government of Ethiopia', to levy taxes and allocate expenditure only with 'prior approval of His Majesty's Government', to grant British courts jurisdiction over foreigners, to 'raise no objection' if the British commander-in-chief 'found it necessary to resume military control of any part of Ethiopia', and not to raise armed forces or undertake military operations 'except as agreed by His Majesty's Government representative'.<sup>18</sup>

The Emperor, not surprisingly, found these proposals intolerable, and telegraphed to Churchill to ask why a treaty between the two countries was so long delayed. The Prime Minister, reluctant to be seen attempting to coerce the first, and at that time the only, country freed from Axis rule, chose to gloss over the matter by replying that the delay was due to the British Government's desire to ensure that nothing remained in the draft 'which could be interpreted as interfering with your sovereign rights over the independence of Ethiopia'.<sup>19</sup>

### **The Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement of 1942**

After protracted negotiations a two-year agreement recognizing Ethiopian independence and providing for a subsidy of £1.5 million for the first year and £1 million for the second year (extendable to £500,000 for a third year and £250,000 for a fourth) to re-establish an administration in the war-torn land, was signed on 31 January 1942. The Emperor was, however, obliged to

make numerous concessions that preserved and legitimized a very substantial degree of British control. They were of a character which no truly sovereign state would ever accept.

The agreement declared, in its preamble, that 'the Government of the United Kingdom recognize that Ethiopia is now a free and independent State and His Majesty the Emperor, Haile Selassie I, is its lawful Ruler'. The remaining articles drastically curtailed the practical application of this statement.

Article I provided that diplomatic relations should be established between the two countries, but went on to state that 'the Diplomatic Representative of His Majesty the King shall take precedence over any other foreign Representative'.

Article II laid down that the United Kingdom should provide Ethiopia with advisers, but added that the Emperor 'agrees not to appoint advisers additional to those referred to . . . except after consultation with the Government of the United Kingdom'.

Article IV specified that Ethiopia should receive a two-year financial grant, extendable for two more years, but stated that the Emperor 'agrees that in all matters relating to currency in Ethiopia the Government of the United Kingdom shall be consulted and that arrangements concerning it shall be made only with the concurrence of that Government'.

Article V, which was to be much resented by the Ethiopian public, gave foreigners the right of trial by a High Court with at least one British judge.

Article VI observed that in relation to private enemy property, a source of considerable wealth, the Emperor 'agrees to consult with the British Diplomatic Representative'.

Article VII, which dealt with Italian prisoners, then virtually the sole skilled manpower in the country, stated that 'all prisoners of war shall be handed over to the custody of the British Military Authorities'.

Article XI gave the British freedom to fly over Ethiopia, but laid down that 'the Emperor will not permit foreign aircraft other than British to fly to, in, or over Ethiopia without the concurrence of the Government of the United Kingdom'.<sup>20</sup>

Besides this unequal treaty the Emperor was obliged to sign a military convention with the United Kingdom, the provisions of which, in the view of one recent commentator, 'read more like the terms of an armistice than those of an alliance'.<sup>21</sup> The convention laid down, in Articles 1 and 2, that the United Kingdom would provide a military mission to train the Ethiopian army, but went on to grant the British extensive territorial and other concessions. The Convention declared in Article 3:

The areas specified in the Schedule attached hereto, and such other areas and places as may be agreed upon between the Parties either in addition to or in substitution for the said areas and places, shall remain under British military administration to the extent which, and as long as, the General officer Commanding-in-Chief, the British Forces in East Africa, in consultation with His Majesty the Emperor, considers necessary.

The extent of the Ethiopian sacrifice embodied in the article is apparent from the published schedule, which stated that the areas to remain under British military administration were to comprise: (a) a large stretch of south-eastern Ethiopia adjacent to French, British and Italian Somaliland; (b) all land occupied by the Franco-Ethiopian railway and its appurtenances—a strip of territory, that is to say, running all the way from Addis Ababa through Dire Dawa to the frontier of French Somaliland; and (c) virtually all the principal Ethiopian towns, namely Addis Ababa, Adama, Gimma, Awash, Gondar, Dire Dawa, Debat, Harrar, Adi Arcai, Adowa, Dalle, Adigrat, Neghelli, Quiha, Yavello, Combolcia, Mega, Sardo and Moggio.

Article 5 of the Military Convention further laid down that ‘the territory of the Ogaden’, which had been included in the Italian colony of Somalia in 1936, should ‘remain under the British Administration of Somalia’.

There were, in addition, numerous other points in the convention on which the Emperor was obliged to yield sovereignty. He thus agreed, in Article 6, that ‘the Government of the United Kingdom shall have the right to keep such military forces in Ethiopia as they think necessary’; in Article 7 that ‘without prejudice to the fact that British cantonments are upon Ethiopian territory, the said cantonments shall be inviolable and shall be subject to the exclusive control and authority of the appropriate British Authority’; and, in Article 8, that the British forces should enjoy ‘complete freedom of movement of personnel, vehicles, animals and materials between British cantonments, and generally such freedom of movement elsewhere as such forces enjoy in the United Kingdom’. The British were likewise allowed ‘entry into and departure from Ethiopia of members of the British Forces at all times without let or hindrance, subject only to the production of a certificate showing membership of the British Forces’. Other articles giving the dominant ally vast extraterritorial rights included Article 12, which stated that ‘the Emperor will provide for the continued operation of so much of the legislation enacted by the British Military Authorities as is considered by the Government of the United Kingdom to be necessary for the security of the British Forces in Ethiopia’, and Article 19, which held that ‘the British Forces shall be entitled to send an armed escort to any part of Ethiopia for the purpose of taking over and escorting to British cantonments or reserved areas any member of the British forces arrested’.<sup>22</sup>

Ethiopia, so far from liberated, was thus tied hand and foot to its 'liberator', to such an extent that John H. Spencer, an American professor of international relations and sometime adviser to the Emperor, was later to write, with an eye perhaps to the American reader:

Ethiopia remained essentially under British control. British military units of the BMME (British Military Mission to Ethiopia) were present everywhere, as were British advisers. All communications, including the Emperor's personal correspondence, and air and surface transport, were controlled by them. Foreign airlines other than British were excluded. The East African shilling replaced the Italian lire and the traditional Ethiopian currency. Ethiopia was part of the sterling area. Goodyear, Goodrich or Firestone tires could be purchased only if they had been manufactured by their branches in England. All dollar exchange earned by exports had to be converted into pounds sterling.<sup>23</sup>

Despite the manifold infringements of Ethiopian sovereignty the agreement of 1942 marked an important stage in the country's decolonization in that it embodied the first diplomatic recognition of the restoration of Ethiopian independence. There could no longer be any talk of this having to await the conclusion of a peace treaty with Italy.

### **The Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement of 1944**

Having obtained recognition of their country's 'independence' by the 1942 agreement, the Ethiopian Government sought to wrest effective freedom of action from the British by turning to the United States. The Americans, anxious to assume the responsibilities of a world power, were inclined to be favourable to such an approach, though, as Spencer recalls, it presented difficulties in that

the only channel of communication with Ethiopian officials lay through the British Legation in the capital. Because the British preferred that U.S. representation in Ethiopia be limited to a consulate-general, negotiations for the re-establishment of a U.S. legation had to be carried on elsewhere. Once the Department of State approved the final arrangements for opening a legation, the problem remained of forwarding notification to the Ethiopian officials in Addis Ababa. This meant passing through the British Legation there. The British Minister held the note until the United States, alerted by the prolonged absence of a reply, finally forced the Minister to release it to the Ethiopians.<sup>24</sup>

The opening of relations with the United States brought about a radical change in the situation in that it enabled the Ethiopian Government gradually but nonetheless effectively to free itself from its dependence on the

British. The Ethiopian attitude was bluntly explained by the Vice-Minister of Finance, Yilma Deressa, in a memorandum to President Roosevelt which complained that the first draft of the 1942 agreement as submitted by the British had 'amounted to the imposition of a protectorate', and that even 'the actual agreement . . . is regarded in Ethiopia as an agreement which imposes upon her government conditions which are incompatible with either liberty or the exercise of her sovereign rights as a free nation'.<sup>25</sup>

After the opening of diplomatic relations with the United States the Ethiopian Government obtained moral support from the Americans, as well as a limited amount of technical assistance and promises of subsequent more substantial aid. Strengthened by such help, the Ethiopian Government soon found itself in a position to demand the termination of the 1942 agreement. The vice-minister of foreign affairs, Aklilu Habta Wald, accordingly wrote to the British Government, on 12 January 1944, requesting a new agreement on the grounds that 'several clauses' of the old 'have no longer any utility'.<sup>26</sup>

The British, because of increasing American involvement in Ethiopia, were scarcely able to refuse. The British minister in Addis Ababa, Robert Howe, who was well aware of this, telegraphed the Foreign Office that it was 'essential to know whether Americans would be willing to pursue a common policy with us' for, he warned, 'at present it is possible for the Ethiopian Government to arrange the matters that affect His Majesty's Government with the United States and present His Majesty's Government with a *fait accompli*'.<sup>27</sup> The United States, the minister learnt to his chagrin, was not willing to underwrite the British position of paramountcy in Ethiopia.

Notwithstanding the resultant weakening of the British bargaining position, negotiations, which were conducted in Addis Ababa by a special British envoy, Lord De La Warr, were long and protracted, and seemed at times liable indeed to fail. The Ethiopians succeeded in having most of the limitations on their sovereignty embodied in the 1942 agreement removed from the 1944 draft. The unequal character of the earlier treaty was thus largely abandoned. In order to escape from the ties imposed by the 1942 agreement, the Ethiopians were, however, obliged on their side also to make concessions. The principal one was that embodied in Article VII, which stated that the Ethiopian Government agreed to the continued British occupation of the Ogaden and Reserved Area. This was nevertheless qualified by the statement that the government did so 'in order as an Ally to contribute to the effective prosecution of the war, and without prejudice to their underlying sovereignty'. The article also explicitly stated that the occupation was 'for the duration of this Agreement'.<sup>28</sup>

The new treaty, which was signed on 19 December 1944, thus resulted in the decolonization of the greater part of Ethiopia, except for the Ogaden and Reserved Area, which remained under British military administration.

### **The Anglo-Ethiopian Protocol of 1948**

The next, and penultimate, step in the decolonization of Ethiopia was taken in 1948. The British Government, which had accepted Ethiopia's claim to 'underlying sovereignty' over the Ogaden and Reserved Area in the 1944 agreement, realized that it could not prolong its occupation in the face of the by then strongly voiced opposition of the Ethiopian Government, the more so as the agreement specified, in Article XIII, that the treaty could be terminated by either party after two years. The continued British military presence had already been denounced in the Soviet press as a manifestation of imperialism, and seemed moreover no longer of much value to the United Kingdom, as it had become evident that the former Italian colony of Somalia, which lay adjacent to it, could not be retained by the United Kingdom, as it was in all probability to be returned to Italy. The British Government accordingly agreed, by a protocol signed with the Ethiopian Government on July 24, 1948, to withdraw from the greater part of the Ogaden, which was thus restored to Ethiopian jurisdiction.

### **The Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement of 1954**

Ethiopian foreign policy in the late 1940s was mainly concerned with the question of the future of the former Italian colony of Eritrea, the integration of which was considered a matter of major economic as well as strategic importance. The disposal of the territory, which had been the subject of much bargaining among the great, and many of the lesser, powers, was finally decided by a United Nations resolution of 2 December 1950, which federated it with Ethiopia under the Ethiopian crown.

After the achievement of the federation in the following year, the Ethiopian Government turned to the question of the Ogaden and Reserved Area, Ethiopia's 'underlying sovereignty' of which had been explicitly specified in the 1944 agreement. The war, which had been invoked in that treaty as the reason for Ethiopia's allowing the British to administer them, had long since ended. The British Government had therefore no option but to return them to Ethiopian rule. This was confirmed in the Anglo-Ethiopian agreement of 29 November 1954, which stated in Article I:

The full and exclusive sovereignty of Ethiopia over the territories which are set forth in the attached Schedule (hereinafter referred to as 'the territories') recognized by the Anglo-Ethiopian Treaty of 1897, is hereby reaffirmed. As from 28 February 1955, British Military Administration for which temporary provision was made under the Anglo-Ethiopian Treaty of 19 December 1944, shall be withdrawn from the Reserved Area as defined in the Schedule to that Agreement and from that part of the Ogaden



which is at present under British Military Administration. The Imperial Ethiopian Government shall, from that date, reassume jurisdiction and administration of, in and over the territories.

The process of decolonizing Ethiopia, which the Ethiopians considered complete only with the restoration of their internationally recognized pre-1935 frontiers, had thus taken one and a half decades.

## Notes

---

1. C. Sandford, *The Lion of Judah hath Prevailed*, p. 87, London, 1955.
2. A. Moorhead, *Mediterranean Front*, p. 37, New York, 1942.
3. C. Sykes, *Orde Wingate*, p. 244, London, 1959.
4. Public Record Office, Foreign Office, 371/24645/306.
5. L. Mosley, *Haile Selassie*, p. 260, London, 1964.
6. Foreign Office, 371/24639/434. See also R. Pankhurst, 'The Ethiopian National Anthem in 1940', *Ethiopia Observer*, Vol. XIV, No. 3, 1971, pp. 219-25; and 'The Ethiopian National Anthem in 1941', *Ethiopia Observer*, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1972, pp. 63-6.
7. M. Perham, *The Government of Ethiopia*, p. 463, London, 1969.
8. L. Mosley, *Gideon Goes to War*, p. 104, London, 1957.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 105-6.
12. Mosley, *Haile Selassie*, op. cit., p. 268.
13. Mosley, *Gideon Goes to War*, op. cit., p. 106. See also O. C. Wingate, 'Appreciation of the Ethiopian Campaign, 1941', *Ethiopia Observer*, Vol. XV, No. 4, 1973, pp. 204-26.
14. Rennell of Rodd, *British Military Administration of Occupied Territories*, p. 67, London, 1948.
15. Mosley, *Haile Selassie*, op. cit., p. 275.
16. J. H. Spencer, *Ethiopia, the Horn of Africa, and U.S. Policy*, p. 9, Cambridge, Mass.
17. Mosley, *Haile Selassie*, op. cit., p. 275.
18. Foreign Office, 371/27514/4091.
19. Mosley, *Haile Selassie*, op. cit., p. 277.
20. Rennell of Rodd, op. cit., pp. 539-43.
21. C. P. Protholm, *Liberation and Exploitation: The Struggle for Ethiopia*, p. 101, New York, 1976.
22. Rennell of Rodd, op. cit., pp. 199, 547-51.
23. Spencer, op. cit., p. 9.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
25. United States, *Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers*, III, p. 104, Washington, D.C., 1943.
26. Foreign Office, 371/41448/403.
27. *Ibid.*, 371/41449/874.
28. Perham, op. cit., p. 477.

# Neo-colonialism or decolonization?

Hagos Gebre Yesus

Protesting vehemently about the continued use of the highly dubious term 'race' by those who are fond of categorizing the human species into their own ethnocentric conceptions, Dr Ashley Montagu, a distinguished anthropologist, was moved to observe:

The principle of 'squatter's' rights apparently applies to words as well as to property. When men make a heavy investment in words they are inclined to treat them as property, and even to become enslaved by them, the slaves of their own vocabularies. High walls may not a prison make, but technical terms sometimes do. . . . This is another reason for self-examination with regard to the use of the term 'race'.

In this brief presentation, I want to argue that a similar exercise of self-examination is long overdue on the part of those who are stuck, for largely the same reasons, with the word 'decolonization'.

As I see it, the crucial question that has to be posed and answered is this: has colonialism given way to decolonization—as the word itself already presupposes and as is also supposed by those partial to that view—or has it given rise to neo-colonialism in Africa or elsewhere in the so-called Third World? If the answer to the first is affirmative and to the second negative, I will no doubt be reprimanded for barking up the wrong tree, in which case I will take my reprimands as gracefully as I can and will undertake to take another hard look at the world around me. If, on the other hand, the answers are reversed, those who have been singing the happy tidings of decolonization will know when and how to change their tune.

First, about the terms themselves. Because the terms in use in any particular discourse, especially those that have somehow gained popular acceptance, have a way of conditioning the manner in which those who habitually use them perceive things, terms are extremely important. And when the terms we use do condition our perceptions, that is to say, when they do not accurately mirror the actual conditions they refer to, it is obvious that they help falsify and obfuscate certain realities that exist in the world. Each time the term 'decolonization' is used with reference to what is called, with little or no discrimination, the backward, the underdeveloped or, more

charitably, the developing world, this is what actually happens. The terms just mentioned, for example, are supposed to refer to or to describe the same thing as if the three words were exactly synonymous. The first word, simply meaning a state of backwardness, suggests a static state; the second denotes the meaning of the first in some general sense but also implies that there may be some developed spheres or spheres of some development; the meaning of the third is quite different from and in many significant ways also opposed to the first two, suggesting as it does a state or a process of development. All these terms, including the most recent one, which goes by a trinitarian appellation (one which of late is being invested with some Marxian—I do not say Marxist—scaffolding by those who appear to be more interested in inventing fanciful worlds than in dealing with the real one here below), have a long and tortured history. But when the term ‘decolonization’ is added to the list of misapplied words, the bubble bursts. In the same way, the misapplication of the idea of decolonization is matched only by the misperception of conditions obtaining in the neo-colonized world.

My chief objection to the term ‘decolonization’ here is that it takes for granted as solved certain endemic problems which are far from being so, and tends to lend credibility to the self-serving propaganda of imperialists of all sorts, who also claim that things are getting better everywhere. When, with ritual fidelity, one goes on repeating the notion that the underdeveloped countries are developing, that the backward peoples are advancing, or that, in a word, decolonization is taking place all over, one echoes this same litany of imperialism. In other words, to continue to use the word ‘decolonization’ under the prevailing regime of neo-colonialism is to persist in pushing the ambiguity of language in order to promote confusion of thought as well as to prolong the pillage and plunder of the neo-colonized world. And this for the simple reason that the passage from the old colonial order to a simulacrum of independence does not spell decolonization but the continuation of colonialism in a new form: hence, only the term ‘neo-colonialism’ accurately captures the ensemble of relationships between the developed and underdeveloped worlds. And if one looks at the world, one sees not receding colonialism or ascending decolonization, but the suffocating reality of neo-colonial domination and exploitation, which is externally imposed by imperialism and internally sustained by the neo-colonial regimes in power, since the former cannot operate effectively without the latter, and the latter cannot continue to exist without the former.

This means that those who talk of the alleged decolonization of the ‘developing countries’ must also recognize one other corollary to this neo-colonial set-up, namely, that the so-called national bourgeoisie in the neo-colonized countries is not at all like the bourgeois classes of other times and places.

Despite its rhetoric to the contrary, this bourgeoisie is not an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist force. Except perhaps for its skin pigmentation and a few other external stigmata, it is not, in truth, even national in character. Far from being an anti-imperialist national force, it is itself, on its own showing, an integrated appendage of the imperialist apparatus. The historically progressive role played out by other bourgeois classes cannot be ascribed to it, which is why one cannot speak of any meaningful decolonization without falsifying the record. By virtue of its integration into the neo-colonial order of things, this class has forfeited that role and has become instead both the agent and the beneficiary of the nexus of imperialism to which it is tied in a hundred and one ways.

Under these conditions, therefore, it is a serious misrepresentation to argue that any real decolonization is somehow being attained either through the exertions of such a crypto-bourgeoisie or the good conscience of the colluding and contending imperialisms of the day, whose spokesmen otherwise never tire of shedding their crocodile tears in order to assuage the nagging appeals of kept politicians. Despite all the pathetic appeals and the soothing promises traded, the facts of capitalist exploitation and class collaboration are much harder nuts to crack than are the high principles that are so often professed and proclaimed by both. After all, when one desires to cut down a tree, one does not usually request the tree to supply the axe. The lumberjacks who are capable of felling the neo-colonial tree are the people who are underneath it, not the hangers-on who have built their nests in it. That is why one can say without much exaggeration that the so-called national bourgeoisie is a dependent class that lives, like certain parasitic organisms in the biological world, by consuming so many times more than its weight. It should surprise no one therefore that such grand schemes as the 'new economic order' on which so much ink is spilt and tons of paperwork compiled have not and cannot alter anything in the continuing scandal of 'unequal exchange' between the haves and the have-nots. The haves still have more than they want, and the have-nots still have little of what they need and nothing of what they want.

The fact that the ruling regimes, which do not so much rule as reign, periodically jump from the frying pan into the fire and trade their allegiances to one or the other imperialist camp; the fact that they remain ever ready to sell themselves and their countries to the highest bidder, must not be mistaken for the assertion of national will and sovereignty on their part. Like the imperialist overlords themselves, these vassals of imperialism do not have enduring friends, only permanent interests.

As already implied in this grim presentation, the emergence and perpetuation of so many inept neo-colonial regimes, which have made their peace with neo-colonialism, is made possible by the character of contempo-

rary imperialism. Unlike the imperialists of the past, present-day imperialists do not carry on their business, *vis-à-vis* the peoples of the neo-colonized lands, with deadly competition to the finish. The once warring imperialisms have today evolved into a single predatory system of complementing imperialism; that is to say, contemporary imperialists no longer operate at cross purposes with respect to the Third World, but rather with a studied unity of purpose and direction. All levels of their operations—economic and political, cultural and ideological, military and technological—are marked by a high degree of cohesion conducted in a complementary and parallel fashion. Whatever the contradictions that still plague them from within, and despite the bellicose postures that sometimes appear to upset their *détentes* and ‘peaceful competitions’, what the imperialist camps fear most is not the possibility of a war of extinction between them but the ever-present danger of wars of national liberation that would put an end to the entire system of imperialism and capitalist exploitation.

In view of these brutal facts, in view of the stark reality that the gap between the imperialist and imperialized countries is widening and not narrowing, in view of the fact that famine and hunger, disease and death, stalk the immense majority of the peoples of the Third World, in what sense and by what criteria can one talk of decolonization?

Plainly, one cannot, without altogether succumbing to that sort of Orwellian travesty, even before 1984 is upon us, in which falsehood becomes truth and men are turned into pigs. But if all these unpalatable truths about the contemporary world appear too bitter to swallow to anyone who has more delicate taste than I, I would advise them to ask the victims of neo-colonialism whether the picture drawn here about their lives is overstated or understated. Then, the victims themselves might respond by citing the French proverb, *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*.

As for the events unfolding in southern Africa and the Horn of Africa in recent years, it would be superfluous, after what has been said in the preceding pages, to recount here the cynical calculations and sordid manoeuvres the superpowers have been engaged in which in those two regions of the continent. These latest manifestations of neo-colonialism are sufficiently well known. So are all the major and minor actors involved in the drama. Moreover, the nature of the contests and the aims of the contestants are not really new—perhaps only more notorious in the totality of their cynicism. Likewise, the stakes at issue remain high and the same.

It is sufficient to recall the series of alliances consummated and broken in rapid succession, the crass opportunism of shifting alignments and realignments, the instant metamorphosis of yesterday's ‘friends’ into today's ‘enemies’ the overnight transformation of so-called revolutionaries into reactionaries and so-called reactionaries into revolutionaries, accompanied

by instantaneous acts of baptism or excommunication by self-appointed priests parachuted from afar in the manner of Batman. All these things, and more, read like a familiar text-book of neo-colonial vintage. It is by means such as these that a triangular power-play is being conducted in the two vital regions of Africa at the present time.

One of the troika, which designates itself as the global champion of 'human rights', feigns neutrality and moderation in the face of the most inhuman acts daily perpetrated by the inveterate reactionary regimes in its keep, which are passed off as so many 'moderates' or as moderating influences for 'stability'. The other proclaims itself to be the purveyor of socialism and the defender of the territorial integrity of countries in these parts of Africa, apparently forgetting its dismembering, in the name of the 'principle' of self-determination, of another country on another continent not so very long ago. Still the third, while pretending that it is against the two, effectively sides with the first against the second and, in the process, supports and abates, all in the name of anti-revisionism, which is itself every bit as revisionist as any seen or heard to date, open aggression by maddened chauvinists and unrepentant white supremacists in search of chunks of real estate. The spectacle of this second edition of the scramble for Africa is there to see for all who have eyes. But then there is also the spectre of resistance and revolution, which haunts them all.

**Part III**  
**Report of the meeting**  
**of experts**

## Inaugural session

The inaugural session was held under the chairmanship of His Excellency Ambassador T. Ocheduszko, President of the Polish National Commission for Unesco. Several speeches of welcome were given on behalf of the Polish university authorities.

Dr Z. Pioro spoke of the meaning of Unesco's efforts in connection with the *General History of Africa*. Ambassador Ocheduszko stressed the fact that the African continent was entangled in a difficult and dramatic present, as indicated by the topics proposed for discussion at the seminar, and said that the vision of past events would throw light on present problems. Professor B. Winid, speaking on behalf of the Chancellor of Warsaw University, drew the participants' attention to the importance, the diversity and the value of the work done in Poland on the history of the African continent. He also drew the attention of participants to the Polish review *Africana Bulletin*.

Mr Glélé, speaking in the name of the Director-General of Unesco, took the opportunity of recalling the terms of two resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly which were most relevant to the items on the agenda of the meeting. The first was Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The second was Resolution 1803 (XVII) of 14 December 1962, establishing the permanent sovereignty of peoples over their countries' natural resources, the exportation of which must be in the interest of 'national development and of the well-being of the people of the state concerned'.

Mr Glélé also made a number of announcements concerning the publication of Volume VIII of the *General History of Africa* and said that its table of contents was still being discussed by the Volume Editor and the Committee. He pointed out the complexity of the concepts of decolonization, liberation and independence (Appendix I).

At the end of the opening meeting, the following officers were elected: Dr Z. Pioro (Poland), president; Professor J. F. A. Ajayi (Nigeria) and Professor E. K. Mashingaidze (Zimbabwe) vice-presidents; Professor



A. Mazrui (Kenya), discussion leader and Professor J. Devisse (France) rapporteur.

The experts then adopted the agenda proposed by Professor Mazrui, the editor of Volume VIII of the *General History of Africa*: 'Africa since the Ethiopian war, 1935–80'.

## General discussion

During discussions general points concerning the drafting of Volume VIII of the *General History of Africa* as a whole and specific points previously submitted to the experts were clarified.

A point frequently reiterated throughout the discussions was that this volume should neither disrupt the continuity nor depart from the historical tone of the previous volumes. At the same time, of course, it should not overlook the contributions to be made by different disciplines, which could all converge in the composition of a general history of Africa in the twentieth century. The historical perspective presupposes an effort to bring out the underlying structure as a whole of the lengthy period of time covered, and it was important not to view past developments through the distorting lenses of purely contemporary events. This volume should be structurally sound, so that it can be read for many years without becoming out of date.

Many experts believed that in studying African history it was impossible to use a method that fragmented reality into 'isolated categories'. They considered that Marxist analysis should be fully applied here to achieve a genuinely comprehensive and explanatory study.

For some experts, the method of Marxist analysis was most appropriate, and by applying it one could foresee the definitive and logical progress of events in the African regions concerned, and perhaps throughout the world. This was a more philosophical and more political view of things. For others, more aware of the balance of power, Marxist analysis was of political importance and fostered political commitments but did not bring out the sequence of events as obviously and necessarily as for the first group.

Other experts suggested that attention should be given to the differences in the economic and social transformations of African societies under colonial rule. These differences could be analysed in terms of social structures, economic structures, and the role played by various social groups in the process of decolonization. Therefore it was suggested that the historical process of decolonization should be studied in the light of an exact knowledge of the social and economic structures of the countries concerned, as has been suggested by some specialists.<sup>1</sup> No analysis of political strategies

was attempted; nor was there any attempt to define the conditions of transition from a pre-capitalist to a socialist society. The emphasis was on the differences that exist in this regard between southern Africa and Ethiopia.

For several experts, all the socialist experiments realized throughout the world should be made known. The importance of Lin Piao's book *Long Live the Victorious War of the People* was emphasized.<sup>2</sup> There were long discussions about the definition of some of the more important terms. The Volume Editor and the members of the International Scientific Committee were asked to be very careful about the way in which such terms were used.

The Leninist definition of imperialism seemed generally to have been accepted, though not studied in depth. Most experts definitely were inclined in this direction and believed that 'imperialism' should be used only to describe the capitalist expansion of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Several participants repeatedly raised the point that a country that continues to call itself socialist but is no longer may have and can be shown to have certain imperialist interests, which are against decolonization and the liberation process of the peoples and nations under discussion.

In reply, it was emphasized that a socialist country that became imperialist would instantly lose all right to call itself socialist. However, the term 'imperialist' could not be applied to the expansion of Ethiopia in the nineteenth century, or to the modification by Haile Selassie of the internationally recognized legal status of Eritrea. At that time, it was pointed out, Ethiopia had itself been under the imperialist yoke, and had also been at a very backward stage of socio-economic development.

The Volume Editor suggested that modern imperialism was perhaps a child of the modern nation-state system rather than a child of capitalism as such. A nation-state could be socialist domestically and still be imperialist in its external conduct. This view was strongly disputed. A genuinely socialist country could not also be imperialist. On the other hand, it was pointed out that a country can very well be imperialist while falsely calling itself socialist.

Finally, imperialism appeared to be essentially a dangerous threat coming from capitalist countries and multinational enterprises against all the clearly African states.

Emphasis was also placed on the need to define colonialism and neo-colonialism, in all their different forms, which would make the problems of transition towards decolonization clear to the readers.

This was specially important in the cases of the Horn of Africa and southern Africa, where colonialism has had quite a different character from that in the rest of the continent. Certain decolonized countries have formally acquired independence but are more or less openly in a state of neo-colonial economic, social and cultural dependence. Others have to contend with the internal colonialism that characterizes, for example, the southern Africa.

In the experts' opinion the term 'decolonization' was unsatisfactory as employed in the working paper prepared by the Volume Editor. Most of them emphasized that decolonization involving merely a transfer of sovereignty and administration was at best only a first step. This step coincided with a national uprising by various classes of the population. It would perhaps be preferable to employ here the term 'independence struggle' rather than 'decolonization'.

Beyond this lay the liberation of people by revolution. Such liberation involved the coming to power of those who were formerly oppressed, and the complete transformation of their economic, social and cultural status. Workers and peasants liberate themselves—with the help, if necessary, of other classes or segments of classes—from external imperialist oppression and from the internal alliances they encounter in post-colonial society.

No overall theoretical analysis of liberation was put forward. Liberation was conceived in general as being essentially social and cultural. But there was no discussion of the tools for its political implementation: the methods offered to the people for choosing their future, or the ways of defending what had been won against a return offensive of imperialism. One expert laid great emphasis on the idea that a liberation policy should also aim at producing a 'new man', adapted to the conditions of the world emerging at the end of the twentieth century.

Differences also emerged in the matter of the interpretation of the concept of liberation itself. Some experts believed that the process of liberation should be viewed in the context of a bipolar confrontation between superpowers, which by increasing risks sometimes masks its advantages. For the majority of the experts, the ultimate victory over imperialism would be the imperialists' loss of the 'South African bastion'. After that, imperialism would no longer threaten Africa. Speaking of models: Mozambique and Angola appeared unquestionably to be the models for southern Africa. The discussion was more lively and the conclusions less definite in the case of Somalia and Ethiopia. The idea of an anti-state 'liberation of the peoples' was broached, but not developed. Cited was Charles Chaumont's article '*Le droit des peuples à témoigner d'eux-mêmes*'.<sup>3</sup> The idea was put forward that it might be interesting from the legal viewpoint to study a people's right to oppose the omnipotence of the state since this has officially been recognized by the United Nations in the case of southern Africa.

Beyond these generally agreed definitions, there was a certain amount of disagreement regarding the results so far obtained in certain African countries. The idea was put forward that it was difficult to reconcile the objectives defined above with the existence of firmly established military regimes. But the discussion remained inconclusive.

Some degree of caution regarding the applicability of the adjective

'socialist' to some African governments was suggested. It was even suggested that the critical classification proposed in this field by a Swedish author, S. Rudebeck, should be used.

These somewhat radical definitions were probably justified by the situation in the regions the experts were considering. Several, however, thought that this analysis was valid for the African continent as a whole.

It would have been worth while to study systematically the idea of 'rupture' or breaking point. It was put forward in connection with the liberation struggles of Zimbabwe: that change is not negotiated but conquered through armed struggle. More than one expert found it seductive in theory, but the opinions expressed were generally less dogmatic when actual situations were being analysed.

The experts in general accepted the proposals of the Volume Editor and of the Committee on the period to be covered by the volume: 1935-80.

The attention of the Volume Editor was rigorously drawn to the subject of the structure of the table of contents and to the chapter and paragraph headings. Various recommendations were made, which he promised to follow in the new table of contents.

## Notes

- 
1. On this question, see, for example: Thomas Sentes, *Political Economy of Developing Countries*; L. Tjaquwienko, *Developing Countries: Regularities, Problems, Perspectives*, Moscow, 1974; Colin Leys, *African Capitalism in Kenya*.
  2. In this connection, certain participants cited the following works of reference: A. Cassese and E. Jouve (eds.), *Pour un droit des peuples*, Paris, Éditions Berger-Levrault, 1978; C. Chaumont, 'Le droit des peuples à témoigner d'eux-mêmes', *Annuaire du Tiers Monde*, 1976, Paris, Éditions Berger-Levrault, 1977; K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*; F. Fanon, *Les damnés de la terre*, Paris, François Maspero; V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1964 (see particularly: 'On National and Colonial questions', 'The Discussion on Self-determination Summed Up', 'Socialism and War', 'Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism', 'A Popular Outline', Vol. 22; Second Congress of the Communist International, 19 July-7 August 1920, Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Questions, 26 July (Vol. 31); Lin Piao, *Long Live the Victorious War of the People*, Peking; Rosa Luxembourg, *Complete Works* (I, II, III and IV), Paris, F. Maspero; Mao Tse-tung, *Selected Works*, Peking, Vol. I, 1966, Vol. II, 1967, Vol. III, 1968, Vol. IV, 1969; K. Marx, *Capital, a Critique of Political Economy*, Book I, 'The Process of Capitalist Production', Vol. 1. *Die Künftigen Ergebnisse der britischen Herrschaft in Indien*; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Werke*, Vol. 9, Berlin, Dietz, 1960; K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Communist Party Manifesto*; J. Stalin, *Principles of Leninism*; L. Trotsky, *Where is Britain Going? Marxism and our Era, The Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, 'Imperialist War and Revolution' (speech on the Third Anniversary of the University of the East).
  3. Chaumont, op. cit.

## Southern Africa

The situation in southern Africa is of paramount importance for this volume. In the twentieth century imperialism has weighed more heavily there than in any other part of the continent. Social tensions are much more marked than elsewhere, and are made worse by the superimposed problem of apartheid. Armed struggle has been, and still is, very fierce in this area of Africa.

The forms assumed by the liberation of Mozambique and Angola explain the intense efforts made by Western countries to arrange the independence of Namibia and Zimbabwe to their advantage. The importance of what was at stake was strongly emphasized by the experts. The liberation movements are waging a 'decisive' struggle against imperialism and its allies within the countries. This struggle can have only one outcome: liberation, comparable to that of Angola or Mozambique, achieved by African forces alone without any outside intervention. And it can have only one result: the unseating of imperialism, which will be deprived of one of its most important economic and strategic base.

The length of this struggle, which began in 1930, was noted.<sup>1</sup> The role of the South African Communist Party is extremely important; and should be studied in this volume. The present liberation movements are continuing the decades-long struggle. This is probably one of the most striking phenomena in the recent history of Africa.

In this perspective, the study of the movements or armed struggle did not yield any major new findings.

The objectives of the most radical leaders are well known. Their total opposition to the 'Rhodesian compromise' is not surprising. The preliminary reports for the present meeting clearly indicate the divergence of views between those who favour total doctrinal and militant intransigence, and those who want to space out the successive stages because they believe it would be difficult to achieve everything in one single struggle. The positions of both sides on this question have changed very little since the Gaborone symposium.

It was emphatically stated that the goal of the struggle is the liberation of the whole of southern Africa, including the present Republic of South

Africa (Azania). The aim is to liberate all the peoples of this region without distinction as to colour or origin, from the alienation of their rights that imperialism imposes on them. It is not a question, it was stated, of fighting apartheid but of building a socialist society.

Discussion became very theoretical on this question between those who advocated total intransigence and those who believed that such intransigence has scarcely any chance of winning through violence. Again, the analysis remained somewhat superficial. How is the idea that it is important for the whites to stay in Zimbabwe and that their interests are to be safeguarded to be reconciled with the revolutionary socialist plan for the whole of South Africa? These two ideas were juxtaposed but were not studied on any theoretical basis.

Very little information of any significance emerged on the role of independent African states in the decolonization of southern Africa. It was noted that the front-line countries had little margin for manoeuvre. The example of Zambia was cited, and the debate concerning the reopening of Zambia's frontier with Rhodesia was recalled.

A somewhat fuller discussion took place, on the proposal of the Volume Editor, on the apparently limited support given by the French-speaking states to the liberation of southern Africa. It was recommended that a study be made, by contacting the office of the Organization of African Unity in Dar es Salaam, which was responsible for the liberation movements, of the exact state of financial, military and humanitarian aid given by the states, and that a distinction be made between real aid and verbal support.

The role of the OAU in the decolonization of southern Africa was examined with different degrees of criticism. The policy of the OAU seemed to depend on the personality of its secretary-general and on the attitude of the 'Club of the Heads of State'. It was suggested that the OAU had perhaps tended too much to consider the United Kingdom, and not the Africans involved, as the chief negotiating party in southern Africa and particularly in the case of Zimbabwe. It is likely that it will have to take a stand on South Africa (Azania) very soon.

The initial comments on the role of the United Nations were rather disparaging. The United Nations is a useful forum, and some progress has been made thanks to its good offices. But the structure of the organization and the influence wielded in it by the developed countries were considered a limiting factor.

However, two very positive aspects were noted: the first is the recognition by the United Nations of the liberation movements approved by the OAU. This has enabled representatives of the liberation movements to attend the present meeting.

Secondly, the United Nations gives direct aid to these movements, for

example through Unesco. It also keeps a close watch on the activities of multinational companies in southern Africa.

The role played by the USSR, before the Second World War, in the decolonization of Africa was emphasized. In the League of Nations, the USSR had constantly proposed that the racist parties in southern Africa should be condemned and a boycott imposed. Its example was followed by other socialist countries after the Second World War.

There was general agreement that no colonialist pressure had been exerted by the USSR or by the other socialist countries and on the positive character of their help to the forces and movements struggling for independence and liberation in southern Africa. Aid offered to the liberation movements in the form of arms and military training was acknowledged with appreciation.

An idea important from the strategic point of view was put forward by one expert of the USSR. The aid to the most radical segments of the liberation movements would have, according to this expert, divided these movements and weakened them. Another expert replied that this division was created by imperialist manoeuvres. However, the idea was and is worth considering at the level of global strategy will not open aid to an active minority lessen its chances of forming an alliance with other classes in order to strengthen the armed struggle? But perhaps such aid would, by its very openness, increase the chances of a radical socialist revolution? This is an old debating position in the political, military and revolutionary strategy of the communist parties which appears again. It was not fully discussed.

The title proposed by the Volume Editor, 'the dilemma of Western countries in southern Africa, 1948-77', was criticized. Who was in a dilemma in the Western countries? Should one speak of 'Western countries' or 'capitalist countries'?

The analysis was in general comprehensive, with few nuances. The West is afraid of losing the enormous capital it has invested in its South African 'bastion'. Some experts believe its means of pressure and of 'survival' are still considerable, despite the weakening of Western Europe brought about by two world wars and the transfer of a great number of its functions to the United States. One expert announced a very dangerous hardening of South African policy.

According to some there are forces in the West that favour the liberation of southern Africa; but these forces—for example, the World Council of Churches—are viewed with some suspicion because they support the policy of compromise in Zimbabwe.

The question of the Third World's solidarity with Southern Africa was hardly discussed. It was simply remarked in general terms that most countries of the Third World, crushed by international economic competition, were



quite unable to take part actively in the liberation of southern Africa.

Several lines of inquiry were proposed to the Volume Editor and the International Scientific Committee:

There should be close scrutiny of the extent of Western investment in southern Africa. A working meeting was proposed on this theme. One expert outlined the chronological sequence of the expansion of these investments.

In southern Africa the gold mines are of decisive economic importance. It was recalled that a representative of a country in southern Africa had recently proposed in the United Nations that these mines should be put at the disposal of the whole of mankind. Gold mines are also places where the work is very hard. The investigations already undertaken on this question should be further pursued.

There should also be a study on the lands taken away from Africans since the seventeenth century.

The analysis of the socio-cultural structure of southern Africa should be further refined. The situation is probably more complex in this region than in any other part of the continent.

On the whole, the discussion on the decolonization of southern Africa left the impression of having been inconclusive and incomplete.

The subject being currently in the news, and the presence at the seminar of scholars who are also militants, committed to the struggle that was under discussion, certainly explains that the discussions sometimes took on an ideological and political turn rather than remaining purely historical. The historians present had all, at one time or another, remarked that this could be dangerous and that one must beware of distorting the history of several decades on account of the passions and preoccupations of the moment. These ideas would be further developed with the whole of the volume in view and should be the subject of another meeting. To venture on recent and contemporary history and on questions of world-wide implications is not an easy task.

The Scientific Committee and the Volume Editor must bear these facts in mind when they finalize the table of contents. They must also bear in mind the repeated request of several experts that this volume must have an evolutionary historical dimension and a carefully structured study to give it consistency, seriousness and durability.

## **Note**

---

1. On this subject mention should be made of an important book, written in Russian by I. Pothekin, A. Zusmanovich and A. Nzula on forced labour and the trade-union movement in Africa (Moscow, 1933). Albert Nzula was one of the leaders of the revolutionary movement in southern Africa from 1928 to 1934.

## **The Horn of Africa**

This debate was inevitably dominated, to a large extent, by the difficult relations between Ethiopia and Somalia. The main arguments of both sides are stated in the preparatory documents. They are well known in broad terms.

There seemed to be no easy way out of the conflict, which still continues. The idea of seeking a solution through a federation of the peoples of the Horn of Africa was put forward several times.

No expert proposed any solution that would satisfy the claims of Somalia. On the contrary, some speakers emphasized that being threatened with dismemberment, Ethiopia was right to appeal for outside help to solve this crucial problem. The Somali military attack seemed to have taken a heavy toll in both countries.

During the initial stages of the debate, a broad discussion on the nature and forms of foreign aid in Africa took place.

The view was expressed that Cuba's role in southern Africa was a contribution to liberation, but Cuba's role in the Horn of Africa was qualitatively different. It was a case of foreign troops helping to decide the outcome of a conflict between Africans. It was also argued that in the context of decolonization Africa should cease to depend on external powers to resolve its conflicts.

This view was strongly contested by several participants, who said that any sovereign country had the right to seek the help of others when its territory was endangered. In any case the presence of foreign troops was a consequence of Africa's other problems. Attention was also drawn to the use of Western troops in conflicts such as those in Shaba and Chad.

With regard to the role of the Soviet Union, it was pointed out that the USSR had a long record of supporting the territorial integrity of African states. It had opposed Katanga's secession from the Congo, Biafra's secession from Nigeria and separatism in southern Sudan. The USSR's role in Ethiopia was in line with this tradition.

The search for a solution to the Somali-Ethiopian conflict was not the task of the meeting, and the experts desirous of not making matters worse preferred to explore other more promising avenues of peace.

A rather striking example of the gravity of certain problems, but also of the possibility of solving them, was provided by the question of the Somali language. The Somali Republic adopted a script using Roman characters several years ago. This written language constitutes the basis of speedy acquisition of literacy and of science teaching—including Marxism—in the national language. After the Ethiopian revolution, it was decided to give equal status to the eight languages spoken in Ethiopia. The Amharic script was used to write these languages, a fact that inevitably aroused great resentment in Somalia.

An example such as this probably indicates how easily hostility can be exacerbated by aggressive attitudes, but also how it can be pacified in a different atmosphere.

The state of relations between Somalia and Kenya was not analysed.

Concerning Eritrea, one expert expressed the view that the problem would be solved when linguistic, cultural and religious oppression inherited from the colonial and post-colonial past had disappeared. If the Government of Ethiopia kept its promises, the idea of secession should be dropped in Eritrea.

Apart from this analysis of the present situation, the majority of experts agreed that the OAU decision concerning the inviolability of African frontiers pending the complete liberation of the continent was the wisest solution. There was some discussion of the term 'ethnic nationalism' proposed by the Volume Editor, but the tendency among the experts was to advocate a situation in which frontiers were rendered 'inoperative' by efforts towards association and unification, so they would no longer confine the peoples.

The discussion turned towards an attempt to clarify the positions of the relevant governments on socialism and progressivism.

It was said that the Government of Somalia had done much to promote literacy, education, national unification, emancipation of women and reform of inheritance laws.

The Revolutionary Government of Ethiopia was given credit for comparable achievements in the field of linguistic equality, development of education for children from the poorer classes, separation of church and state, equality for Muslims, and agrarian reform. On the questions of agrarian reform and education, the Volume Editor was given precise information; this was noted with great interest by all the experts present.

Reservations were expressed on the relations of the Ethiopian Government with trade unions and with students. Questions were asked about the place of the intelligentsia in Ethiopian political life.

From this quite varied picture, the fact emerges that major problems exist at present in Ethiopia, which has progressed swiftly from the archaic

economic and social structures of the Empire to a society riddled with contradictions but where radical reforms have taken place. The analysis of the present-day Ethiopian social structure and of relations between the social classes and state power was not pursued very far. This fact was again regretted by several experts, who considered it impossible to attempt a serious examination of the Ethiopian situation in the absence of basic studies of this society, which has undergone many changes in a very short space of time.

As in the case of southern Africa, differing views were expressed about the attitude of the OAU. Sometimes considered to be an organization that represents the African petty bourgeoisie, the OAU is also seen as a key factor in the solution of the Somali-Ethiopian conflict. This conflict is an internal African one and it was hoped that it would be settled among Africans.

A positive contribution of the OAU in settling conflicts in Africa is its proposal at Khartoum, a few weeks before the present meeting, for the setting up of a unified African military command.

Another interesting question was raised concerning the influence exerted by Haile Selassie on the constitution and the working of the OAU. What legacy has the fallen Emperor left and what influence does Ethiopia have on the OAU?

There was discussion of the policy concerning closer relations between the Middle East and the Horn of Africa. Although the Horn is not as well endowed economically as southern Africa, it affects the vital supply routes of the Western world which link it to the Middle East. The Horn's strategic importance has progressively increased in the period covered by Volume VIII. Major stages in this development included the consequences of the Suez war of 1956, Israel's occupation of Arab lands after the 1967 war, the consequences of the Arab oil embargo of 1973 and the rising power of OPEC. These events revealed more clearly, to the West especially, the importance of the Horn in the world economy.

The expert's statements on the situation in the Indian Ocean merely revealed what French, British and American bases existed in this ocean, without throwing light on the general relationship between the Horn of Africa and the Indian Ocean.

A proposal was put forward for an investigation of the naval situation of the great powers in the Indian Ocean.

One expert stressed the importance for the coastal states in the Horn of Africa, as for those in southern Africa, of actively sharing in the 'decolonization of the law of the sea' and also of studying the exploitation of their maritime resources.

A more fruitful discussion could probably have resulted from the view

that changes in the internal and international situation of Ethiopia had led to increased foreign interference in Africa. Emphasis was laid on the economic, social and political consequences of the huge purchases of armaments, sometimes at the expense of development projects, by certain African states. Similarly, it was stressed that difficulties could result by arming the people without a sufficient framework of leadership and disarming them by a government worried about stability.

Some experts thought that too much importance had been attached to the arrival in Africa of Cuban soldiers, and that equal weight ought to be given to Cuban help in non-military tasks, such as education in Equatorial Guinea or in Angola, and to the extensive activities of Brazilians in several regions of the continent.

Speaking of ideological problems and going beyond the subject of the Horn of Africa, some experts raised the question of how 'external models' and particularly Western models should be regarded by African states. The general opinion seemed to favour making use of all outside contributions while at the same time being wary of any exclusive or total dependence.

To sum up, what emerges from this part of the discussion is that the African experts are anxious, above all, to achieve genuine liberation, and to safeguard the long-term interests of the peoples.

One expert raised a last question which could not leave a historian unmoved. He noted with apprehension that the historic leaders of Africa were disappearing one after another, apparently without leaving any successors of the same stature. One can raise this question in another way, by asking whether the gradual emergence of the African peoples is not making these people the 'new heroes' of the present period of African history, guided as they are by leaders who are closer to them and are thus seeming at first less prestigious than their predecessors.

Concluding the discussion with a few general remarks, the experts expressed the hope that Volume VIII would examine the possibility of Africans freeing themselves from the 'alienated' space which they inhabit in urban and rural areas.

# Appendices

# 1. Speech by the representative of the Director-General of Unesco

Your Excellency the President of the Polish National Commission for Unesco, The Representative of the Vice-Chancellor,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

One of the most important realities of our contemporary world is the decolonization of Africa.

The League of Nations and then the United Nations gradually formulated, developed and established as a general rule of law the principle of the right of peoples to decide their fate through political but also economic and cultural self-determination. United Nations practice has produced a decolonization law by clarifying the general provisions of the Charter by the adoption, on 14 December 1960, of Resolution 1514 (XV), entitled Declaration on the Granting of independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which states: 'The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation. . . . All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.' This resolution became the mandate of the Committee of Twenty-four, known as the 'Decolonization Committee'. Other international declarations and covenants have contributed to the recognition and consolidation of this principle, which has become an actual rule of law.

Invoking this rule of international applicable law, the peoples of Zambia, Malawi, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Somalia and more recently Djibouti, Angola and Mozambique have regained their international sovereignty. It is by virtue of this rule that the liberation movements are waging their armed struggle, and the United Nations and the OAU are conducting their diplomatic activities in Zimbabwe and Namibia and in the direction of Azania.

Ladies and gentlemen, the *General History of Africa* which is being compiled under the auspices of Unesco is a major enterprise which covers the whole of Africa both in space, as a continent, and in time, since it covers the period from the origins of man to our own day, and perhaps to 1980. So the work is concerned with the question of the decolonization of Africa, and in particular with the Horn of Africa and southern Africa; this reflects power relationships in international life, since Africa is proving to be the focal point of present international tensions. This dramatic history—a challenge to the human conscience, to the international community and to international law—will be analysed and discussed in Volume VIII. *Africa since the Ethiopian War, 1935–1980* is the title of this volume of the *General History of Africa*,



and its editor, Professor Ali Mazrui, will be one of the main speakers at the present seminar.

The study of the decolonization of southern Africa and of the Horn of Africa will give us a profound understanding of contemporary history both in its internal aspects and in its regional and international dimensions—that is to say, the repercussions of decolonization on the economic and political development of neighbouring countries. Such a project implies a multidisciplinary approach involving historians, sociologists, political scientists, economists and experts in international relations. We are happy to welcome and to thank all the experts for so kindly accepting the invitation from Poland and Unesco. You who are specialists in different disciplines will, all together, define a complete and living history. You will no doubt examine all aspects of decolonization: the process itself, the way it takes place, for example within the countries, the logic and the dynamics underlying the Bantustans, the national liberation movements, their social make-up and their impact on the countries concerned, and in Africa their evolution, their internal changes, the reasons for instance why they have become radical, the socio-economic basis of their struggle, the reasons for their success or for any failures, the help given by blacks abroad and by political exiles. In addition, as Professor Mazrui suggests in the agenda he is proposing, you will also study the role of the United Nations in the decolonization of southern Africa. Apart from diplomatic action, it will be necessary also to study the struggle against apartheid, economic sanctions and their effectiveness, and the other forms of assistance that the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies such as Unesco give to liberation movements in the training of young leaders who will take charge of decolonization. This is because, for the United Nations, decolonization goes far beyond the proclamation of political independence. It also implies for each people self-determination, the free definition, and conscious choice of its form of society, with the aim, of course, of political development but also of economic, social and cultural advancement.

Thus, while undertaking the most rigorous scientific analysis possible of the phenomenon of decolonization and particularly of the activities of the liberation movements, it is important not to neglect the political and ideological dimensions of their struggle. An analysis of political speeches and of the organizational system reveals the ideology that motivates the liberation struggles as well as the liberation movements' project for society and the problems involved in national construction. It also gives a better understanding of the subtle tactics of the great powers, dictated by their strategic, economic or ideological interests, and of the insidious action of the multinationals, who are well aware of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1803 (XVII) of 14 December 1962, entitled Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources. This resolution proclaims that 'the right of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and their resources must be exercised in the interest of their national development and of the well-being of the people of the state concerned'.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have seen that the analysis of the phenomenon of decolonization should go beyond mere accession to international sovereignty. The painful events still afflicting the Horn of Africa remind the historian and the internationalist of the difficult question of the right of peoples to self-determination,

and of the thorny problem of nationalities and frontiers, even though the United Nations and the OAU—agreeing to apply the rule *uti possidetis juris*, i.e. the principle of the inviolability of frontiers inherited from colonial days—believe there is nothing more to add. Undoubtedly Volume VIII will have to consider other similar cases of irredentism and of frontier disputes.

Ladies and gentlemen, this seminar is the first of a series which, in conformity with the decisions of the International Scientific Committee for the Drafting of a General History of Africa, will precede the drafting of Volume VIII; the volume's table of contents will be finalized at one of the forthcoming sessions of the Committee.

Apart from questions of methodology—how should one write the contemporary history of Africa?—there will be research and scientific consultation on certain themes, for instance:

1. Africa and the Second World War.
2. The role played today by the survival or the resurgence of traditional Africa's precolonial part on the socio-political and cultural level as well as in the framework of socialist experiments.
3. The building of the nation, national problems and problems of nationality and the role of the African languages in this connection.
4. Continuity or discontinuity in the forms of African political life.
5. Does a 'public opinion' exist in Africa? What is the role of the mass media, etc.?

These various seminars or conferences should allow original and promising material to be made available to the authors who will write Volume VIII; this material will give a comprehensive and enriching view of the history of Africa. This is the type of information which we hope will emerge from your present meeting.

Aware of the competence and of the work of all those meetings here at the crossroads of the human sciences—historians, political scientists, sociologists, internationalists and leaders of decolonization (here I am referring to representatives of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and of the Pan-African Congress (PAC)—I am convinced that you will forward a living and instructive perspective of history before the young people of Africa for whom all this *General History of Africa* is being written. Thank you in advance for your contribution.

I cannot conclude without expressing, on behalf of the Director-General of Unesco, Mr Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, and on my own behalf, our deep gratitude to the Polish authorities, to the Polish National Commission for Unesco and to the University of Warsaw for organizing, in co-operation with Unesco, this seminar.

This proves that men from different continents and different cultural areas but inspired by the same ideal, Man, and by the same goodwill, can meet within the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies (in this case, Unesco) to search objectively and honestly for historical truth, with a view to achieving a better understanding between peoples and nations by shedding new light on the past and the present of Africa and on its relations with other peoples and continents. I should like in particular to express my thanks to Professor Piore, who has played a key role in organizing this meeting.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish you every success in your work.

Maurice Glélé

## 2. List of participants

- Said Yusuf Abdi, 1580 Logan No. 37, Denver, CO 80203, United States.  
J. F. Ade Ajayi, International African Institute, 210 High Holborn, London, W.C.1.  
B. W. Andrzejewski, 15 Shelley Court, Milton Road, Harpenden, Herts. AL5 5LL, United Kingdom.  
T. Buttner, Karl Marx University, African and Near East Studies Centre, 701 Leipzig, Karl-Marx Platz 9, German Democratic Republic.  
David Chanaiwa, History Department, California State University, Northridge, 91364, United States.  
Apollon Davidson, Institute of General History, USSR Academy of Sciences, 19 Dmitri Ulianoff Street, Moscow.  
Jean Devisse, 14 avenue de la Porte de Vincennes, 75012 Paris.  
Edmond Jouve, Chargé de conférence au Département de Science politique de Paris-I, 3, rue Marié-Davy, 75014 Paris.  
Artem Letnev, Africa Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences, 16 Starokonucheny, Moscow.  
M. Malinowski, University of Warsaw, Warsaw.  
Joanna Mantel-Niecko, Al. Wojsha, 01-554 Warsaw.  
Christian Meahrdel, Karl Marx University, African and Near East Studies Centre, 701 Leipzig, Karl Marx Platz 9, German Democratic Republic.  
E. K. Mashingaidze, National University of Lesotho, P.O. Roma, Lesotho.  
Ali A. Mazrui, Centre for Afro-American and African Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, United States.  
Jan Milewski, Ul. Czesnika 12/18 m.2, 02929 Warsaw.  
E. L. Ntoedibe, PAC, Box 2412, Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania.  
Richard Pankhurst, 22 Lawn Road, London NW3 2XR.  
Zygmunt Piore, Chocimska 33-15, 00-791 Warsaw.  
Jerzy Prokopczuk, Polish Institute of International Affairs, Warecka 1a, P.O. Box 1000, Warsaw.  
Nathan Shamuyarira, Patriotic Front (ZANU), Caixa Postal, 743, Maputo, Mozambique.  
M. T. Tymowski, University of Warsaw.  
B. Winid, Geography Department, University of Warsaw, Kwakowskie-Pnedmiescie 26, Warsaw.  
Hagos Gebre Yesus, 6254 Cedar Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 2K2, Canada.

**Unesco representatives**

**Maurice Glélé, Chief of the Section of African Cultures, Division of Cultural Studies,  
Section of Culture and Communication.  
Monique Melcer, Division of Cultural Studies.**

## 3. Agenda

### I. Decolonization in southern Africa

- (a) The general process of decolonization: from the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland to the aftermath of Angola's independence.
- (b) The role of liberation movements in the struggle for southern Africa, 1955–77.
- (c) The role of independent African states in the decolonization of southern Africa, 1957–77.
- (d) The role of the Organization of African Unity in the decolonization of southern Africa, 1963–77.
- (e) The role of the United Nations in the decolonization of southern Africa, 1945–77.
- (f) The role of socialist countries in the decolonization of southern Africa, 1957–77.
- (g) Western dilemmas in southern Africa, 1948–77.
- (h) Southern Africa and Third World solidarity, 1960–77.

### II. Decolonization in the Horn of Africa

- (a) The general process of decolonization: from the Italian occupation of Ethiopia to the struggle for the Ogaden.
- (b) The problem of boundaries in the process of decolonization.
- (c) The problem of ethnic nationalism in the process of decolonization.
- (d) The problem of civil-military relations in the process of decolonization.
- (e) The Horn of Africa and the Organization of African Unity.
- (f) The Horn of Africa and the politics of the Middle East.
- (g) The Horn of Africa and the big powers:
  - (i) The politics of the Indian Ocean.
  - (ii) The politics of the Red Sea.
  - (iii) The politics of military bases.
  - (iv) The politics of access to Africa's resources.
- (h) Ideology and revolution in the Horn of Africa: implications for the process of decolonization.

