CHRISTIANITY AND BLACK RESISTANCE TO APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA: A COMPARISON OF ALBERT LUTULI, ROBERT SOBUKWE, STEVE BIKO, AND DESMOND TUTU

Lyn Shelton Graybill
Culpeper, Virginia

B.A., The College of William and Mary, 1980
M.A., The University of Virginia, 1987

A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate
Faculty of the University of Virginia
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Woodrow Wilson Department of Government
and Foreign Affairs

University of Virginia
January 1991

Kenneth W. Thompson
Inis L. Claude, Jr.

Abstract

The focus of this study is on Christianity and black nationalism. Just as theology (Calvinism) was significant in the formulation of Afrikaner nationalism, so too has theology, variously interpreted, been instrumental in the articulation of African nationalism. The African National Congress (ANC), the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM), and the United Democratic Front (UDF) all relied on a Christian perspective and vocabulary to articulate the goals of black nationalism. Religion is thus the thread of continuity that links the resistance movements of the twentieth century.

My study looks at four individuals -- Albert Lutuli, Robert Sobukwe, Steve Biko, and Desmond Tutu -- and demonstrates how each leader's Christian belief influenced the political strategy he pursued within the African National Congress, Pan-Africanist Congress, Black Consciousness Movement, and United Democratic Front, respectively. I focus on their leadership in four major episodes of resistance: the Defiance Campaign of 1952, the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960, the Soweto Uprising of 1976, and the Opposition to the Tricameral Parliament of 1983.

Only recently with the 1988 bannings of eighteen anti-apartheid organizations, which catapulted many religious leaders into politics to fill the void, has the centrality of Christianity to the struggle against apartheid been recognized. I argue, however, that religion has always been paramount in the African resistance movements, and as a pervasive influence deserves to be taken seriously as an engine for change.

Table of Contents

For "Busy"

1960-1988

Introduction

In 1981 the Study Commission on U.S. Policy Toward Southern Africa produced what was generally considered a definitive study on South African politics and society.[1] Regrettably, religion was covered in a mere page and half. Given its thorough treatment of a multitude of other subjects -- trade unions, political parties, the press -- and given the use to which this study would be put in helping to develop U.S. foreign policy toward South Africa, this omission is especially egregious. Yet the Commission's oversight is not the exception but the rule in analyses of South African politics. Most scholars pay insufficient attention to the impact of religion on political development despite the fact that South Africa is an avowedly "Christian" state whose census figures,[2] Constitution, and public pronouncements support this appellation.

One cannot pick up a political document from either the Nationalist government or the resistance movements without being struck by the numerous references to God. Prime Ministers have been known to respond publicly to synodical resolutions and these resolutions have led to debates in Parliament, with each side attempting to show the consistency of its position with Scripture. What

this suggests is that the role of religion is not insignificant. De Gruchy states that theology "is ... not pushed to the edges of life but operates at the very pulse of South African culture."[3]

A review of South African history reveals how central religion has been to politics -- both black and white. The relationship between the Dutch Reformed Church and the Nationalist Party has been recognized; the Dutch Reformed Church[4] is sometimes referred to as "The National Party at Prayer." The linkages between the Dutch Reformed Church and the government are ample with many prime ministers and members of Parliament having served as either ministers or church leaders of that denomination. Indeed, the NG Kerk churchmen have boasted that it was their church, not the Nationalist Party, that first laid down the principles and framework of apartheid. The thesis that Calvinism helped to foster Afrikaner nationalism is recognized in the academic literature. Moodie[5], de Klerk[6], and Templin[7] have demonstrated how theology has buttresed, rationalized, and helped to realize Afrikaner nationalism. According to them, the Calvinism that developed during the Great Trek held that God had divided mankind into distinct nations. Thus, separation of population groups is the norm and the will of God. Furthermore, God had chosen

the Afrikaner nation as the elect -- His instrument in Southern Africa to fulfill a divine mission. From the doctrine of separation came the political policy of apartheid, and the idea of election gave religious justification for beliefs in racial superiority.

Both popularly and academically there is less appreciation of Christianity's role in the development of African nationalism. Popularly, it is assumed that Communism is the most salient ideology that has shaped black political resistance. One need only turn to Ronald Reagan's explanations of "constructive engagement" to see that the main threat envisaged to South Africa, both externally and internally, is Communism.

In the academic literature, studies similar to Moodie's and De Klerk's on the impact of Christianity on black nationalism are few in number. The best are: Walshe's[8] history of the African National Congress, which looks at the ideological influences, including Christianity, on the formation of the ANC; Gerhart's[9] work, which traces the evolution of various ideologies, including Christianity, on the ANC's Youth League, Pan-Africanist Congress, and Black Consciousness Movement; and Mothlhabi's[10] studies, which examine the Christian legacy on the African National Congress, Pan-Africanist Congress, Black Conscicusness Movement,

United Democratic Front, and National Forum. Though indebted to these, especially the latter two, this study's perspective is narrower than Gerhart's, focusing solely on Christian influences and unlike Mothlhabi, makes no attempt to judge which organization's strategy was the more "moral."

The conventional wisdom is that religion's impact on African political activity, if any, has been negative -- preaching patience, encouraging forebearance, teaching obedience to the state, and urging dialogue rather than revolt. Religion is viewed as having hampered African assertiveness, the degree of religiosity corresponding to the degree of passivity. However, the Marxist critique that religion is an ideology of the oppressing class used to mystify the oppressed is an oversimplification. This may well have been the use the Nationalists had in mind for Calvinism, but this mystification did not come about. At no time did black South Africans accept the condition of oppression as an expression of the will of God. Counter-theologies arose in opposition to the theology of the oppressors, which enabled Africans to pierce the myth of racial inferiority and see themselves as equal before God.

Even the South African government recognizes that Christian theology can be put to the service of radical

politics. The Schlebusch and Eloff Commissions investigating the Christian Institute and South African Council of Churches, respectively, determined that Christian theology was capable of launching a "dangerous and subversive attack ... on the existing political, social, and economic order in the Republic."[11] The banning of the Christian Institute can be understood in the context of the government's fear of a militant black Christian-based political opposition.

Admittedly, in the early days of the ANC, religion did play a somewhat moderating role. The ANC stressed modest goals: the right for representation in government as junior partners and the removal of certain discriminatory laws that assaulted the dignity of man. The white brother, it was believed, could be petitioned on the basis of a shared Christian morality to play fairly. Other tactics were prohibited: one could not justify illegal methods against a God-ordained state nor employ violent means against a neighbor one was enjoined to love.

By the time of the Defiance Campaign in 1952, the point at which this study begins, African resistance had become more assertive, motivated by Christian beliefs that pushed in the direction of active resistance. The goal was more ambitious: one man-one vote in a unitary

system. Passive resistance against unjust laws replaced beggar tactics. The "sinfulness" rather than the "goodness" of the white man in time came to be stressed. And armed struggle eventually was condoned as the "lesser of evils." Christianity, then, was never a static dogma but was continually re-interpreted in the light of new exigencies. Thus, the Christianity espoused by Albert Lutuli was quite different from that articulated by Steve Biko -- and led to different strategies.

This study looks at four individuals -- Albert Lutuli,[12] Robert Sobukwe, Steve Biko, and Desmond Tutu -- and explores how each leader's Christian beliefs shaped the political strategy he pursued within the ANC, PAC, BCM, and UDF, respectively. It focuses on their leadership in four major episodes of resistance: the Defiance Campaign of 1952, the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960, the Soweto Uprising of 1976, and the Opposition to the Tricameral Parliament of 1983.

The selection of these four particular individuals[13] is based on their significant roles in these major campaigns, or "moments of resistance", to use Mothlhabi's phrase.[14] His term is more accurate than the more commonly used "watershed events" because these campaigns were largely unsuccessful. To quote Le May, they were "'turning points' where nothing turned."[15] But it was

the very failure of these campaigns that made the leaders realize the ineffectiveness of the prevailing tactics and the need to devise new ones, always in the context of a religious explanation and justification. These four campaigns, then, provide an opportunity for a snapshot look at African resistance politics as it developed over thirty years.

Among these four individuals, politics tended to gravitate toward two poles -- two opposing views of nationalism. Lutuli and Tutu represent the inclusive multiracial approach, sometimes called the Charterist position. Sobukwe and Biko typify the exclusive blacks-only approach, referred to as the Africanist position. Neither position was completely exclusive of the other, but they were two distinct approaches, supported by different Christian notions, about which much of twentieth century African politics tended to gravitate. This study looks at how theology has been variously employed to justify both the moderate approach of the Charterists and the radical approach of the Africanists.

One can surmise why certain Christian doctrines tend to be stressed to the exclusion of others. Undoubtedly, the fact that the African sees God as liberator and the Afrikaner as the maintainer of order and the status-quo

reflects the different social, political, and economic positions, as well as interests, of those theologizing. Both schools of thought, "prophetic criticism" which stresses the evils of government in history and "priestly sanctification" which sees government as an ordinance of God, are armed with proof texts for their respective positions.[16] Theology, Niebuhr reminds us, is not free from the "ideological taint" of all human knowledge, which gained from a particular perspective nevertheless pretends to be final and ultimate.[17] It "is subject to historical contingencies, influenced by egoistic passions, corrupted by sinful pretensions and is, in short, under the same judgment as philosophy," he writes.[18] The Church is subject to the faulty insights and sinful ambitions of specific groups and classes.[19] "Wherever religion is mixed with power and whenever the religious man achieves power, whether inside or outside the Church, he is in danger of claiming divine sanction for the very human and frequently sinful actions which he takes..."[20] In short, he is tempted to equate his particular interests with eternal truths.

However, circumstances alone can not explain the dominance of one idea over another. Multiracial mission education had quite different effects on Lutuli and Sobukwe, the former valuing multiracial alliances and the

latter shunning them. There is a sense, then, in which beliefs are more than a reflection of circumstances. The affiliation to the Charterist or the Africanist position cannot always be explained by objective conditions, since Africans from the same economic class with similar life experiences opted for opposing movements. It was the task of the individual leaders, therefore, to make their position appealing, and Christianity, which claimed the loyalty of most Africans, was employed in the service of legitimating various strategies and objectives to the African masses. Rationalizations of means and ends, addressed to a society where Christianity was the earliest and most potent ideological frame of reference, were invariably couched in Christian language. Gerhart notes that the "ingrained morality" of the Charterist position vied with the "new moral perspective" of the Africanist approach in every young African's heart and mind.[21]

Lutuli and Tutu could advocate multiracial alliances on the grounds that God's universal fatherhood made all South Africans "brothers." To claim that all whites were irredeemably evil was to deny the power of Christ to convert the sinful. If the goal was a future harmonious multiracial society, certainly the means had to be consistent with that end involving all the people of

South Africa. Tutu emphasized that "we cannot afford to use methods of which we will be ashamed when we look back."[22] Likewise, Lutuli was wary of any revolution fueled by hatred of whites being capable of establishing a political order in which whites would be accepted without rancor. But the primary reason he eschewed violence was that it could not be morally justified given the sacredness of the human person made in God's image.

Sobukwe and Biko, on the other hand, believed that the Charterist approach drew too heavily on the Christian tradition that stressed the goodness of man. They were skeptical about the possibility of white conversion, feeling that it was naive to believe the white man would willingly give up his many advantages without being forced. They were especially cynical of the motives of those apparently sympathetic whites who claimed to share their objective of dismantling apartheid since they so clearly benefited from the system. Polarization was seen as necessary to draw attention to who the enemy was -- the entire white population.

Sobukwe and Biko, like Lutuli and Tutu, were interested in maintaining an aura of moral respectability. They rejected cooperation with whites because paternalistic whites were disrespectful of the black man's dignity. Excluding whites was morally

superior to cooperating with them, because multiracial alliances tended to perpetuate a sense of black inferiority and degradation, encouraging blacks to doubt their own efforts, to wonder whether they were the children of God, or merely his "step-children."

"Love of Africa" was the highest good; therefore, hating whites was ethically justified for it was tantamount to loving Africa. Later, after black rule, whites would again be loved as brothers because all who accepted black majority rule would be counted as "Africans." The belief that God was on the side of the oppressed helped dissolve any moral ambiguities surrounding the use of violence. Just war theories further removed any moral qualms about resorting to armed struggle. It came to be argued that Africans have a "divine right" to liberate themselves from the tyranny of the state because the government had lost any legitimacy as a God-ordained institution.

Invariably, political pronouncements for mass consumption were couched in Christian terms that all levels of a church-attending society -- the educated and the uneducated -- could understand. That is not to say that these leaders did not possess sincere Christian beliefs. The use of religious justifications by African political movements demonstrates, as Niebuhr has pointed

out, that man is nearly incapable of claiming some desired object without seeking to prove that it is desirable in terms of some wider system of values than those which have his own desire at the center.[23] The "value of the end," he writes, "is necessary to sanction the fact that it is desired."[24] Advancing the cause of black political rights became, thus, a Christian duty. The liberation of black South Africans was seen as having wider implications: the liberation of mankind. Likewise, the tactics employed -- nonviolent or violent, multiracial or exclusivist -- were presented within a moral framework, appealing to values beyond mere pragmatism. It was the task of these four leaders, vying for recruits to their political cause, to direct and to manipulate mass attitudes through the language of Christian protest.

The role of religion, however, is twofold. Religion is not only an instrumentality but an absolute standard by which to judge all finite structures. The two forces of religion war with each other -- the utilitarian, which seeks to harness the ultimate to one's immediate purpose, over against the transcendent, in which man desires to submit his will to the divine.[25] Niebuhr writes, "we seek in the same act and the same thought to conform our will to God's and to coerce God's will to our own." [26]

The tendency to hide interest behind more inclusive ideals arises from the fact that man is a transcendent being able to contemplate a more general realm of value than his own interests. If man were not capable of transcending the temporal, he would have no concern for unconditioned truth and thus would not feel compelled to claim absolute validity for his partial perspectives and particular insights. He would not be tempted to confuse his truth with the truth.[27] But, Niebuhr asserts, "[t]he self never follows its 'natural' self-interest without pretending to be obedient to obligations beyond itself. It transcends its own interests too much to be able to serve them without disgusing them in loftier pretensions."[28] Political man justifies his immediate purposes by ultimate principles, "always trying to prove that what [he is] doing is in accord with God's will or with ultimate truth or with the supreme good. Thus, even a religion which is primarily the servant of human purposes points beyond itself." [29]

The capacity of man for self-transcendence opens up a more absolute vantage for judging his necessarily finite perspectives in the light of a more inclusive truth.[30] Man's transcendence forces him to ask how his truth is related to "eternal" truth.[31] Despite the corruption of generally valid principles, there really

are universal norms, writes Bull, "proclaimed by philosophers and publicists, and present in the rhetoric of ...leaders [and] ... reflected at least in part, in ...reality...."[32] It is true that man's ideals are cclored by interests which spring from his temporal existence, yet "he ... sees the possibility of a truth which is more than his truth and of a goodness which is more than his goodness."[33]

The Kingdom of God, though not realizable on earth, nevertheless exerts a pressure upon the conscience of man and represents an ideal for which to strive. Religion provides a source of moral insight for individuals to oppose the false sanctities of governments. It provides a vantage point from which to discount the "pretensions of demonic Caesars."[34] The value of religion is in raising up "sensitive minorities" who can act as the conscience of the nation, subjecting its actions and pretensions to criticism.[35] A prophetic faith enables the opposition to detect the spurious claims of impartiality and universality endemic in every community.[36] A profound faith points to the fact that God is not the ally of nations but their judge.[37]

Focusing on religion in South Africa is justified, then, not only because it has been neglected, but also because nowhere has the interplay between religion as

instrumentality and transcendent truth been more evident than in that country. Religion has been the touchstone both for political ideas and the vehicle for the dissemination of those ideas in South Africa. As a pervasive force, it deserves tc be taken seriously as a catalyst for change.

Notes

1. Study Commission on U.S. Policy Toward Southern Africa, South Africa: Time Running Out (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

2. Over 80% of South Africans are members of Christian churches.

3. John W. de Gruchy, Cited by Simon Maimela, Proclaim Freedom to My People (Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1987), p. 12.

4. There are actually three main white Dutch Reformed Churches: Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk, Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk, and Gereformeerde Kerk.

5. T. Dunbar Moodie, The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

6. William A. de Klerk, The Puritans in Africa: The History of Afrikanerdom (London: Rex Collings, 1975).

7. J. Alton Templin, Ideology on a Frontier: The Theological Foundation of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1652-1910 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984).

8. Peter Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa: The ANC 1912-1952 (Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1971).

9. Gail Gerhart, Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978)

10. Mokgethi Motlhabi, Challenge to Apartheid: Toward a Moral National Resistance (Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans, 1988) and Mokgethi Motlhabi, The Theory and Practice of Black Resistance ao Apartheid (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1984).

11. Cited by Ernie Regehr, Perceptions of Apartheid: The Churches and Political Change in South Africa (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1979), p. 212.

12. Lutuli preferred this spelling of his name. See Thomas Karis and Gwendolen Carter, From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in

South Africa, 1882-1964, 4 Volumes, Volume 3 (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972-1977), p. xviii.

13. Time and space limitations prohibit an extended study of individuals such as John Dube, Z. K. Matthews, Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo, Anton Lembede, Allan Boesak, and the many others whose political perceptions were shaped by their Christian convictions. The majority of African political leaders were Christians whose faith had political implications and who articulated the struggle within a theological framework.

14. Motlhabi, Challenge to Apartheid: Toward a Moral National Resistance, p. 37.

15. G. H. L. Le May, Cited by John Daniel, "Radical Resistance to Minority Rule in South Africa: 1906-1965" (Ph.D. dissertation, Buffalo: State University of New York, 1975), p. 284.

16. Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II: Human Destiny (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964), p. 270.

17. Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destinv of Man, Volume I: Human Nature (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), p. 194.

18. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II, p. 230.

19. Reinhold Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy: Essays on the Christian Interpretation of History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 121.

20. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 122.

21. Gerhart, p. 75.

22. Naomi Tutu, ed. The Words of Desmond Tutu (New York: Newmarket Press, 1989), p. 48.

23. Reinhold Niebuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems (Fairfield, New Jersey: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1977), p. 77.

24. Niebuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems, p. 88.

25. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 78.

26. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 81.

27. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume I, p. 197.

28. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II, p. 109.

29. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, pp. 79-80.

30. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II, p. 214.

31. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II, p. 240.

32. Hedley Bull, The Anarchical Society: A Study of World Politics (New York: Columbia University, 1977), p. 24.

33. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 61.

34. Reinhold Niebuhr, The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defense (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), p. 82.

35. Niebuhr, The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness, p. 183.

36. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 37.

37. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 56.

Chapter I:
Albert Lutuli and the ANC

Albert Lutuli was born in 1898 in Bulawayo, Rhodesia into a devout Christian home. His grandfather had been the first Christian convert of the Umvoti Mission Reserve in Groutville, a mission established by American Congregationalists in Natal in 1836.[1] His father at the time of his birth was employed as an evangelist-interpreter at the Congregationalist mission near Bulawayo. At the mission, Harcourt writes, "...Christian living was a reality, there were no distinctions in color or station; on the contrary, the black man was taught to recognize his own worth and to walk straight with the tallness of his ancestors."[2]

Student and Teacher

After his father's death, the family returned to Groutville where he attended the local mission school, Groutville Primary. He continued his education at Ohlange Institute at Inanda;[3] Edendale, a Methodist school in Pietermaritzburg, and Adams College, an American Board Missionary institute in Amanzimtoti.

At this time in South Africa, any schooling available to Africans was provided by the churches.[4] Gerhart notes that missionary schools were responsible for creating "an African middle class ... imbued with

knowledge of the wider world."[5] Consequently, writes Zulu, it was "from these educated young men and women that the efforts to develop the black man ... politically arose."[6] The educated were the first to argue that liberty, equality, and fraternity about which they were taught should apply equally to Africans. Reflecting on the impact of his early education on his political ideas, he says, "It was at Edendale, I think, that I began to wake up and look about me."[7]

Equally significant to these future African leaders as the academic training was the integrated environment. According to Hinchliff, mission education promoted a "deliberate mixing of the races so that they might come to know one another."[8] Lutuli found this multiracialism advantageous: "Two cultures met, and both Africans and Europeans were affected by the meeting. Both profited, and both survived enriched."[9] Certainly, the intellectual and spiritual experiences during this period laid the foundation for his later moral and political leadership.

His first job was as a school principal in Blaauwbosch[10] where he was challenged by two African Christians to think through the Christian beliefs he had taken for granted. Until then, he admits, he was a Christian "by accident of upbringing rather than by

conscious choice."[11] Shortly thereafter, since there was no local Congregational church, he was confirmed in the Methodist Church and became a lay preacher. "The reality of his faith to him would forever after be a vital influence ...", Benson writes.[12] According to Carter and Gerhart, "The language of the Bible and Christian principles profoundly affected his political style and beliefs for the rest of his life."[13]

Within a few years he was awarded a scholarship to pursue teacher training at Adams College where he stayed on as the first African teacher of Zulu Culture and music. He attributes the Christian ethos he developed to the varied contacts made over a number of years at Adams.[14] He benefitted greatly from the spirited discussions with overseas visitors connected with the American mission board. Thus, while somewhat isolated from political realities within South Africa, Lutuli was exposed to global ideas far advanced to most South Africans, black or white.

In particular, he points to the influence of a fellow teacher at Adams, a liberal Afrikaner who associated freely with blacks. Lutuli comments, "More than any one person, this man helped me to forestall intolerance of whites in general and of Afrikaners in particular."[15] This colleague[16] gave him a sense of Afrikaners as

victims of their own past. "It did enlarge my understanding of the forces which go to the making of men, and it gave me some insight into the dilemma of whites, particularly Afrikaners, which has possibly served in later years as a real protection against hatred and bitterness."[17]

He credits Adams with instilling in him the belief that Christianity was not a private affair without relevance to society but a belief which had to be applied to the conditions of one's time. "Adams taught me what Edendale did not, that I had to do something about being a Christian, and that this something must identify me with my neigbour, not dissociate me from him."[18]

Chief

Reluctantly, Lutuli left Adams in 1936 to take over the duties of chief of the Umvoti Mission Reserve in Groutville. While his experiences as an academic had provided him with an understanding of Christianity as a belief which equipped one to meet the challenges of society, his role as chief opened up his eyes to exactly what those challenges were. He writes, "At Adams College I had had no particular cause to look for beyond the walls of the institution. I was, of course, aware of the South African scene, but Adams was in some ways a protected world, and the South Africa outside did not

reach in in those days.... All that came to an end whan I became Chief of Groutville. Now I saw, almost as though for the first time, the naked poverty of my people, the daily hurt to human beings."[19]

For seventeen years, Lutuli immersed himself in the affairs of his people and gained first hand experience of African political problems. He became aware of the "land hunger" of his people, confined as they were to 13% of the land, and thereby forced to sell their labor to subsist. He was confronted by the need of African men to migrate to the mines and urban areas, causing families to be split apart.[20] He saw this exploitable proletariat was discriminated against in opportunities for employment, conditions of work, and recognition as workers. And in time he came to see that his people were helpless without the vote. As a Christian, what he found unforgiveable about apartheid was its utter indifference "to the suffering of individual persons" who lose their land, their homes, and their jobs in the government's pursuit of an unholy division of mankind.[21] Lutuli's concern, however, was not just that apartheid impoverishes Africans but that it is "a most humiliating affront to their person and dignity."[22] Lutuli considered personal dignity more deserving of redress than economic bondage. He wrote, "This matter of

dwarfing our personalities and trying to make us believe we are nobodies is the worst sin the white man has commited against Africans."[23] He held an "essentially Christian"[24] belief in the sacredness of the human person, and therefore viewed apartheid as an affront to the humanity of the oppressor as well as to the oppressed, since it appealed to his baser instincts: selfishness, greed, and personal agrandisement.[25]

Overseas Ambassador

During this time he made two overseas speaking trips on behalf of Christian missions. Woodson notes that these trips were critical to his philosophical development, providing a rare opportunity for a nonwhite South African to observe nonwhites in societies without apartheid.[26] In 1938, having been elected to the executive committee of the South African Christian Council, he served as a delegate to the International Mission Conference in Madras to discuss the place of indigenous churches in missionary endeavors. Davey writes that Lutuli was impressed with the freedom enjoyed by Indians under the British Raj. The mixing of races in debate, worship, and fellowship at the conference also made a decisive impact upon Lutuli, for it exposed the apartheid of South Africa in all its shame.[27]

It is in India that he experienced the political

implications of Christianity. He was thrilled to witness the vigor of Christianity, which was "alive and active, grappling with its problems and facing its challenges."[28]

He contrasts this with the church in South Africa which "...tended to accommodate itself to the general secular pattern of the country...and generally...has waited for its African converts to push it from behind, to alarm it into belated action."[29] From discussions on the interaction of the Christian faith and rising nationalist movements in the Third World, he discovered that "we in South Africa were way down below in our thinking...."[30] He came home, he writes, "an incisive critic of South African Christianity...."[31]

Ten years later, a second invitation to travel overseas arose out of his church activities. Under the aegis of the American Board and the North American Missionary Conference, he was invited to the United States to speak on Christian missions. During that trip, he warned Americans that Christianity was facing its severest test in South Africa because of the evil of racial discrimination. Having witnessed the power of the growing civil rights movement, he was reluctant to return to South Africa, for it was refreshing to enjoy "normal relations" with white people.[32]

He credits travel abroad with helping him see South

African issues more sharply, and in a different and larger perspective. But he denied he was "spoiled" by travel abroad. He writes, "I was spoiled by being made in the image of God."[33] His deeply held religious belief that men are equal in the sight of God is the fundamental source of his political ideas, and his opposition to apartheid is based on its splintering of the family of man. Trips abroad only opened his eyes to how other societies had dealt more positively with race relations.

Political Leader

Lutuli was being challenged not only by experiences abroad but by political events within South Africa. In 1936, the "Hertzog Bills" were passed, which presaged the full-scale implementation of apartheid in 1948.[34] These bills included the Representation of Natives Bill which removed Africans from the Cape roll of voters to a separate roll,[35] and the Native Trust and Land Bill, which prohibited any African from owning land except in the reserves -- areas designated by the government as homelands for the various ethnic groups. Benson writes, "As his deeply held religious beliefs were applied to these facts, almost for the first time he felt the poverty and daily hurt to human beings inflicted by the system of rule by a privileged white minority."[36]

As part of the Representation of Natives Bill, the

Native Representative Council (NRC) was established with Africans as members to advise the government on African concerns.[37] Lutuli was elected to it in 1946,[38] and although Lutuli says that the African leaders "were never warm about the Representation of Natives Act of 1936," they nevertheless accepted it in the spirit of "Let us put the white man on trial."[39] At his first Council meeting, realizing the impotence of this body, he succeeded in having the members vote to adjourn indefinitely.[40] Lutuli explained, "The feeling was growing apace that there was work to be done. The days of fruitless talking were sliding into the past.... Men with a desire to air grievances gave way to men with a purpose."[41]

The previous year, Lutuli had joined the ANC Natal chapter and increasingly felt that the ANC was the better vehicle through which to press African demands to the government. He explained his introduction to the ANC this way:

> I was precipitated into Congress casually, almost by accident.... I had for a long time admired the stand made by the ANC particularly against the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts, and against passes. It appeared as an organization struggling for the uplift of the people, and the removal of heavy shackles.... I was then, as many people are now, a part of Congress in all but the technical sense.[42]

Callan notes that it was more than just a whim that brought Lutuli into the ANC at this time. World War II

had brought an industrial revolution to South Africa with the accompanying population movement from rural to urban areas. Many of Lutuli's subjects were becoming directly and harshly affected by the administration of apartheid as they migrated for jobs in the city.[43]

When Dube, President of the Natal chapter, died suddenly in 1946, Lutuli found himself on the executive committee under the new president, A.W.G. Champion. As membership in Natal grew under Champion's leadership, Lutuli writes, "...at last we began to turn away from thinking in terms of an amelioration here and a concession there, and to get down to fundamentals. We began, in other words, to demand our rightful place in the South Africa sun, where before we had been petitioning to be treated a little less harshly in the place assigned to us by whites."[44]

With the Adoption of the Programme of Action in 1949, following on the heels of the Nationalist victory the previous year, new goals were clarified: "We were no longer interested in ... petty adjustments. There was no longer any doubt in our mind that without the vote we are helpless."[45] Likewise, new methods were stresed: illegal but non-violent country-wide demonstrations, strike actions, and civil disobedience were to replace words.[46]

Lutuli explained his political activity in the ANC

as the expression of his Christian faith: "For myself I am in Congress precisely because I am a Christian. My own urge, because I am a Christian, is to get into the thick of the struggle ... taking my Christianity with me and praying that it may be used to influence for good the character of the resistance."[47] He began to feel that the Church all too often evaded its responsibility for the whole of man's life. "How can you wipe out man's political ambitions and desires and say you are developing his personality...?" he questioned.[48] Lutuli warned against a misapplication of Christian trust, the idea that "God will give us freedom when He is ready."[49] Such belief encouraged the abandonment of personal responsibility, resulting in a "resigned fatalism, a daydream about what God may do in the future, while the present slips by."[50] For Lutuli, a passive view of Christianity could not be reconciled with the "Christian principle of work and pray."[51]

Defiance Campaign

Opportunity to put his faith into action arose when, as the newly-elected Natal provincial president of the ANC,[52] he found himself embroiled in the Defiance Campaign, the first major episode of passive resistance led by the ANC. Champion, unsure of the advisability of the Campaign, had not informed the Natal chapter of the

plans. Lutuli was astonished to learn of the Campaign for the first time at the end of 1951 at the ANC's national conference. He decided to argue for it in principle but plead for postponement so that he could prepare the Natal ANC membership. He feared that an ill-prepared action would be worse than none, because of the possibility of its leading to violence. Lutuli's objections were heard, but the ANC voted to go ahead with the June 26 date, with the proviso that Natal could enter when it felt ready.

Congress decided to apply its new method -- non-violent civil disobedience -- to "all those particular discriminatory laws ... which were not informed by morality."[53] However, the fact that the Indian[54] and African Congresses participated jointly in the campaign limited the scope of what actually could be done.[55] Different laws oppress different non-white groups. What they shared in common, writes Lutuli, was the humiliation of discrimination in public places.[56] Thus, the main focus of the campaign was against the national motto "Europeans only;" volunteers were to disregard "separate but equal facilities". The idea was for the two congresses to openly disobey these laws and to suffer arrest and imprisonment peacefully. "The method was to send in groups of carefully trained

volunteers to disobey publicly," explained Lutuli.[57] Forman writes, "And in every case they first made certain that they would be caught red-handed, making appointments with the police as carefully and meticulously as with dentists."[58] The aim was to fill the prisons, thus paralyzing the system of justice and forcing the government into concessions.[59]

In fact, some 8500 volunteers -- mainly Africans, but some Asians and a few Europeans -- trained in the methods of non-violent resistance, used segregated public amenities, patronized the European section of post offices and train coaches, and sat on white park benches. Led by 250 leaders of the ANC, the campaign was to consist of three phases: defiance by small groups in cities; extension throughout the countryside; and finally mass defiance involving industrial centers.

Lutuli's role in the campaign was that of a "staff officer." He writes, "I did not myself defy any law. My job was to remain in the background, to keep up the pressure and to organise."[60] In particular, Lutuli's job was to tour the rural areas, recruting for volunteers. But the campaign never fully reached into the countryside as anticipated. In fact, 70% of those arrested came from the small towns and cities of the eastern Cape.[61] Lewin's explanation for this pattern of concentration

follows: They were "... better educated and more Christianized after longer contact with western civilization. Resistance in this area was marked by notable religious fervor ... and it was supported by African clergy...."[62]

In October 1952 Lutuli was summoned to Pretoria by Dr. W.W.M. Eiselen, Secretary of Native Affairs, to discuss his Congress activities. He explained that he was in Congress precisely because of the things to which chieftancy had opened his eyes. When he refused to resign either posts, seeing no conflict with serving God in two realms, he was deposed as chief. In response, Lutuli issued a statement: "I have embraced the Non-Violent Passive Resistance techniques in fighting for freedom because I am convinced it is the only non-revolutionary, legitimate and humane way that could be used by people denied, as we are, effective Constitutional means to further aspirations."[63]

At the annual ANC conference in December 1952, Lutuli was elected President-General by an overwhelming majority.[64] Lutuli later had this to say about his election at so crucial a time: "I felt it was an overwhelming call of the people -- and the voice of the people is sometimes the voice of God."[65] In the wake of harsh, new legislation,[66] he quickly brought the campaign

to an end six months after it began. In a press statement, he explained his reason for involvement in the Campaign:

> Laws and conditions that tend to debase human personality -- a God-given force -- be they brought about by the State or other individuals, must be relentlessly opposed in the spirit of defiance shown by St. Peter when he said to the rulers of his day: "Shall we obey God or man?"[67]

He believed the new tactics were consistent with Christian teaching: "I sin if I submit to the indignities that are hurled at me. I am a guardian of the divine dignity within me, and it is my duty to defend it."[68] Later, he wrote, "We are performing a divine duty when we struggle for freedom."[69] In his Nobel prize acceptance speech, he eloquently summarized the Christian convictions that led to his involvement in the Defiance Campaign:

> "I ... as a Christian and patriot, could not look on while systematic attempts were made almost in every department of life, to debase the God-factor in man or to set a limit beyond which the human being in his Black form might not strive to serve his Creator to the best of his ability. To remain netural in a situation where the laws of the land virtually criticized God for having created men of colour was the sort of thing I could not, as a Christian, tolerate.[70]

Until the Defiance Campaign, the Christian conviction of the ANC leadership was manifested not in active political self-assertion but in verbal appeals on moral grounds for justice. The ANC had traditionally relied on

petitions and deputations, hoping what South Africans could be enjoined to live up to the standards of Christianity. Despite disillusionment over the years with efforts to pursue justice, "a Christian vision of non-racial justice persisted," writes Walshe, and the "most common form of protest consequently remained a moral assertion of human dignity with its roots in the Christian ethic."[71] The leaders of the ANC continued into the 1950s to rely "on the assumption that non-racial justice in political and economic matters was grounded in the Christian message of God's fatherhood, the brotherhood of man, and the command to love one's neighbor as oneself."[72]

Lutuli says this about the early strategy of Congress:

> In its early days Congress gave voice to the many day-to-day grievances of the people. It appealed (fruitlessly) to the whites, it made representatations, and it busied itself with the spadework of creating unity. It did not at that time attack the fundamental issue -- participation in ownership and government. Realistically -- for it was dealing with people who were still politically unawakened -- it addressed itself to such sources of hardship as the 1913 Land Act and the Pass System. In these early stages it was asking for alleviation rather than demanding votes.[73]

The legacy of Christianity up to this point in South African history was to support an unrealistic optimism in white South Africa's willingness to change. This view,

with its apparent faith in the white man's basic instinct for fair play, "ill-prepared [black South Africans] to come to grips with the realities of power politics and the selfish drive of organized white interests."[74] However, with the realization that appeals to fellow Christians would not bring political reform, the ANC gradually accepted the need for mass organization and assertion of black political power, culminating in the Defiance Campaign.

Lutuli's explanation for rejecting the early strategy, was simply, that it had not worked:

> Who will deny that thirty years of my life have been spent knocking in vain, patiently, moderately and modestly at a closed and barred door? What have been the fruits of moderation?[75]

In fact, the Africans' situation had worsened dramaticlly over the years:

> The past thirty years have seen the greatest number of laws restricting our rights and progress until today we have reached a stage where we have almost no rights at all: no adequate land for our occupation; our only asset, cattle, dwindling; no security of homes; no decent and remunerative employment; more restrictions to freedom of movement through passes, curfew regulations, influx control measures. In short, we have witnesed in these years an intensification of our subjection to insure and protect white supremacy.[76]

Therefore, the new strategy was justified:

> It is with this background and with a full sense of responsibiliy that, under the auspices of the ANC, I have joined my people in the new spirit that moves them today, the spirit that revolts openly and boldly against injustice and expresses itself in a

determined and non-violent manner.[77]

The Church

An inclination to moralize on the basis of Christian ethics survived the transition from reliance on the moral regeneration of society to the acceptance of the need for mass demonstrations.[78] Despite the change in tactics, the church was still relevant. Lutuli wrote:

> Obviously we do not expect to see the Church organizing political movements. But it must be with the people, in their lives. I have no admiration for the political predikant. But I know something of the thirst of my people for spiritual guidance in the situation which confronts us now and will continue to be our lot for some time yet. The Church must be in among us all. If it stands on the outskirts, we cannot expect our religion to survive and be respected -- we are untrue to our mission and that is suicide. Too often the flock has been left to its own devices in pressing matters of the moment.[79]

While seeing an important role for the Church, Lutuli nevertheless criticized it for not living up to its responsibility. In a speech given during the Treason Trial (1956-61), in which he along with 155 other leaders of all races was tried on charges of high treason,[80] he laments:

> White paternalist Christianity -- as though the whites had invented the Christian faith -- estranges my people from Christ. Hypocrisy, double standards, and the identification of white skins with Christianity, do the same. For myself, for very many of us, nothing short of apostasy would budge us. We know Christianity for What it is, we know it is not a white preserve, we know that many whites --

> and Africans for that matter -- are inferior exponents of what they profess. The Faith of Christ persists in spite of them.[81]

The Church he accuses of supporting government policy:

> The Churches above all were to have brought us not apartheid but fellowship one with another. Have they? Some measure of human failure is inevitable. Even so, have not many of the churches simply submitted to a secular state which opposes expressions of fellowship and our membership one with another? Have not some even gone so far as to support the outlook of the secular state?[82]

The churches burned during the Defiance Campaign had become to Africans symbols of oppression:

> They stand for an ethic which the whites have brought, preached, and refused to practise... "You close your eyes obediently to pray," goes the saying, "and when you open them the whites have taken your land and interfered with your women..." These churches represent something alien from the spirit of Christ, a sort of patronising social service... Do not many Christian ministers talk down to us instead of coming down ... among us, as Christ did and does?...[83]

In conclusion, he urged that it was not too late for white Christians to look at the Gospels and redefine their allegiances: "But, if I may presume to do so, I warn those who care for Christianity, who care to 'go into all the world and preach the Gospel.' In South Africa the opportunity is three hundred years old. It will not last forever. The time is running out."[84]

Despite his criticism of the church, Lutuli credited the ANC's Defiance Campaign with drawing the churches

more directly into the political arena. Except for the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC), no church condemned outright the Defiance Campaign. The churches were participating instead of taking the stand "politics is not our business." When the Christian Council first refused to issue a statement during the Defiance Campaign, feeling it would be an inappropriate action for a coordinating body of member churches, Lutuli persuaded it to draft one.[85] The Council resolved that the individual Christian had to bring his conscience to bear; only obedience to a Higher law than man's justified disobedience to man's laws. Lutuli found it a "sound and useful statement" which saved the Christian Council from charges of evasion.[86] Lutuli wrote:

> At long last there were clear signs that the churches were becoming involved in the South Africa struggle as churches. Here and there individuals have acted and spoken out all along. Now African Christians, involved in making moral decisions about passive resistance, wanted the guidance of their churches speaking officially with voices not African or European but Christian.[87]

Communists

But Lutuli had one important criticism of the churches. Christians were criticizing the Communists "from a deep armchair" when Communists were among those deeply involved in the opposition.[88] Communists had been some of the ANC's earliest allies -- the Communist Party dating back to 1921 -- with many ANC members boasting

dual memberships in the ANC and SACP (South African Communist Party).[89] He wrote, "For myself I am not a Communist. Communism seems to me to be a mixture of a false theory of society linked on to a false 'religion.' In religion I am a Christian and the gods of state worship (as in Russia...) are not my Gods."[90] But, according to Lutuli, the principle concern is liberation, and "we are not going to be side tracked by ideological clashes and witchhunts. When I cocperate with Communists in Congress affairs I am not cooperating with Communism. We leave our differing political theories until the day of liberation, and in the meantime we are cooperating in a defined area in the cause of liberation."[91] After the dismantling of apartheid, "we will sort ouselves out into conventional political parties."[92]

Given his Christian background, it is not surprising that Lutuli expressed his willingness to cooperate with Communists in terms of the principle of the dignity of man before God and the command to love one's neighbor. He wrote:

> The Communist philosophy I reject. But Communists are people; they are among the number of my neighbours, and I will not regard them as less.... The strength to combat and rectify their false doctrines, as with the false doctrines of white supremacists, does not lie in my depersonalising them and going apart into an anti-anybody campaign. It lies rather in the things I believe in, it lies within me. I am confident enough in the Christian faith to believe that I can serve my neighbour best

by remaining in his company.[93]

Jordan Ngubane, a one-time Youth Leaguer, publicly debated Lutuli on this issue. He warned Lutuli that he was in danger of being used as a "cat's paw" of Moscow.[94]

Yet Lutuli continued to affirm his position and to work alongside communists such as Walter Sisulu, a member of the Youth League, and communists in the Congress of Democrats. Of the latter he wrote: "All we know is that these men came to help us. I don't deny that some might have ulterior motives, but all I am concerned about is that they came to assist me fight racial oppression, and they have no trace of racialism or being patronizing, just no trace of it at all."[95]

To make his point, he reminded his critics of the Biblical story of the blind man healed by Christ. When people asked him, "Who healed you? Was he not a sinner?", the blind man said (here Lutuli threw wide his arms), "I don't care who he was. All I know is that he healed me."[96]

Multiracialism

Because Lutuli believed in the brotherhood of all men, the equality of the races before God, he believed that the tactics employed should be multi-racial and, likewise, any final political solution should be multi-racial, involving all the peoples of South Africa

-- white, Indian, and Colcured, as well as black. Briggs and Wing write, "As a Congregationalist he stood for those values which are an integral part of the Congregational witness ... the liberty and the unity of all men within the family of God."[97] He believed "that the unity between the races which had been achieved in Congregationalism, where our oneness in Christ transcends our racial differences, was a practical policy for South Africa."[98]

At Bloemfontein, the ANC had endorsed the decision to undertake the Defiance Campaign in conjunction with the Indian Congress "and with any others who cared to join in."[99] In speech after speech, Lutuli affirmed his willingness to accept whites in the struggle. Lutuli praised the emergence of cooperation between races during the Defiance Campaign "not merely because it increases the impact of resistance, but because it is the beginning of a non-racial South Africa."[100] As the following passage makes clear, his advocacy of multiracialism was clearly a moral decision over a mere tactical one:

> I believe that a racially exclusive resistance is the wrong reply to a racially exclusive oppression. It is morally the wrong reply, and it is also a demonstration of the wrong method if we think of the ideal it sets before our children. Tactically, the drawing in of our horns and the concentration of our forces may have some advantages, but in the long run it will obstruct the way to a South Africa that embraces all her citizens.[101]

Never once did Lutuli advocate a narrow, black nationalism; he stood for a form of political partnership in which each group would make its own contribution to the "growing fullness and enrichment of all."[102] He made it clear that he was not opposed to whites per se but to their system: "Africa as a whole is sick of ... whites as perpetual 'senior partner'. This is not the same as being sick of whites...."[103] The Defiance Campaign, he made clear, was undertaken to resist unjust laws, not whites. In fact, because of his moderate multi-racialism, many whites correctly saw Lutuli as a devoted Christian, concerned about their well-being. According to Choonoo, Lutuli became a "Moses figure", whom his followers saw not exclusively as a black nationalist but as a black man concerned about the destiny of all men.[104]

Lutuli, re-elected President General in 1955, brought together at Kliptown,[105] on the symbolic date of June 26, the Congress of the People[106] -- members of the Indian and Coloured Congresses as well as the Congress of Democrats.[107] The COP was to be a demonstration of what South Africa's first national convention in 1903 should have been, representative of all racial groups. The Congress's agenda was the ratification of the Freedom Charter, which Lutuli had helped write.[108] The Freedom

Charter[109] summarized the posture of the ANC as well as Lutuli's own philosophy on the principle of a multi-racial South Africa: "South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and ... no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of all the people."[110] Lutuli explained that the Freedom Charter was based on the fact that all races which had made South Africa their home were entitled to ownership: "What is important for our situation is that we are all here ... and no one desires to change it or should desire to change it. And since we are all here, we must seek a way whereby we can realize democracy, so that we can live in peace and harmony in this land of ours."[111]

Kuper points out that the Freedom Charter did not demand a transfer of power to Africans but urged a sharing of power.[112] Motlhabi explains that the moderate language, a 40-year habit with the ANC, was retained to allay white fears and prevent an all-white backlash.[113] Of course, the implication of the Charter's preamble was black majority rule, but the tone of the document was color blind with no "Africanist" invocation.

According to Gerhart, the legacy of Christianity in the ANC was the acceptance of a multi-racial ideal of nationalism. The ANC under Lutuli's leadership stood for African rights within the framework of a pluralistic

democracy, "the [nation] being ultimately defined not as the community of black Africans only, but as a multi-racial community of all people born in South Africa."[114] Lutuli was clear on this point: "...we would as strongly be opposed to Black domination, or any other kind of domination from whatever source, as we are uncompromisingly opposed tc white domination."[115] For "we do not desire to dominate but to share as between brethren."[116]

Violence

According to Gerhart, the other legacy of Christianity on the ANC was a rejection of violence.[117] For Lutuli, cooperation with some whites necessarily excluded violence against other whites. Lutuli summed up his beliefs: "Had Congress ever been an organisation which placed reliance on bloodshed and violence, things would have been simpler. What we have aimed to do in South Africa is bring the white man to his senses, not slaughter him. Our desire has been that he should co-operate with us, and we with him."[118] For Lutuli, the claim of human dignity precludes force. "With those who recognize it we are at one. We cannot discard it in our dealings with those who deny it."[119]

Lutuli believed that a non-violent approach had practical implications as well. It would make

reconstruction and reconciliation in a new South Africa easier, because there would not be the bitterness bound to follow a violent struggle. But the main reason for choosing the non-violent approach was moral, because "our better natures and our conscience demand this of us."[120]

Lutuli urged non-violence because as a Christian he felt no other methods were moral, or, for that matter, necessary. The belief in the rightness of their cause was a tremendous source of encouragement to Lutuli and his followers. He wrote, "I trust that the consciousness of the justice of our cause and a belief in the divine approval of our struggle will give us strength and courage to bear it until victory is won."[121] Lutuli saw the struggle as one of "right against wrong, good against evil" and saw the conclusion as foregone. Apartheid will perish, he believed, as must any system founded on "contempt for human beings."[122] He urged, "The road to freedom may be long and thorny but because our Cause is just, the glorious end -- Freedom -- is ours."[123]

His faith in the inherent goodness of man translated into the conviction that whites could be enjoined to change their ways. By the time of the Defiance Campaign, there was an awareness that whites had not had a change of heart. Still, Lutuli did not advocate wresting power from whites. Rather, the non-violent passive resistance

campaign was to demonstrate tc white South Africa the lengths that Africans were prepared to gc to demonstrate their unhappiness with apartheid. White South Africans would be so moved as to modify their opinions it was hoped. "We will shake to repentance the hearts of white South Africans...", Lutuli wrote.[124] Daniel notes that the ANC never expected that these campaigns would be immediately successful; they were, instead, undertaken to rejuvenate the faith of the protesters in the rightness of their cause.[125] Lutuli did not harbor an "apocalyptic" view of God's intervening on their behalf, but he did see the struggle in terms of spiritual warfare. "We do not struggle with guns and violence, and the supremacist's array of weapons is powerless againt the spirit," he wrote.[126]

Callan notes that Lutuli never wavered from his commitment to nonviolence even as late as 1960 on the eve of Sharpeville: "Our situation in the Union may be grim, but it is not hopeless. There is still enough good will and charitableness among South Africans, Black and White -- if only leaders, both Black and White, and the government would get together to talk things over."[127] The Legums note that nine years after the Defiance Campaign, on the occasion of receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, there was still no oscillating in his belief:

> I firmly believe in non-violence. It is the only correct form which our work and our struggle can take in South Africa. Both from the moral and the practical point of view the situation in our country demands it. Violence disrupts human life and is destructive to perpetrator and victim alike.... To refrain from violence is the sign of the civilized man.... Yet I do not regard peace as a passive thing. The non-violent policy I am advocating is a positive one.... It demands moral courage and taxes our physical courage....[128]

Perhaps Lutuli's position is more complex. In his Nobel acceptance speech, he reaffirms his belief in non-violence, while recognizing the legitimacy of armed struggle elsewhere in Africa. Furthermore, he asserts that violence is not an appropriate method for the ANC, but he admits it is not an impossibility given white intransigence. Lutuli wrote:

> It has naturally crossed our minds to wonder whether anything but indiscriminate bloodshed and violence will make any impression, so impervious do they seem. It will do neither them nor us any good, and if they get it, it would not be from Congress. It will be simply the result of unendurable provocation, of trading for too long on a patience which has its limits. If the whites continue as at present, nobody will give the signal for mass violence. Nobody will need to.[129]

Gerhart writes that all the ideological asumptions underlying the outlook of the ANC rested on Christian morality.[130] Therefore, "an aggresively anti-white stance could perhaps be ruled out on grounds of practicality alone, but more important to the genuine Christian -- and there were many in the ANC -- no African organization could ever be regarded as <u>morally</u> justified

if its appeal for support was based on the policy of an eye for an eye."[131]

But emerging at this time within the ranks of the ANC was a nationalist-minded coalition, called Africanists, at odds with both the moderation and multiracialism of Lutuli. Walshe writes that there was much "heart-searching and frustration" as a new strand of thought established itself.[132]

Notes

1. The founder, Alvin Grout, is also known as the man who loaned a copy of the U.S. Constitution to the Voortrekkers, who founded a Republic in Natal.

2. Melville Harcourt, "Albert Lutuli" in his Portraits of Destiny (New York: Sheed and Worrel, 1966), p. 103.

3. Ohlange was founded by the Rev. John Dube, the first President-General of the ANC. Educated in the United States, he was influenced by Booker T. Washington's program for eductional self-help.

4. The Bantu Education Act of 1953, implemented in 1954, took control of education away from the churches. The Act arose out of concern that mission schools were inculcating in black students a desire for equality with whites. Bantu education, on the other hand, would prepare blacks for an economically useful role while denying them higher achievements. See Shaun Johnson, "Youth in the Politics of Resistance," in Shaun Johnson, ed. South Africa: No Turning Back (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 98.

5. Gail Gerhart, Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), p. 33.

6. Lawrence Zulu, "Nineteenth Century Missionaries: Their Significance for Black South Africa," in Mokgethi Motlhabi, Essays on Black Theology (Johannesburg: University Christian Movement, 1972), p. 88.

7. Albert Luthuli, Let My People Go (London: Collins, 1962), p. 28.

8. Peter Hinchliff, The Church in South Africa (London: SPCK, 1968), p. 88.

9. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 31.

10. Lutuli was the entire staff.

11. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 32.

12. Mary Benson, Chief Albert Lutuli of South

Africa (London: Oxford, 1963), p. 7.

13. Thomas Karis and Gwendolyn Carter, From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964, 4 Volumes (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972-1977), Volume 4, p. 61.

14. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 42.

15. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 39.

16. The colleague was de Villiers, who, ironically, later became head of the government department responsible for applying the Bantu Education Act.

17. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 40.

18. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 42.

19. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 57.

20. Group Areas legislation kept families from living with the male head of household in the "white" areas.

21. Albert Luthuli, "Africa and Freedom," Vital Speeches, 28, (February, 1962), p. 269.

22. Albert Luthuli, "The Effect of Minority Rule on Nonwhites" in Hildegarde Spottiswoods, South Africa, The Road Ahead (London: Bailey Bros. and Swinfen, Ltd., 1960), p. 112.

23. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 140.

24. Edward Callan, Albert John Luthuli and the South African Race Conflict (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1962), p. 51. He notes that the idea of sacredness of the person is an African as well as Christian concept. For the similarities between African traditional religions and Christianity, see also John de Gruchy, The Church Struggle in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 157.

25. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 214.

26. Dorothy Woodson, "The Speeches of Albert J. Luthuli," Africana Journal 13, 1-4, p. 214.

27. Cyril Davey, Fifty Lives for God (London:

Oliphants, 1973), p. 109.

28. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 80.

29. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 80.

30. Benson, p. 13.

31. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 81.

32. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 10.

33. Luthuli, Let My People Go, 85.

34. Hertzog's was the first Afrikaner Nationalist Party victory. Lutuli did not take part in the All-African Convention in the late 1930s to oppose the Hertzog Bills. Natal was still politically isolated. This convention, however, included other respected church dignitaries. See Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 6.

35. This removed Cape blacks to a separate roll for the purpose of electing three white native representatives to the lower house, and by indirect means, electing four white senators to the upper chamber. Before the removal, it had been hoped that the franchise for property-owning Africans effective in the Cape Province since 1854 would be extended to the other three provinces. This did not happen, and the Coloureds in the Cape lost their franchise as well in 1955.

36. Benson, p. 12.

37. This was merely a consultative body that advised the government. The NRC had twenty-three members -- seven whites and sixteen Africans. Twelve of the latter were selected by indirect elections.

38. Lutuli defeated Selby Msimang in a by-election for a successor to John Dube, who had died.

39. Callan, p. 22.

40. The NRC was abolished by the government in 1951 under the Bantu Authorities Act which transferred the administration of Africans to the minister of Native Affairs, then Dr. Verwoerd.

41. Luthuli, Let My People Go, pp. 97-98.

42. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 99.

43. Callan, p. 99. For the effect of post-World War II industrialization on African nationalism, see Peter Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa: The ANC 1912-1952 (Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1971), pp. 328-332. For a discussion of post-war economic development as an impetus for uniting Blacks, Coloureds, and Indians in a common milieu, see Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 70.

44. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 100.

45. Luthuli, p. 109. "African Claims" in 1943 had stated "our undisputed claims to full citizenship." Earlier tht year, the ANC's revised constitution did not mention the franchise explicitly, but the 1957 constitution was clear about insisting on the principle of one man-one vote.

46. The new strategy reflected concern that the Nats under Malan were bent on expanding customary segregation into sytematic apartheid. New tactics were thought to be necessary.

47. Luthuli, Let My People Go, pp. 154-155.

48. Benson, p. 13.

49. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 190.

50. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 190.

51. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 190.

52. With the support of the Youth League, he was able to defeat narrowly Champion.

53. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 109.

54. Presumably, the Indian Congress could provide experienced leadership for passive resistance, since Gandhi had developed this technique during his sojourn in South Africa, 1893-1913. Just three years earlier, Africans had rioted against Indians in Durban, which made this joint effort all the more remarkable.

55. The six categories of laws they were protesting were: Pass Laws, Stock Limitation, Group Areas Act, Separate Representation of Voters Act, Suppression of

Communism Act, Bantu Authorities Act. See Edward Feit, The Dynamics of the ANC (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 27.

56. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 117.

57. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 117.

58. Lionel Forman and E. S. Sachs, The South African Treason Trial (London: John Calder, 1957), p. 139.

59. John Daniel, "Radical Resistance to Minority Rule in South Africa: 1906-1965" (PhD dissertation, Buffalo: State University of New York, 1975), p. 149.

60. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 119.

61. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 419. For a description of the Campaign and its aftermath, see Horrel, Muriel, A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa, 1952-1953 (Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1953), pp. 27-30.

62. Albert Luthuli, "Treason Trial lawyer's brief" (Carter-Karis collection). Cited by Gerhart, p. 119.

63. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, pp. 488-489.

64. He succeeded Mcroka who at his trial during the Defiance Campaign disgraced himself by dissociating himself from the other defendants.

65. Benson, pp. 24-25.

66. New legislation had been enacted in 1953: The Public Safety Act enabled the government to declare a state of emergency and then issue emergency regulations. The Criminal Law Amendment Act mandated severe penalties to protesters of any law (fines up to 500 pounds or five years imprisonment).

67. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 488.

68. Colin Legum and Margaret Legum, The Bitter Choice: Eight South Africans' Resistance to Tyranny (New York: World Publishing Co., 1968), p. 62.

69. Albert Luthuli, "Let Us Speak Together of Freedom," Fighting Talk (October, 1954), p. 5.

70. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 705.

71. Walshe, pp. 158-159.

72. Walshe, p. 341.

73. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 91.

74. Gerhart, p. 36.

75. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 487.

76. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, 487.

77. Karis and Carer, Volume 2, p. 487.

78. Walshe, p. 345.

79. Luthuli, Let My People Go, 138.

80. The treason charges against Lutuli were dropped at the end of 1957, but he was involved as a defense witness for the next three years. The prosecutor cited October, 1952, the peak of the Defiance Campaign, as the starting point of the treasonable acts. It has also been said that the Freedom Charter itself was on trial. (Eventually, all 156 defendants were acquitted. The prosecutor was unable to prove either that the Freedom Charter was a Communist document or that the accused had conspired to overthrow the state.)

81. Luthuli, Let My People Go, pp. 131-132.

82. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 132.

83. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 131.

84. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 132.

85. Lutuli had served on the executive of the Christian Council.

86. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 137.

87. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 136.

88. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 137.

89. The Communist Party was opened up to Africans in the mid-1920s. The ANC's relationship to the Party

was mainly with individual members, not the Party itself. Some ANC members boasted dual memberships in the ANC and CP.

90. Luthuli, Let My People Go, pp. 153-154.

91. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 154.

92. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 154.

93. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 155.

94. Anthony Sampson, The Treason Cage: The Opposition on Trial in South Africa (London: Heinemann, 1958), p. 194.

95. Benson, p. 31.

96. Benson, p. 31.

97. D. R. Briggs and J. Wing. The Harvest and the Hope: The Story of Congregationalism in Southern Africa (Johannesburg: United Congregationalist Church of Southern Africa, 1970.), p. 291.

98. Briggs and Wing, p. 291.

99. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 113.

100. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 186.

101. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 186.

102. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 99.

103. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 188.

104. R. Neville Choonoo, "Parallel Lives: Black Autobiography in South Africa and the United States" (Ph.D. dissertatioin, New York: Columbia University, 1982), p. 152.

105. Illness kept Lutuli from attending.

106. June 26, 1952 was the date of the Defiance Campaign. June 26, 1950 had been National Day of Protest and Mourning. Since then, June 26 has been observed as South African Freedom Day. At the Congress of the People, there were 2,844 delegates: 2,182 Africans, 320 Indians, 230 Coloureds, and 112 Whites. The COP later

included the South African Congress of Trade Unions.

107. The Congress of Democrats was formed during the Defiance Campaign. It included many communists, since the Communist Party had been banned in 1950.

108. The Freedom Charter was not penned by one person but based on thousands of ideas forwarded from all around the country. See Forman, p. 142.

109. The Freedom Charter was divided into the following ten headings:
The people shall govern!
All national groups shall have equal rights!
The people shall share in the country's wealth!
The land shall be shared among those who work it!
All shall be equal before the law!
All shall enjoy human rights!
There shall be work and security!
The doors of learning and of culture shall be opened!
There shall be houses, security and comfort!
There shall be peace and friendship!

110. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 205.

111. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 205.

112. Leo Kuper in Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson, The Oxford History of South Africa: 1870-1966, Volume 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 463-464.

113. Mokgethi Motlhabi. Challenge to Apartheid: Toward a Moral National Resistance (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), p.. 44.

114. Gerhart, p. 12.

115. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 401.

116. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 209.

117. Gerhart, p. 42. Even for those ANC members whose political convictions had no religious foundation, the moral position of the ANC was important. See Gerhart, p. 100.

118. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 113.

119. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 116.

120. Benson, p. 64.

121. Albert Luthuli, "The Necessity of a 'Black' South African Church History" in Hans Jergen Becken, ed. Relevant Theology for Africa (Durban: Lutheran Publishing House, 1973) p. 113.

122. Albert Luthuli, "Foreword" in Leslie Rubin and Neville Rubin, This Is Apartheid (London: Christian Action, 1966), p. 3.

123. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 214.

124. "South African Treason Trial Record", p. 32. Cited by Ruth Turner, "Violence and Non-violence in Confrontation: A Comparative Study of Ideologies. Six Historical Cases. Paine, Lenin, Hitler, Gandhi, Luthuli, and King" (Ph.D. dissertation, Amherst: University of Massachussetts, 1979), p. 298.

125. Daniel, p. 197.

126. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 229.

127. Callan, p. 54. Luthuli, "The Effect of Minority Rule on Nonwhites," in Spottiswoods, p. 117.

128. Cited by Legums, p. 61.

129. Luthuli, Let My People Go, p. 113.

130. Gerhart, p. 25.

131. Gerhart, p. 99.

132. Walshe, p. 247.

Chapter II:
Robert Sobukwe and the PAC

That new thought established itself in a political organization founded in 1959, the Pan-Africanist Congress, with Robert Sobukwe as president. Born in 1925 in the predominantly Afrikaner town of Graaff-Reinet in the northern Cape, Sobukwe "grew up with Christianity as his earliest ideological frame of reference," Gerhart writes.[1] The religious examples in his family were his father, a Methodist lay preacher, and a brother, an Anglican bishop. Like Lutuli before him, Sobukwe also became a lay preacher in the Methodist Church. He was educated at Healdtown[2], a Methodist boarding school, and at Lovedale[3], a Presbyterian institution. He graduated with a teaching degree from the mission-founded University College of Fort Hare, the offspring of Lovedale and at the time the only university for Africans in the country.

Youth League

At Fort Hare, he joined the Youth League, the youth division of the ANC, in 1948. He took an active role in the controversy over which direction the resistance movement should take and came down squarely on the side of a restricted black nationalist approach. It was the Youth League, also, which had seen the ANC's struggle for

ameliorations -- not the franchise -- as inadequate, and had been succesful in pushing the ANC to its point of view.[4] Sobukwe had been part of the group that wrote the Youth League's Manifesto, which was later incorporated in the ANC's 1949 Programme of Action.

In 1949, he was elected both president of the Fort Hare Students Representative Council, where he earned a reputation as a militant nationalist, and national secretary to the Youth League. But, following graduation, Sobukwe began a period of isolation from the mainstream of ANC politics. In 1950, he began teaching at Standerton in the Transvaal but was suspended temporarily for publicly supporting the Defiance Campaign in 1952. After being reinstated, he had little direct contact with national politics except as secretary of the Standerton ANC branch. Sobukwe gradually became the unoffical leader of the Orlando Africanists, editing the Orlando Youth League's journal The Africanist, "and guiding the maturation of the group's ideas...."[5] In 1954 he was appointed Languages lecturer in the Department of Bantu Studies at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg,[6] a post he held for the next seven years, until he quit to lead the PAC's Positive Action Campaign.

During the ANC Conference in Durban in November,

1958, the Africanist wing of the Youth League attempted to take over the leadership from Lutuli and his moderate supporters. On that occassion, Lutuli addressed the conference to criticize the Africanists' exclusivist position: "The African National Congress stands or falls by a free democracy. It is opposed to a racial majority masquerading as democracy, as it is opposed to a minority of any kind -- racial or otherwise -- dominating others because it seized full control of the state."[7]

Unable to take over the leadership of the ANC, and to change its focus, the Africanists under Sobukwe's leadership broke away in April 1959 and formed the Pan-Africanist Congress.[8] In a letter of seccession, they explained their parting: "... we are launching out on our own as the custodian of the ANC policy as formulated in 1912 and pursued up to the time of the Congress Alliance."[9] By this they meant a return to both militancy and to the all-African character of the early ANC.

Multiracialism

The PAC disagreed sharply with the ANC on the value of multiracial efforts. Sobukwe rejected collaboration with sympathetic whites,[10] for multiracial cooperation between slave owner and slave was an "ungodly alliance."[11] Unlike Lutuli, Sobukwe denied that in

political terms there could be such a thing as a "good" white in South Africa. The PAC consistently rejected appeals to alliances with whites based on any notion of white morality.

Silk explains that for Sobukwe all whites impede African aspirations. The "bad" white -- hard Boers -- want to keep the African in his place. But, also, the "good" white -- the missionary and liberal -- while wanting the African to develop, increase the servant's dependence on the master by destroying the African's confidence in his own strength and ability. He writes, "Although their motives and techniques differed, Sobukwe realized that their effect on African spirit and initiative was similar."[12]

In a graduation speech at Fore Hare in 1949, Sobukwe explained his stand:

> We have been accused of bloodthirstiness because we preach "non-collaboration." I wish to state here tonight that that is the only course open to us. History has taught us that a group in power has never voluntarily relinquished its position. It has been forced to do so.[13] And we do not expect miracles to happen in Africa.

Africans are the only people who, "because of their material position, can be interested in the complete overhaul of the present structure of society. We have admitted that there are Europeans who are intellectual converts to the African's cause, but, because they

benefit materially from the present set-up, they cannot completely identify themselves with that cause."[14] If some whites seem sympathetic to African demands, he writes, "... it is only in so far as those demands do not threaten the privileges of the favored group. If they offer assistance, it is for the purpose of 'directing' and 'controlling' the struggle of the under-privileged and making sure that it does not become 'dangerous'."[15]

Whereas Lutuli viewed whites as "brothers", Sobukwe saw them as "colonizers".[16] Lutuli saw the foe as the "present nationalist government", but Sobukwe believed the enemy was the entire "foreign minority."[17] Sobukwe accused the ANC of fighting just the present nationalist government and its policies. "The fact that the Nats are a logical product of past South African history and that what they stand for is approved and supported by the overwhelming majority of whites in the country, has apparently escaped the notice of the ANC."[18] Because of the ANC's narrow definition of the enemy, everyone else opposed to the nationalist government was regarded as an ally. The PAC, on the other hand, aimed at complete overthrow of white domination. It wanted political control, not merely political participation in a new white government. It rejected any notion of being incorporated as full citizens without the need for

deep-seated changes in the system. Thus, to say, as did the ANC, that there existed some "good" whites obfuscated the true nature of the struggle.

Sobukwe criticized the ANC for thinking of South Africa as an exceptional case in Africa -- an independent state and not a colony.[19] "Before the formation of the PAC," writes Khopung, "South Africa had been written off from the list of African countries to be liberated. African leaders themselves [in South Africa] including the white communists had made the African masses believe that South Africa was not a colony. It was, therefore, an exception from the rest of Africa. It was an 'independent state.'"[20] The Simons concur that "elsewhere in Africa, national liberation meant the transfer of political authority from an external imperial government; in South Africa [under the ANC] it was construed as a sharing of power with a white minority."[21]

This view Sobukwe emphatically rejected. He felt the democratic aspect of the struggle had been overemphasized by the ANC rather than the nationalist one because of a mistaken belief that South Africa was not a colony. Sobukwe linked the nationalist struggle against "colonialism" in South Africa with the other revolutionary struggles throughout Africa. He subscribed to the Pan Africanist view that sought the creation of a

"United States of Africa, stretching from Cape to Cairo, Morocco to Madagascar."[22] Karis and Carter point out that a perspective of Africa as a single nation made it easier to dismiss South Africa's few million whites as an insignificant minority within the larger population.[23] Denying the uniqueness of South Africa made it possible to deny the necessity for a unique political solution. Therefore, like the nationalist movements to the north, his organization aimed at the complete overthrow of white domination and the setting up of a black majority government.

Other Oppressed Minorities

Sobukwe's rejection of multi-racial collaboration extended to Indians as well as whites. He granted that the Indians were oppressed as a class. Certainly, the "down-trodden, poor stinking coolies"[24] of Natal could identify with the African majority in its struggle to overthrow the white minority. Unfortunately, the Indian leadership was the "merchant class --- who have become tainted with the virus of cultural supremacy and national arrogance. This class identifies itself by and large with the oppressor...."[25] For that reason Sobukwe had rejected the Congress Alliance, which embraced Indians, whites, and communists in the struggle against apartheid.[26]

It was particularly the presence of communists in the Congress Alliance which led to the Africanist breakaway.[27] Sobukwe feared that a united front approach would, in fact, mean Communist control of the resistance. Furthermore, he rejected Marxism as a "foreign" ideology not relevant to the South African situation since Africans were oppressed not as a class but as a nation. Class analysis, was, at best, a "distraction."[28] He called the "leftists" in South Africa "quacks" and concluded that Communism in South Africa, like Christianity, "has been extremely unfortunate in its choice of representatives."[29] He rejected, then, help from both right-wing and left-wing groups of the "minorities who arrogantly appropriated to themselves the right to plan and think for the Africans."[30]

Psychological Liberation

Sobukwe believed it was necessary for Africans to build up their bargaining power before they could collaborate or negotiate with other groups. Only when the African could be sure that his dignity as a person would be respected could he meet with others as equals. To that end, a Status Campaign was envisaged (but never carried out) to exorcize the slave mentality and to impart self-reliance. The campaign's stated purpose was to accustom Africans to the idea of acting collectively

in order "to force the pace of progress toward freedom."[31] The immediate target was to have been shops and businesses that did not give courteous service to Africans. These businesses would have been boycotted until they halted differential treatment of Africans. The task was to arouse and consolidate the masses so that they could be made aware of their power. Having been "conscientized", they would realize they could rely on themselves, rather than on sympathetic whites negotiating on their behalf. Having built up their bargaining power, they would be worthy of respect and could negotiate as equals.

Until such time that Africans could be treated as equals, he rejected the advice of so-called "responsible preachers" who suggest "cooperation as a solution."[32] Rather, Sobukwe urged:

> Watch our movements keenly and if you see any signs of "broad mindedness" or "reasonableness" in us, or if you hear us talk of practical experience as a modifier of men's views, denounce us as traitors to Africa.[33]

One legacy of Sobukwe's Christian upbringing is that he never failed to see the spiritual dimension to the struggle for freedom. The Status Campaign was to "free the mind of the African -- and once the mind is free, the body will soon be free."[34] Both he and Lutuli viewed the evil of apartheid more in its affront to human dignity

than in the economic deprivation it wrought. Sobukwe explained why his primary concern was with the intangible:

> Certain quarters have accused us of being concerned more with our status, with being addressed as "Sirs" and "Ma'am" than with the economic plight of the African people. Our reply is that such accusations can come only from those who think of the African as an economic animal -- a thing to be fed and not as a human being.[35]

He saw the movement towards self-reliance on the part of Africans as a spiritual transformation, a religious experience: "... we shall become purer and purer, leaving all the dross of racialism and similar evils behind..."[36]

The importance of this "spiritual" dimension should not be neglected, believes Daniel. He says that the real importance of the PAC, often overlooked in analyses that concentrate on its exclusivist orienation, was its awareness of the necessity for a mental revolution as a prerequisite to political revolution.[37] He notes that Sobukwe was stressing the same theme as Frantz Fanon in Algeria -- that centuries of colonial oppression had produced a degraded self-image, which first had to be overcome.[38]

It is in this context that Sobukwe's rejection of multiracialism should be understood. Sobukwe believed that multiracialism perpetuated the inferiority complex of Africans. He "recognized that Africans had

internalised both a belief in the innate superiority of whites and an acceptance of their own inferior status with the result that Africans exhibited an unconscious sense of shame in their blackness and a habit of dependence upon whites."[39]

For Sobukwe, admitting whites into alliances inevitably led to domination by those whites. Whereas an educated middle class African might value the symbol of multiracial leadership and not feel the ANC was being "dominated" by White and Indian Congresses, the "average African" would view it differently. Sobukwe felt that "the mere existence of the alliance served to reinforce his doubts about the worth and ability of his people."[40] Lutuli, on the other hand, advocated cooperation with those whites he distinguished as "progressive." He differentiated between the redeemed whites and those yet to be redeemed whose hearts he believed could be "shaken to repentance."[41]

Minority Rights

Sobukwe's concept of a future South Africa likewise differed from Lutuli's vision. While the ANC had supported the need for an electoral or constitutional system that would guarantee the rights of the white minority,[42] the PAC rejected the idea of minority guarantees as contrary to the goal of a non-racial

society. Sobukwe considered the guarantee of individual rights the highest guarantee necessary.[43] He saw no reason either why a predominantly black electorate should not return a white man to Parliament "for colour will count for nothing in a free South Africa."[44] Those Europeans and Indians prepared to regard themselves as Africans would have an equal say but no special privilege. Sobukwe expressed this view to the PAC Inaugural Convention:

> ...multiracialism is in fact a pandering to European bigotry and arrogance. It is a method of safeguarding white interests, implying as it does, proportional representation, irrespective of population figures. In that sense it is a complete negation of democracy. To us the term "multiracialism" implies that there are such basic insuperable differences between the various national groups here that the best course is to keep them permanently distinctive in a kind of democratic apartheid. That to us is racialism multiplied, which probably is what the term truly connotes.... We guarantee no minority rights, because we think in terms of individuals, not groups.[45]

Multiracialism, according to Sobukwe, represented the aspirations of a cosmopolitan upper stratum:

> It must be confessed that the Africanist view of democracy must be startling and upsetting to all those who have been bred and fed on the liberal idea of an African elite being gradually trained, brain-washed, fathered and absorbed into a so-called South African Multiracial Nationhood, whilst the vast masses of Africans are being exploited and denied democratic rights on the grounds of their unreadiness, backwardness and illiteracy.[46]

He criticized the ANC leadership which "claims to be fighting for freedom when in truth it is fighting to

perpetuate the tutelage of the African people. It is tooth and nail against the Africans gaining the effective control of their own country. It is fighting for the 'constitutional guarantees' or 'national rights' for our alien nationals."[47] He emphatically denied that multiracialism was a "virtue." Rather, the granting of "rights" on the basis of "ethnological origin" amounted to the "continued maintenance of contempt for human worth and disregard for human dignity."[48] There is <u>one</u> race, the <u>human</u> race, he preached, and he condemned all forms of racialism, including multiracialism.

While Lutuli had made it clear that his organization was fighting apartheid, and not whites, Sobukwe reverses this. "We do not fight apartheid alone. We fight the whole of white supremacy."[49] But, he denied he was anti-White:

> In every struggle, whether nationalist or class, the masses do not fight an abstraction. They do not hate oppression or capitalism. They concretize these and hate the oppressor, be he the Governor General or a colonial power, ... or, in South Africa, the white man. But they hate these groups because they <u>associate them with their</u> oppression! Remove the association and you remove the hatred. In South Africa, then, once white domination has been overthrown and the white man is no longer "white-man boss" but is an individual member of society, there will be no reason to hate him and he will not be hated even by the masses.
>
> We are not anti-white, therefore. We do not hate the European because he is white. We hate him because he is an oppressor. And it is plain dishonesty to say I hate the sjambok [lash] and not the one who wields it.[50]

Indeed, he hated whites as oppressors, not as persons. More than that, he hated the ideology that buttresed white oppression. He wrote, "We are fighting against the Calvinist doctrine that a certain nation was specifically chosen by God to lead, guide and protect other nations."[51] It was against the ideology of racial superiority that he vented his hatred. Ambiguously, he warned against that destructive emotion: "...a doctrine of hate can never take people anywhere. It is too exacting. It warps the mind. That is why we preach the doctrine of love, love for Africa."[52]

The ANC had accepted that South Africa belonged to all who lived in it. The PAC, on the other hand, asserted that Africans, in addition to being the majority, are indigenous "sons of the soil" and, therefore, are the true owners.[53] Whites had stolen the country through conquest and time had not cancelled the injustice of this theft. Sobukwe accepted the Youth League's Manifesto of 1944, later adopted in the Programme of Action of 1949, which asserted the Africans' "primary, inherent and inalienable right to Africa which is his continent and motherland."[54] Thus, the Africans' right to effective control is unchallangeable. It accused the ANC of repudiating the "nation-building" strategy of the Programme of Action by endorsing the

Freedom Charter, which effectively auctioned the Africans' land "for sale to all."[55] The PAC's objectives coincided with the resolutions adopted at the All African Peoples Conference in 1958, which embraced the slogan "Africa for Africans."[56] The PAC, however, dissociated itself from the extreme Garveyist aim "to hurl the white man into the sea."[57]

Whites, too, can be counted as "Africans", once the country is returned to its rightful owners, if their first allegiance is to Africa and the concept of majority rule: "We aim politically at government of the Africans by the Africans for the Africans, with everybody who owes his only loyalty to Africa and who is prepared to accept the democratic rule of an African majority being regarded as an African."[58] In this context, his doctrine of "love for Africa" makes sense alongside his hate of the white oppressor; love is possible towards those whites who are not opposed to black majority rule, for they are true Africans.

That same conference compelled Lutuli to reiterate the ANC's stand: "We of the ANC have no desire to dominate others by virtue of our numerical superiority. We are working for a corporate multi-racial society. We are opposed to the outlook that the color of one's skin should determine one's politics. We are prepared to

extend the hand of friendship to White South Africans who are our brothers and sisters."[59] Of course, both Lutuli and Sobukwe were advocating universal suffrage. The ANC had evolved by the 1950s tc that demand; early on, it had merely sought the representation of Africans in Parliament, not questioning the present structure of government. There was no question, of course, that recognition of African votings rights would lead to a black majority government. The ANC had merely avoided speaking openly about the implications of a predominantly black government, lest any suggestion of African control provoke violent reactions from the white minority. The PAC, on the other hand, deemed white opinion irrelevant and hence was explicit about who would rule Africa.

Churches

While Lutuli had believed intensely in multiracial efforts and appealed specifically to the multiracial, English-speaking churches,[60] Sobukwe's rejection of multiracialism prevented him from looking in that direction for support. Rather, it was to the African Independent Churches that he turned.[61] The black independent churches had begun to split from the white churches by 1884 in response to white domination, but a religiously conceived resistance can be detected in South Africa as early as 1818.

In that year the prophet Nxele (aka Makana, aka Makanda), the war doctor for Chief Ndlambi, who was fighting the colonist-supported Ngqika, created an explicitly anti-colonist song of Xhosa resistance:

> To chase the white men from the earth
> and drive them to the sea.
> The sea that cast them up at first
> For Ama Xhosa's curse and bane
> Howls for the progeny she nursed
> To swallow them again.[62]

The "Africanism" of Nxele found its counterpoint in the "liberalism" of Ntsikana, who was councillor to Ngqika. Ntsikana, like the churchmen within the early ANC, sought evolutionary change within the dominant system. The rivalry foreshadowed the competition between the ANC's and PAC's religiously based concepts of resistance.

When the major schisms did come, later in the nineteenth century, it was predominantly from Methodism, Sobukwe's own denomination.[63] In 1884, Nehemiah Tile, a Tembu, seceded from the Wesleyan Methodist Church and founded his own sect, the Tembu National Church. Lea, in The Native Separatist Church Movement in South Africa, writes that Tile had grown "impatient of European control ... and set himself to establish a purely Native Church...."[64] Houston believes that "as to the political significance of the movement there was never the slightest doubt."[65]

Tile's successor in the movement was another

Wesleyan Methodist, Mangena Mokone, who in 1892 founded the original Ethiopian Church in Pretoria. Lea notes that its "distinguishing feature was that it was a racial Church, composed of and controlled by Africans."[66] According to Hewson, there was a decisively anti-white aspect to it, its slogan being "Africa to the Africans."[67]

Shortly afterwards, another African minister, James Mata Dwane, also left the Methodist Church to join the movement.[68] He "cherished visions of a national church that would assume an important role in the Africans' fight for self determination."[69] A fourth seccession, described in Sundkler's Bantu Prophets in South Africa, was the Bantu Methodist Church, or the "Donkey Church", founded in 1932 on the Rand.[70]

Sundkler writes, "There was an unmistakable nationalist spirit which fired leaders and followers with enthusiasm for the break...."[71] The "explosive development" of independent churches after 1913 was a reaction against the Native Land Act. He writes, "From 1913, the burning desire of the Africans for land and security provided the apocalyptic patterns of the Zionist or Messianic myths, whose warp and woof are provided by native land policy and Christian, or at least Old Testament material."[72] D. T. Jabavu also asserts that

the religious breakaways symbolize "the general ambition of the Bantu for liberation, liberation from being underlings to the Europeans in various phases of life, namely: economic, political and religious."[73]

Kretzschmar adds her voice to those who see both religious and political reasons for the emergence of the African Independent Churches. She believes that not only were the new churches responding to Africans' desire to interpret the Bible in their own way, to engage in indigenous forms of worship, and to enjoy leadership opportunities; they were also reacting to a host of discriminatory legislation that restricted Africans to the reserves, hampered opportunity to buy land, controlled employment advancement, imposed taxation, and denied representation in government.[74]

There is a feeling from some quarters, however, that the independent churches were not founded for political, economic, social, or racial reasons. Appiah-Kubi, for instance, warns against seeing these movements primarily as a reaction against white control. He argues that "spiritual hunger" was the main cause for their emergence. There was a need for "healing, divining, prophecying and visioning" that these churches fulfilled.[75] Hastings points out that many did not begin as conscious schisms but emerged because there was no

mission church in an area. He likewise believes the most characteristic motivation was not a political rejection of colonialism or colonial churches "but the establishment of accessible rites of healing with a Christian reference and within a caring community by gifted and spiritual individuals claiming an initiative effectively denied them in the older churches."[76]

But his argument is belied by the fact that it was circumstances of social uncertainty that were prone to trigger a popular movement. Included in these are "the imposition of colonial regulations" and "the apparently irresistible loss of ancestral lands to incoming white settlers...."[77] The evidence does in fact support the belief that the independent churches were reacting to both political and ecclesiastical domination. DeGruchy correctly concludes, "There remains little doubt that the independent churches were concerned about more than just religious freedom. They wanted the liberty of their people from all unjust bondages.... But, at least for the time being, they had to be content with religious freedom."[78]

The fact that the government was suspicious of the new church bodies gives credence to the view that the independent churches were subversive, or at least potentially so. At the time of the Bambata Rebellion,

especially, there was alarm over the political role played by the independent churches. Bamba, a Zulu chief, led an armed revolt against the British government in Natal in protest over the poll tax. The rebellion was marked by seditious preaching among the Ethiopian groups who urged African ascendancy over whites. Later, at Bulhoek in 1921, the potential for a religiously inspired resistance was again evident. The government ordered an Ethiopian church to move since it was squatting on Crown Land. The church's leader, Mgijima, told his people to charge the troops, promising them that God would turn the army's bullets into water.

But, while the beginning of the independent church movement may have been coterminous with the rise of African nationalism, this is not to say the AICs did not become complacent in time. Regeher writes, "Separatist groups ... tended to stop short of a concept of African political assertion and in many instances went out of their way to establish their respectability."[79]

This happened in part because of the churches' natural interest in public recognition by the government for such purposes as registration of marriages and purchasing of communion wine. By 1950, the second and third generations of independent church leaders were generally "cautious about much involvement in political

protest -- which came far more from the black elite within the missionary churches."[80] In some instances, preoccupation with the "Kingdom of God" distracted the independent churches -- especially the Zionist groups -- from political involvement. Rather than act, they tended to withdraw from the reality of racial discrimination, waiting for God himself to usher in the millenium.[81]

At the very least, though, the independent church leaders, more than their brothers in the multiracial churches, offered a stronger critique of the white Christian churches and its members. They did not harbor a naive trust in the inherent goodness of whites, nor make appeals for political freedom on the basis of a shared Christian morality.

It is to this section of Christendom that Sobukwe turned.[82] The black independent churches were a natural source of converts to the PAC's cause, given the clear affinity between the PAC's "go it alone" spirit and the anti-white mood of these churches. Had the PAC not been banned, Gerhart believes, it might eventually have redirected the energies of religious separatism into political channels.[83] That it hoped to tap the latent political interests of the independent churches is evident from the PAC's invitation to Bishop Walter M. Dimba, a leading separatist and head of the Federation of

Bantu Churches, to deliver the opening sermon at the PAC Inaugural Convention. According to a white observer, the ministers at the Inaugural Convention spoke wildly of "the hooligans of Europe who killed our God and have never been convicted."[84]

Use of such intemperate language -- anathema to the ANC -- was the hallmark of the PAC. Using the Christian terminology dear to him, Sobukwe urged:

> And we have it from the Bible that those who crucified Christ will appear before Him on the judgment day. We are what we are because the God of Africa made us so. We dare not compromise, nor dare we use moderate language in the course of freedom. As Zik puts it, "Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell a mother to extricate gradually her baby from the fire into which it has fallen; but do not ask me to use moderation in a cause like the present."[85]

The PAC in exile years later boasted of politicizing the "broad masses of our people under the cloak of religion."[86] The PAC's Revolutionary Command revealed: "The PAC Oath of Allegiance had taken the place of religious vows. This was not an isolated phenomenon. Throughout the country, the church and other 'innocent' forms of organisation had become the banner of the PAC underground activity."[87]

Surely, Sobukwe's mission-sponsored education had left a legacy on his political development quite different from Lutuli. According to Kuper, "Christian missions brought Africans and whites together in new

structures of relationship, and under dedication to a universal ethic, conditions which might be expected to counteract tendencies toward the expression of an exclusive nationalism."[88] However, the mission experience had a quite different impact on Sobukwe.

The Legums explain that one result of mission eduction is that English-speaking missionaries are sometimes treated with derision as hypocrites. At least the Afrikaners are honest and consistent on where they stand on race. This hostility towards missionaries, they note, is often carried over to English-speaking Christians and to white liberals.[89]

Young Sobukwe reflected this attitude. When the principal of Healdtown Institute had addressed the boys on the need for improved contact between the races, Sobukwe challenged him: "The moment I step out of your home, sir, after a show of the brotherhood of man, I will be picked up for a pass offense." When the principal protested that the pass law was not his responsibility, Sobukwe replied: "It will be sir, You're part and parcel of the set-up in this country. The country cannot absolve itself. The Methodist Church itself is pursuing a segregationalist policy; it has different stipends for Black and White ministers."[90]

Whereas Lutuli had been grateful to missionaries for

their work among Africans, Sobukwe included them among the "friends" who "every time our people have shown signs of uniting against oppression" have come along and "broken that unity."[91] He explains:

> In the very earliest days it was the Missionary (we owe the bitter feelings between Fingoes and Xhosas to the Christian ideals of the Rev. Shaw). Between 1900 and 1946 it had been the professional Liberal. Today it is again the Missionary who fulfils this role. After maintaining an unbroken and monastic silence for years while Smuts was starving the people out of the Reserves, the Missionaries suddenly discover, when the Africans unite, that the Africans have not had a fair deal....[92]

Sobukwe asserts that Africans are no longer so gullible as to trust the Church's efforts on their behalf. "I am afraid these gentlemen are dealing with a new generation which cannot be bamboozled. 'What you are thunders so loudly that what you say cannot be heard.'"[93]

Lutuli had agreed that white Christians were not always good exemplars of their faith. But he continued to work with them and believed in the efforts of the multiracial churches. Sobukwe refused to cooperate with the multiracial churches, instead looking for support in the black independent churches. It is significant that he did not reject the church in toto. Like Lutuli before him, Sobukwe saw the struggle in terms of the battle between good and evil, which he couched in Christian terminology. For instance, the following Methodist hymn contained the theme of his address to the 1949 graduating

class at Fort Hare:

> Once to every man and Nation
> Comes the moment to decide,
> In the strife of truth with falsehood
> For the good or evil side....
> Then to side with truth is noble
> When we share her wretched crust,
> Ere her cause bring fame and profit
> And 'tis prosperous to be just.
> Then it is the brave man chooses
> While the coward stands aside,
> Til the multitude makes virtue
> Of the faith they had denied[94]

The "brave" men, according to Sobukwe, were those who espoused African nationalism; the "cowards" are its opponents.[95]

All of his speeches echoed with biblical cadences, and he quoted regularly from scriptures in his political pronouncements. There was a recognition among the Africanists that politics had to be based on a Christian foundation. They stressed that the national liberation struggle had to be "strengthened by an unflinching faith in the Almighty God."[96] Lembede,[97] Sobukwe's predecessor as the intellectual father of the PAC, had urged, "...our ethical system today has to be based on Christian morals since there is nothing better anywhere in the world."[98] In fact, Africanists claimed a "divine duty" to free Africa.[99]

Interestingly, both Lutuli and Sobukwe professed belief in the "inevitability" of success. "The final triumph of the liberation movement under the direction of

the PAC," Sobukwe wrote, "is assured."[100] Sobukwe predicted that South Africa would be "independent" by 1963.[101] He no doubt believed this because of the example to the north; by 1957 Ghanian independence held the prospect that, if Africans to the north could free themselves by their own efforts, so too could the African in South Africa. For many politically conscious Africans, including Sobukwe, independent Africa took on the quality of a "new Jerusalem," write Karis and Carter, and its leaders the appearance of "infallible prophets of freedom."[102] In addition, Sobukwe's optimism was based on a genuine conviction that exclusive nationalism was the "true religion" to address South Africa's sin. The masses, he believed, were yearning for nationhood; all that had been lacking was the correct ideology, African nationalism. The PAC was ready to "preach a creed" that would show the way to the self-realization the masses desired.[103] "Surely the PAC could optimisticly conclude on the basis of these a priori premises, success could now by only a matter of time," explain Karis and Carter.[104]

Both Lutuli and Sobukwe believed in the rightness and justice of their cause. Sobukwe had said, "We are fighting for the noblest cause on earth, the liberation of mankind."[105] And Lutuli asserted: "Our cause is just

and we have the Divine assurance that it must triumph over wrong."[106] Both men engaged their followers in prayer before the two campaigns in question. In addition, Lutuli believed that God would help the Africans, by converting the whites to see the error of their ways. Nowhere in Sobukwe's writings, however, is there any indication that God was expected to intervene in any way. Certainly, Sobukwe felt it was unrealistic to believe that God would change the hearts of the white minority. But, if not God, then at least "history [is] on our side. We will win!"[107]

Sobukwe's "go it alone" spirit seems applicable to the Almighty as well. Turner in a doctoral study on comparative ideologies posits the thesis that a belief in a personal, intervening God is associated with a leader's policy of non-violence. A more "deist" concept of God, which Sobukwe held, corresponds to the acceptance of violence as an appropriate method of struggle.[108]

Violence

Did Sobukwe, in fact, promote violence? The Orlando Youth League, the predecessor to the PAC, on remembering the Sophiatown removals, had been contemptuous of the ANC's non-violent strategy: "What is the use of calling on the people of Sophiatown to resist the removal 'non-violently'? How is this possible? Is

it not a contradiction in terms? One either resists violently or submits unwillingly.... Since white domination is maintained by force of arms it is only superior force of arms that it can be overthrown by."[109]

The PAC shared the Youth League's view on this. But, on the eve of the anti-pass campaign, Sobukwe wrote to Major-General Rademeyer, the Commissioner of Police, emphasizing that the campaign would be non-violent and imploring the Commissioner to instruct his "trigger-happy, African-hating" policemen to refrain from violence in attempting to put down the demonstration.[110] He assured Rademeyer that his people would disperse if given clear orders and time to do so.

In a press conference on March 18, he reiterated the non-violent nature of the demonstration: "I have appealed to the African people," Sobukwe told the press, "to make sure that this campaign is conducted in a spirit of absolute non-violence, and I am quite certain they will heed my call."[111] In his final instructions to the PAC branches, Sobukwe warned: "Our people must be taught <u>now and continuously</u> that in this campaign we are going to observe <u>absolute non-violence.</u> There are those in our ranks who will be speaking irresponsible [sic] of bloodshed and violence. They must be firmly told what our stand is."[112]

His call for a non-violent pass demonstration was based on practical considerations, not on any philosophical commitment to passive resistance, as the ANC's had been. Sporadic outbursts of violence during the Defiance Campaign had provided the government with an excuse to use force against the protesters. He did not want to see that repeated. He explained that the only people who would benefit from violence were the police, who, after the dead are buried, would round up a few people "and the rest will go back to Passes, having forgotten what our goal had been."[113]

Indeed, Daniel points to Sobukwe's frequent praise of violent protesters of the past as well as his statement -- "We are ready to die for our freedom. We are not yet [emphasis added] ready to kill for it." -- as proof he considered violence an acceptable, if future, option.[114] If there is any doubt that the PAC did not rule out violence in principle, the PAC put this notion to rest when it admitted later to its earlier "pretence to non-violent struggle."[115] Peter Molotsi, one-time PAC executive member, admitted that the PAC accepted the inevitability of violence and in fact welcomed the possibility of open conflict.[116]

Sharpeville Massacre

At the first (and last) PAC conference, the decision

had been taken to launch a Positive Action Campaign "to overthrow White domination and to attain freedom and independence."[117] Sobukwe had criticized the ANC's approach of reacting against individual apartheid laws. Such an approach, he believed, led to a preocuupation with effects rather than the root cause. He explained, "every year will bring forth, as every year has brought forth, new oppressive laws, on top of the ones we are opposing."[118] Thus, while fighting against Bantu education, passes for women would come along "and while they are preoccupied with that, universities and apartheid laws for women emerge."[119] Politically, the PAC's aim was to close the very source of South Africa's evil legislation. The task was to carry out the PAC's program, irrespective of what the government was doing. The PAC was to take the offensive by executing the 1949 Programme of Action "item by item."[120]

From the above statements, one can see that the belief in non-cooperation extended to the government as well as Indians, communists, and sympathetic whites. The PAC's stand was to have nothing to do with the government except to wrench power from it, because "the white minority can maintain its continued domination only by perfecting the techniques of control in such a way as to enlist the active cooperation and good will of the

oppressed."[121] The PAC felt its approach was consistent with the Programme of Action which advocated non-cooperation with oppressive structures.

The ANC had interpreted this part of the Programme of Action to mean rejection of Natives Representatives Councils and the like. For the ANC, non-cooperation meant civil disobedience if certain demands were not met. But it did not reject negotiations out of hand. It normally began with negotiations, threatening non-collaboration if its demands went unmet. Motlhabi sees in this process a refusal by the ANC to believe all its previous years of negotiations were futile, as well as an indication of faith in fellow human beings and their capacity for conversion.[122] The PAC, seeing the ineffectiveness of this approach, put aside negotiation attempts altogether. An exception, of course, is when it negotiated on a "technical issue" when it cautioned the Police Commissioner not to use force during the Positive Action Campaign.

For all its criticism of the ANC for merely tinkering and fiddling -- "here a boycott, there a demonstration, elsewhere a defiance campaign"[123] -- and reacting to government policy, the PAC embarked on a demonstration not unlike the ANC's Defiance Campaign in 1952. Earlier, Sobukwe had criticized the ANC for not

turning the water off at the source, but instead bailing water out of a flooding house. Lutuli had forecast "... in order to get at the tap a good deal of wading through dirty water is necessary.... I suspect that when it emerges from theory, the PAC may well find itself committed, like us, not to a single master-stroke, but to a series of partial successes."[124] There is evidence that Sobukwe was opposed to the pass campaign, but went along with the decision of his executive committee, who wished to pre-empt the ANC's planned pass-campaign scheduled later in the month.[125]

Nevertheless, there is a good reason why Sobukwe accepted the decision of the executive committee: to rouse the masses. No other feature of the apartheid system was as detested as the pass system. It was considered the "linchpin" of apartheid, affecting employment, residence, and even marriage. Thus, Sobukwe felt that the pass campaign would generate support from all sectors of African society and be a vehicle for mass political education. It was a step towards psychological liberation, which he believed is a key prerequisite for political liberation. On a pragmatic note, the young militants within the PAC wanted action. The PAC hoped to show that, unlike the ANC, they could produce results.

The day before the scheduled protest, Lutuli took

the opportunity to contrast the moderation of the ANC with the extremism of the PAC: "We do not want to kick you out of the country and we do not want to marry your sisters. All we want is a fair deal in our own country."[126]

On March 20, 1960, Sobuke announced a national anti-pass campaign[127] to be held on March 21, 1960, during which his followers were to surrender themselves at police stations without passes under the slogan "no bail, no defence, no fines."[128] If not arrested, the defiers were to return and insist on arrest. The leaders were to be in the forefront, inspiring the masses by their example of sacrifice. The PAC felt that the ANC's leaders had hung back at critical times, when the masses were prepared to forge ahead. The PAC also accused the ANC leadership of hiring lawyers, paying fines, and posting bail while the masses suffered imprisonment for acts of civil disobedience.[129] Therefore, Sobukwe was in the front of 200 followers who presented themselves for arrest at the Orlando Police Department.

The campaign had large turnouts at Langa and Nyanga townships in Cape Town and in Vanderbijlpark and Sharpeville townships near Johannesburg.[130] At Sharpeville, the crowd numbering some 5,000 to 20,000

protesters led by Myakale Tsolo, was "noisy and excitable but not hostile, nor armed."[131] For all their singing and shouting, the crowd was more "festive than belligerent."[132] Upon reaching the police station, the leaders marched forward, asking the police to let them through so that they could surrender themselves for arrest for refusing to carry passes. Shortly after the PAC branch leaders had been let through into the police station, with no warning, the police fired upon the assembled protesters, killing 69 people, most of them in the back, and wounding 186. At Langa, 1,000 miles away, in a similar situation, two were killed and 49 injured. Following the killings, the crowds went wild, rioting and burning schools, public buildings, and other symbols of oppression.[133] In all, 74 people died throughout the country on this day of protest that Sobukwe had planned to be peaceful.[134]

The South African churches responded quickly to the incident. A week after Sharpeville, twelve clergymen from the three Dutch Reformed Church bodies issued a statement rejecting apartheid as "unethical, unbiblical, and without any foundation in Scripture."[135] But nine leading members of the NGK (Nerderduitse Gereformeerde Kerk), while acknowldging mistakes made by the government in implementing apartheid, nevertheless approved of the

policy of "independent, distinctive development, provided this was carried out in a just and honourable way, without impairing or offending human dignity."[136] The clergymen noted that it had always been accepted that apartheid in the early stages would create a certain amount of disruption. In general, the English-Speaking churches denounced the government's reaction in the "Sharpeville Massacre", which was not surprising since these churches had been on record for years as opposing apartheid.

Significantly, Sobukwe was silent about the churches' pronouncements. Unlike Lutuli, who was glad to see the churches taking a stand, Sobukwe had not been looking for allies in these directions. He no doubt viewed their pronouncements as the hypocritical response of liberals wishing to dissociate themselves from the government's policies, at the same time benefiting from those very policies. Sobukwe had commented that Africanists were too sophisticated to be "bamboozled" anymore. At any rate, he did not want help from the white churches. "We are on our own," he had urged his followers.[137]

Sobukwe was arrested at Orlando police station and, consistent with his belief in non-collaboration, refused to defend himself on the charge of inciting people to

violate the law. After being sentenced along with eighteen other PAC members to three years in prison, he made the following statement:

> Your worship, it will be remembered that when this case began we refused to plead, because we felt no moral obligation whatsover to obey laws which are made exclusively by a White Minority.... But I would like to quote what was said by somebody before, that an unjust law cannot be justly applied. We believe in one race only -- the human race to which we all belong. The history of that race is a long history of struggle against all restrictions, physical, mental, and spiritual. We would have betrayed the human race if we had not done our share. We are glad to have made our contribution.[138]

After his sentence was completed on Robben Island, Sobukwe was held for six additional years under a new measure, The General Laws Amendment Act of 1963, which allowed for continued detention "this side of eternity" of prisoners who had completed their sentences.[139] Left leaderless, "... the PAC rapidly fell into a state of total disarray from which it was never to fully recover."[140]

By this time, both the PAC and ANC had been outlawed,[141] and efforts at peaceful change finally gave way to outright violence.[142] Having decided upon a course of violence,[143] the underground ANC established a military wing in 1961 called Umkhonto we Sizwe ("Spear of the Nation") that committed sabotage.[144] The PAC simultaneously formed a military wing called Poqo ("Africans Alone"), that engaged in terrorism.

Carter and Karis argue that Lutuli himself came tc adopt the belief that violence was at times a necessary evil in the struggle for justice. Just days after he received the Nobel Peace Prize, the ANC launched its first sabotage campaign, "apparently with his tacit consent."[145] They offer no proof cf his advance knowledge, other than that he met with Mandela, the commander-in-chief of Umkhonto, in the days preceding the first bomb explosions on government installations. However, Callan notes that because of continued bannings in the late 1950s, it is doubtful that he was involved with the day-to-day operations of the ANC.[146] The executive of the ANC, responsible for major policy decisions, was drawn from members living within fifty miles of Johannesburg; Lutuli was thousands of miles away confined to the Groutville reserve. The better reading is that he did not lead the ANC into its new position and would not have had he been in a position to do so. But he understood how others were led to a course of violence because of closed legal means of prostest. In a speech issued on June 12, 1964 after Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and others were sentenced to life imprisonment in the famous "Rivonia Trial" for engaging in violence against the state, Lutuli stated:

> The African National Congress never abandoned its method of a militant, nonviolent struggle, and

> creating in the process a spirit of militancy in the people. However, in the face of the uncompromising white refusal to abandon a policy which denies the African and other oppressed South Africans their rightful heritage -- freedom -- no one can blame brave just men for seeking justice by the use of violent methods in order to establish peace and racial harmony.[147]

But not until the 1970s, after a decade long lull in African resistance,[148] was violence to find its most complete religious justification in the Black Consciousness Movement.

Notes

1. Gail Gerhart, Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), p. 183.

2. A principal made Sobukwe's schooling possible by giving him a monthly stipend out of his own pocket.

3. Lovedale was established by the Glasgow Missionary Society as a showpiece of the church's multiracial efforts in education.

4. By 1944, explicit provision was made by the ANC for universal franchise.

5. Thomas Karis and Gwendolyn Carter, From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964, 4 Volumes, Volume 3 (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972-1977), p. 19.

6. Sobukwe was one of less than half a dozen black academics on staff at this white university.

7. African Digest, IV (February, 1958). Cited in Edward Callan, Albert John Luthuli and The South African Race Conflict (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1962), p. 39.

8. The PAC was formally constituted at a conference on April 6, 1959, the 300th anniversary of the Cape landing of Van Riebeeck. Sobukwe was elected president by unanimous vote.

9. "Letter of Secession, Africanists to Special Transvaal Conference of ANC" (November 2, 1958). Cited in Richard Gibson, African Liberation Movements: Contemporary Struggles Against White Minority Rule (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 55.

10. Patrick Duncan later became the PAC's first white member.

11. "Three African Freedom Movements," FreedomWays 2, 1 (Winter, 1962), p. 84.

12. Andrew Silk, "Understanding the Master: Robert Sobukwe's Legacy," The Nation, 226, 12 (1978), p. 368.

13. Mangaliso Robert Sobukwe, Speeches of Mangaliso Sobukwe 1949-1959, no publishing information, p. 11.

14. Sobukwe, p. 23.

15. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, pp. 508.

16. PAC, Time for Azania (Toronto: Norman Bethune Institute, 1976), p. 18.

17. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 514.

18. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 507.

19. The ANC's leaders saw South Africa as an exception because of the large number of non-Africans there.

20. Ethel Khopung, Apartheid: The Struggle of a Dispossessed People (Dar Es Salaam: Sharpeville Day Association Mbizana, 1972), p. 63. Cited by Mokgethi Motlhabi, Challenge to Apartheid (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), p. 45.

21. Jack and Ray Simons, Class and Colour in South Africa 1850-1950 (London: International Defence Aid Fund for South Africa, 1983), p. 621.

22. Sobukwe, p. 16.

23. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 323.

24. Sobukwe, p. 19.

25. Sobukwe, p. 19.

26. The PAC accepted collaboration with Coloureds, defining them as "blacks".

27. Benson explains that Mandela and other Youth Leaguers opposed Communism because their background was religious and they had been taught that communists were the anti-Christ. See Mary Benson, Nelson Mandela (London: Panaf, 1980) p. 33.

28. Peter Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa: The ANC 1912-1952 (Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1971), p. 356.

29. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 509.

30. Sobukwe, pp. 19-20.

31. Jordan Ngubane. An African Explains Apartheid (London: Pall Mall, 1963), p. 103.

32. Sobukwe, p. 8.

33. Sobukwe, p. 9.

34. Sobukwe, p. 34.

35. Sobukwe, p. 35.

36. Sobukwe, p. 36.

37. John Daniel. "Radical Resistance to Minority Rule in South Africa: 1906-1965" (Ph.D. dissertation, Buffalo: State University of New York, 1975), p. 218.

38. Daniel, p. 219.

39. Daniel, p. 219.

40. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 319.

41. "South African Treason Trial Record," p. 32. Cited by Ruth Turner, "Violence and Non-violence in Confrontation: A Comparative Study of Ideologies. Six Historical Cases. Paine, Lenin, Hitler, Gandhi, Luthuli, and King" (Ph.D. dissertation, Amherst: University of Massachussetts, 1979), p. 298.

42. The ANC Youth League also had a provision for protecting minority rights.

43. Sobukwe, p. 25. Walshe writes that Christian faith was the source of respect for individual rights. See Walshe, p. 342.

44. Sobukwe, p. 25.

45. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 516.

46. Robert Sobukwe, "PAC on Guard in Defence of PAC Policy and Programme," The Africanist (December, 1959), p. 13. Cited by Gerhart, p. 190.

47. Sobukwe, p. 42.

48. PAC, Time for Azania, p. 19.

49. "Three African Freedom Movements," FreedomWays, p. 84.

50. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 508.

51. Colin Legum and Margaret Legum, The Bitter Choice: Eight South Africans' Resistance to Tyranny (New York, World Publishing Co., 1968), p. 114.

52. Sobukwe, p. 9.

53. Gerhart, p. 146.

54. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 324.

55. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 505.

56. See Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 322. Also see Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 105.

57. Gerhart, p. 216. Molotsi, discussing the PAC's decision to avoid the slogan, admitted: "[People] liked it privately! But we didn't want to go down on paper ... it would damage us with our friends overseas." Cited by Gerhart, p. 216.

58. Sobukwe, p. 25.

59. Callan, p. 40.

60. "English-speaking" refers to the churches of English origin who came to South Africa during the time of British Imperialism. The majority of their members are blacks. It includes the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches but not the Lutheran and Catholic Churches.

61. AICs are usually divided into two groups, Ethiopianism and Zionism. Sundkler differentiates Ethiopianism from Zionism as follows: Ethiopianism broke away from the white churches but retained outer forms, structure, and much of the teaching of the parent body. Zionism usually sprang up independently and blended together Christian faith with African traditions. See Bengt G. M. Sundkler, Bantu Prophets in South Africa (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 53-60.

62. James Cochrane, Servants of Power: The Role of

English-Speaking Churches, 1903-1930: Towards a Critical Theology Via an Historical Analysis of the Anglican and Methodist Churches (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987), p. 90.

63. Meli explains that the Wesleyan church had become associated with the imposition of cclonialism, which explains the large number of breakaways from that denomination. See Francis Meli, South Africa Belongs to Us: A History of the ANC (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 9. Thomas comments that while those in the multiracial churches cried 'out', those in the apartheid churches (Dutch Reformed) cried 'in', clamoring for closer unity. See David Thomas, Councils in the Ecumenical Movement in South Africa (Johannesburg: SACC, 1979), p. 35.

64. Allen Lea, The Native Separatist Church Movement in South Africa (Johannesburg: Jeta and Co., 1926). Cited by Leslie Hewson, An Introduction to South African Methodists (Cape Town: Methodist Publishing House, 1951), p. 92.

65. J. W. Houston, The Methodist Churchman, (July 24, 1960). Cited by Cochrane, p. 91.

66. Lea. Cited in Hewson, p. 92.

67. Hewson, p. 94.

68. He eventually joined the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) but grew disillusioned with American control and subsequently joined the Anglican Church and formed the "Order of Ethiopia" as part of the Church of the Province. Bishop U. M. Turner of the AME in the United States inspired both Mokone an Dwane, bringing a "rebellious nature" to African separatist churches. See Gayraud Wilmore, Black Religion and Black Radicalism (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1972), pp. 131-132.

69. Karis and Carter, Vol. 1, p. 7.

70. See Sundkler, p. 40, p. 172.

71. Sundkler, p. 47.

72. Sundkler, p. 330.

73. D.D.T. Jabavu, "Foreword" to Lea, p. 11. Cited by Hewson, p. 94.

74. Louise Kretzschmar, The Voice of Black Theology in South Africa (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1986), p. 47.

75. Kofi Appiah-Kubi and Sergio Torres, eds. African Theology En Route: Pan Africanist Conference of Third World Theology, Accra, 1977 (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979), pp. 117-118.

76. Adrian Hastings, A History of African Christianity 1950-1975 (London: Cambridge University, 1979), p. 69, p. 72.

77. Hastings, p. 73.

78. John W. de Gruchy, The Church Struggle in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 45.

79. Ernie Regehr, Perceptions of Apartheid: The Churches and Political Change in South Africa (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1979), p. 179.

80. Hastings, p. 74.

81. See Walshe, p. 10. The prophetic Zionists were among the most impoverished groups and were, in Comaroff's estimation, profoundly subversive. Their radical rejection of Capitalism and the State perhaps most closely replicated the PAC's own non-collaborationist stance. See Jean Comaroff, Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1985), pp. 255-263.

82. Tactically, it made sense to turn to the AICs because through the AICs, the PAC had links with both rural peasants and urban Africans. Ideologically, it was natural that the PAC sought to link the AICs' theology of separation to its political ends.

83. Gerhart, p. 202.

84. Gerhart, p. 203.

85. Sobukwe, p. 12.

86. PAC, PAC in Perspective (PAC: London, 1973), p. 20.

87. PAC, PAC in Perspective, p. 20.

88. Leo Kuper in Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson, eds. A History of South Africa to 1870 (Cape Town: David Philip, 1982), p. 434.

89. Legums, p. 109.

90. Legums, pp. 109-110.

91. Sobukwe, p. 11.

92. Sobukwe, p. 11.

93. Sobukwe, p. 12.

94. Sobukwe, p. 10.

95. Sobukwe, p. 11.

96. Bantu World (September 27, 1947). Cited by Walshe, p. 343.

97. Lembede, a devout Catholic, had been the first president of the Youth League.

98. Mary Benson, South Africa: The Struggle for a Birthright (New York: Fund and Wagnalls, 1969), p. 85.

99. Karis and Carter, Vol. 2, p. 324.

100. Sobukwe, p. 47.

101. Legums, p. 14.

102. Karis and Carter, Vol. 3, p. 321.

103. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 326. Sobukwe believed that the ANC's ideology of compromise and multiracialism lacked the emotional appeal to mobilize African support on a wide scale. Only the doctrine of exclusive nationalism was dynamic enough to inspire sacrifices. See Karis and Carter, Vol. 3, p. 318.

104. Karis and Carter, Vol. 3, p. 326.

105. Sobukwe, p. 38.

106. Albert Luthuli, "South Africa Shall Have Its Freedom," Africa Today 3, 5 (September/October, 1956). p. 3.

107. Sobukwe, p. 38.

108. See Turner, p. 30.

109. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 27.

110. Karis and Carter, Vol. 3, p. 566.

111. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, 567.

112. Sobukwe, p. 37.

113. Sobukwe, p. 37.

114. "Molotsi Reveals PAC Policy," Contact (June 18, 1960), p. 3. Cited by Daniel, p. 224. Indeed, a PAC flyer issued at the same time declared that Pass laws had to be "blown to oblivion this year, now and forever." See Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 561. Gerhart notes that the constant reference to past heroes who fought in self-defense was tc put violence within an acceptable moral framework and appeal to those whose moral convictions might otherwise preclude violence. See Gerhart, p. 100, p. 149, pp. 201-201

115. PAC, PAC in Perspective, p. 16.

116. Daniel, pp. 224-225.

117. Legums, p. 113.

118. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 503.

119. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 503.

120. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 503.

121. Sobukwe, p. 22.

122. Mokgethi Motlhabi, The Theory and Practice of Black Resistance to Apartheid (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1984), p. 83.

123. Albert Luthuli, Let My People Go (London: Collins, 1962), p. 187.

124. Albert Luthuli, p. 188.

125. Ngubane explains that Sobukwe preferred the

Status Campaign, but he was persuaded that dramatic results were necessary to increase the PAC's membership. See Jordan Ngubane, An African Explains Apartheid (London: Pall Mall, 1963), pp. 104-105,

126. Callan, p. 41.

127. The date was chosen to pre-empt the ANC's campaign scheduled for March 31. The anti-pass campaign was coupled with a demand for a minimum wage.

128. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 330.

129. See Gerhart, p. 230. Dr. Moroka during the Defiance Campaign had cut his own deal with the courts, dissociating himself from his fellow defendants.

130. Muriel Horrell, ed., A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa, 1960 (Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1961), pp. 56-58.

131. Motlhabi, Theory and Practice, p. 94.

132. PAC, Time For Azania, p. 58.

133. Horrell, p. 73. For a detailed discussion of events at Sharpeville, see Ambrose Reeves Shooting at Sharpeville: The Agony of South Africa (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969) and Gibson, pp. 55-57.

134. On hearing of the deaths at Sharpeville, Lutuli publicly burned his pass.

135. de Gruchy, p. 188.

136. de Gruchy, p. 189.

137. Sobukwe, p. 24.

138. Legums, p. 104.

139. This legislation, sometimes called the Sobukwe Clause, was designed especially for him.

140. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 341.

141. In outlawing it, the government used the same reasoning as it had against those charged during the Treason Trial, that their fundamental aim was the violent overthrow of the government. No churches spoke out

against the bannings.

142. Oliver Tambo puts the decision to resort to violence upon the occasion of protests in 1961 against the formation of a Republic. The army, not just the police, was mobilized. He says it was a new situation that encouraged the ANC to embrace violence as a method of struggle. See Francis Meli, South Africa Belongs to Us: A History of the ANC (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989) p. 148.

143. The official ANC, not its military wing, retained its position on non-violence but refused to condemn Umkhonto. See Benson, Nelson Mandela, p. 239.

144. On the day that whites celebrate the defeat of the Zulus in 1828, Umkhonto exploded its first bomb at government targets. Mandela explained that sabotage was the least undesirable and most morally justifiable type of violence, but that the struggle would escalate to guerrilla warfare, then terrorism, and finally revolution if these tactics weren't successful.

145. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, pp. 649-650. See also "The Role of Chief Luthuli" African Communist, 70 (Fall, 1977), p. 18 where it is suggested that Umkhonto had Luthuli's full support.

146. Callan, p. 30.

147. Karis and Carter, Volume 3, p. 799.

148. Lutuli was banned. Sobukwe, Mandela, Sisulu, and Mbeki were imprisoned. The ANC's underground leaders had been rounded up and arrested.

Chapter III:
Steve Biko and the Black Consciousness Movement

Born in 1946 in King Williams Town in the Cape Province, Steve Biko would become a major figure in the Black Consciousness Movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. He was raised in an Anglican family and educated at mission-founded institutions -- Lovedale,[1] the Presbyterian academy in Alice, and St. Francis College, a Catholic boarding school in Marrianhill. He later attended Natal University Medical School, but quit in 1972 to devote himself full-time to politics.

A committed Christian,[2] Biko nevertheless rejected the approach to politics associated with the Christian leadership of the ANC under Lutuli, who accepted collaboration with whites concerned with justice. Gerhart writes, "Christian principles impressed him, as did the ideals of an eventual common, integrated society; but he was not satisfied to have any white try to influence his thinking about the precise detail of either ends or means when it came to the future of Africans."[3]

SASO

It is no wonder, then, that in 1969 he founded the South African Students' Association (SASO), a splinter group from the mostly white National Union of South African Students (NUSAS), as an all-black student

organization. The split arose cut of a NUSAS conference at Rhodes University in 1967 at which black conferees were required to board at separate accommodations away from the conference site. Although this was in accordance with South African law, the fact that whites accepted it without question left the black students "dumbfounded and disillusioned."[4]

The next year Biko attended another student conference at Rhodes University, this one sponsored by the recently formed University Christian Movement (UCM).[5] Despite being subjected again to the government's requirement for segregated accommodations, the African delegates found the UCM attractive because its orientation was Christian and its majority was black. More than half of the ninety delegates at the inaugural conference were Africans, explained partly by the fact that unlike NUSAS it was allowed to exist on black campuses, since it had not had time to develop a bad reputation with officials on black campuses.[6] Still, its viewpoint and leadership were disproportionately white.

During subsequent debates on the value of blacks remaining in multi-racial organizations, Biko came to see that the black perspective -- not wanting to accept segregated quarters, for instance -- did not coincide with the white one.[7] But he admits that it was difficult

to abandon faith in multiracial efforts: "I think I realized that for a long time I had been holding on to this whole dogma of nonracialism almost like a religion, and feeling that it is sacrilegious [sic] to question it...."[8]

The following year, the break was made. SASO provided this statement to explain its decision "to go it alone":

> The complexity of the South Africa scene makes it impossible to have a pluralistic organization that satisfies the aspirations of all member groups. Social and political stratifications in the country coupled with preferential treatment of certain groups result in differing aspirations prevailing in the different segments of the community.[9]

SASO explained that African students had unique problems and aspirations. Unlike white students, black students in student organizations tended to have concerns that transcended mainly student issues. SASO's Manifesto explained: "We black students are an integral part of the black oppressed community before we are students."[10]

At first, the government welccmed the organization, as it fit in with its notion of "separate development." Initially, it saw in Black Consciousness a manifestation of "tribal conscicusness" which it was trying to foster through Group Areas, bantustans and Bantu Education. It did not understand that BCM's goal was to counter white domination with black solidarity.

The White Question

Biko favored black solidarity over multiracial collaboration because of the dangers associated with white collaboration. Biko wrote, "We must realize that our situation is not a mistake on the part of Whites, but a deliberate act and that no amount of moral lectures will persuade the white man to 'correct' the situation."[11] Biko rejected the notion of the ANC under Lutuli that whites could be enjoined to live up to the Christian standards they professed. He denied that "beggar tactics" whereby "you choose to come to a round table to beg for your deliverance" accomplished anything but, rather, ensured the contempt of those in power.[12]

Biko wrote, "Not only have they kicked the black but they have also told him how to react to the kick. For a long time the black has been listening with patience to the advice he has been receiving.... With painful slowness he is now beginning to show signs that it is his right and duty to kick in the way he sees fit."[13] Even the white liberal who claims to have a "black soul wrapped up in white skin"[14] benefits from the apartheid regime:

> Being white, he possesses the natural passport to the exclusive pool of white privileges from which he does not hesitate to extract whatever suits him. Yet, since he identifies with blacks, he moves around his white circles -- white only beaches, restaurants and cinemas -- with a lighter load,

> feeling that he is not like the rest. Yet at the back of his mind is the constant reminder that he is quite comfortable as things stand and therefore should not bother about change.[15]

In one respect, liberals were worse than those doing the "kicking". Seeking to control blacks' response to the "kick", they inevitably advocated moderation and gradualism. Thus, collaboration with white liberals, according to Biko, has been "mostly responsible for the arrest of progress."[16] Liberals tended to confuse blacks regarding the enemy. To the liberal, the enemy is the nationalist party. The assumption, according to Biko, is that all is well with the system "save for some degree of mismanagement by irrational conservatives at the top."[17] Thus, white liberals aim merely at replacing one white political party with another less reactionary one and relaxing certain oppressive laws.

Furthermore, the more radical of the left wing, the Communists, "tell us that the struggle is a class struggle rather than a race one."[18] But the true foe for Biko was white racism which needed to be faced by black unity. "Black people should first close their ranks, to form themselves into a solid group to oppose the definite racism that is meted out by White society, to work out their direction clearly and bargain from a position of strength."[19]

Biko denied his followers were themselves black

racists:

> Some will charge that we are racist but let us not take heed.... We do not have the power to subjugate anyone. We are merely respondong to provocation in the most realistic way. Racism not only implies exclusion of one race by another -- it always presupposes that the exclusion is for the purposes of subjugation.[20]

However, he was aware of the ambiguity of the exclusive approach: "History has charged us with the cruel responsibility of going to the very gate of racism in order to destroy racism -- to the gate not further."[21] The possibility of a racialistic opposition able to order society on a non-racial basis after victory Lutuli had soundly rejected.

Biko advocated an exclusive black front, but, unlike Sobukwe, he accepted Coloureds and Indians in that front. (From the beginning the executive of SASO included members from the Coloured and Indian campuses.) The BCM defined "black" as "those who are by law or tradition politically, economically, and socially discriminated against as a group in the South African society and identifying themselves as a unit in the struggle toward the realization of their aspirations."[22] Certainly, the "stinking Coolies" rejected by Sobukwe deserved to be counted among the oppressed.

But, for Biko anybody who does not identify with the Black struggle, regardless of his skin pigmentation, does

not deserve the appellation "black." Biko wrote, "... I must state categorically that there is no such thing as a Black policeman. Any Black man who props the System up actively has lost the right to be considered part of the Black world."[23] Using a Biblical allusion, he explains, "He has sold his soul for 30 piece of silver and finds that he is not in fact acceptable to the White society he sought to join.... They are extensions of the enemy into our ranks."[24]

Likewise, those homeland leaders -- "honorary whites" -- who chose to accept the bantustans arrangement as the appropriate area in which to seek political rights were not "black."[25] They were denying their God-given right to the whole country for some remote corner. These "non-whites" were aspiring for limited privileges within the established order.[26]

Biko held the same view of any person who entered the Coloured Representative or Indian Councils, the Urban Bantu Councils (the advisory bodies in the townships) or any government boards or councils in the townships or reserves. His opprobrium of these "dummy platforms" and "phony telephones"[27] is reminiscent of Lutuli's disavowal of Native Representative Councils as "toy telephones."

Collaboration with the white system condemned them to a perennial state of compromise which conflicted with

the radical aims of the Black Consciousness movement. A SASO newsletter editorialized, "It is the elitist class, created by the very oppressed, that has joined hands with the oppressor in suppressing the legitimate aspirations of the masses of the people and they collect crumbs from the master's table for this dirty work."[28] In so doing, Biko wrote, they are well on their way "towards selling [their] souls."[29] Trying to emulate whites, they are "insulting the intelligence of whoever created them black."[30]

Just as there were "a few bad blacks", Biko admitted that there were "a few good whites."[31] But, for Biko, the exception merely proved the rule. Even the "good" whites benefit from the system, so their sincerity in wishing to destroy that system is dubious. And if they are sincere, i.e. "true liberals," then they are oppressed themselves and must fight for their own freedom and not for that of blacks with whom they can hardly identify.[32] The role of whites is therefore limited: No group, however benevolent, can ever hand power to the vanquished on a plate, Biko stated.[33] What the more aware whites can do is work within their own community to educate their brothers for the future. He wrote that the liberal must serve as a lubricating material so that as the black majority changes the gears in trying to find a

better direction for South Africa, there would be no grinding noises of metal but a easy flowing movement characteristic of a well-tuned vehicle.[34]

Assimilation

In contrast to the ANC's premise that blacks should be accorded equality within the white world, Biko denied that he was seeking assimilation into white society. He wrote, "This is white man's integration -- an integration based on exploitative values in a society in which the whites have already cut out their position somewhere at the top of the pyramid. It is an integration in which black will compete against black, using each other as rungs up a step ladder leading them to white values."[35] It is an integration in which the black man first will have to prove himself in terms of the white man's values before meriting acceptance and assimilation.

In the French former colonies, the chance of assimilation made it possible for blacks to aspire to "be white," but "in South Africa whiteness has always been associated with political brutality and intimidation, early morning pass raids, general harrassment in and out of the townships, and hence no Black really aspires to be white."[36] Whereas Lutuli had admired Western culture, for Biko, in the South African context, it was evil. Equally important, it is not the majority culture. Biko

explained,

> If by integration you understand a breakthrough into white society by blacks, an assimilation and acceptance of blacks into an already established set of norms and code of behavior set up by and maintained by whites, then YES I am against it.... I am against the fact that a settler minority should impose an entire system of values on an indigenous people... For one cannot escape the fact that the culture shared by the majority group in any given society must ultimately determine the broad direction taken by the joint culture of that society... A country in which the majority of people are African, must inevitably exhibit African values and be truly African in style.[37]

Thus, SASO's 1971 policy manfesto called for the necessity for blacks to develop their own value system. It stated: "The Black man must reject all value systems that seek to make him a foreigner in the country of his birth and reduce his basic human dignity. The Black man must build his own value systems, and see himself as self-defined and not defined by others."[38] A first step in defining himself was the refusal to refer to oneself as "non-white", opting for "black" instead. Biko wrote, "Merely by describing yourself as black you have started on a road towards emancipation, you have committed yourself to fight against all forces that seek to use your blackness as a stamp that marks you out as a subservient being."[39]

Black Consciousness

SASO upheld the concept of black consciousness as the key to liberation. Biko explained, "... we cannot be

conscious of ourselves and yet remain in bondage. We want to attain the envisioned self which is a free self."[40] SASO wrote that black consciousness is an inward-looking process that seeks to reawaken blacks to their value as human beings and dignity as God's children.[41] Its aim was to "pump back life into [the black man's] empty shell ... infuse him with pride and dignity ... remind him of his complicity in the crime of allowing himself to be misused and therefore letting evil reign supreme in the country of his birth."[42]

Like Sobukwe, Biko believed in the priority of psychological liberation. SASO's Policy Manifesto stated that the black man must be liberated first from psychological oppression arising out of inferiority complex and, secondly, from physical oppression accruing out of living in a white racist society.[43] The emphasis on psychological liberation in the writings of the BCM sometimes overshadow the ultimate objective. But it is clear that Biko believed that psychological liberation would create black solidarity and "bargaining strength" for the pursuance of its ultimate goal, which was, in short, a completely non-racial franchise: "an open society, one man, one vote, no reference to colour."[44]

It is not clear how Biko envisaged getting from psychological to political liberation. Clearly more

concerned with the present than with the future, he wrote, "The future will always be shaped by the sequence of present-day events."[45] Nevertheless, like Lutuli and Sobukwe before him, he had faith in ultimate success because "no lie can live forever."[46] In addition, the successful revolutions in Angola and Mozambique were a source of encouragement, presenting the possibility of change in his lifetime. However, unlike Sobukwe, he was prepared for a lengthy struggle: "We have set out on a quest for true humanity, and somewhere on the distant horizon we can see the glittering prize."[47]

Like his two predeccesors, Biko believed, "Truth must triumph over evil."[48] He stated in Court that "the white man ... is going to eventually accept the inevitable."[49] Davis notes that Biko provided his followers with a living hope in the future that could sustain them in the midst of oppression. An eschatological vision enabled his people to live in the midst of their present oppression as though they were already liberated. It was the means by which powerlessness and poverty were prevented from crushing the free spirit within. Biko "spoke as if the vanquished were already vanquished. He functioned prophetically, as if new Azania had already been born," Davis explains.[50]

Moore argues that conquering the sense of inevitable

subjugation is essential for political change. People must "define their situation as the consequence of human injustice: a situation that they need not, cannot, and ought not to endure." He concludes, "... without some very considerable surge of moral anger such changes do not occur."[51]

Christianity for Lutuli, Sobukwe, and Biko provided the ethical critique of apartheid and with it the source of moral anger and hope in face of great obstacles. For instance, Biko wrote, "We have in us the will to live through these trying times. Over the years we have attained moral superiority over the white man. We shall watch as time destroys his paper castles...."[52]

Community development projects and leadership training seminars formed the bulk of SASO's work. SASO and the Black People's Convention (BPC), an adult organization founded by Biko in 1972, busied themselves with directing literacy campaigns, health projects, and community centers. Biko explained that they were undertaken in order to instill a sense of dignity and pride within the black man. Blacks benefited from seeing other blacks carrying out these projects. Previously, it had always been whites who offered charity. Now it was blacks helping themselves. Biko wrote, "Our role was a simple one: to assist in the upliftment of the Black

community and to help Black people ... to diagnose their problems and to participate in their solutions."[53] He explained that self-help projects removed the defeatist attitude that good comes only from whites. This, he asserted, helps in the building-up process. "This is 'conscientization.'"[54] Community projects in addition to fostering self-reliance were to build a sense of oneness between leaders and masses without which any future resistance would be unattainable.

Majority Culture

Like Sobukwe, Biko made no guarantees for minority rights:

> We see a completely non-racial society. We don't believe, for instance, in the so-called guarantee for minority rights, because guaranteed minority rights implies the recognition of portions of the community on a racial basis. We believe that in our country there shall be no minority, just the people. And those people will have the same status before the law and ... the same political rights.[55]

Individual rights, however, would be respected in the observance of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Biko, like Sobukwe, claimed that South Africa belonged to Africans, "and to them alone."[56] Once it was independent, then whites could be accepted as equals. Then could whites be invited to sit at the Africans' table:

We are aware that the white man is sitting at our

> table. We know he has no right to be there; we want to remove him ... strip the table of all trappings put on by him, decorate it in true African style, settle down and then ask him to join us on our own terms if he wishes.[57]

He explained the difference between Black Power in the United States and Black Consciousness in South Africa as the difference between a minority and majority philosophy. Black Power seeks participation by a minority in an already established society through pressure group tactics. Black Consciousness, on the other hand, aims at complete transformation of the system to make of it what the majority wishes.[58] South African blacks were no longer interested in becoming part of the system but in changing it, to make it more in keeping with traditional African values of communalism, compassion, and sharing in contradistinction to the white society's elevation of individualism, greed, and materialism in which "the poor will grow poorer and the rich richer."[59] The goal was a just, egalitarian society based on equal sharing of the country's wealth.

Fatton argues that although the ANC in its Freedom Charter had linked political emancipation to economic transformation with an agenda that included some nationalization of industry and banks, rather than usher in a classless state, the ANC sought the transfer of wealth to an African bourgeoisie class.[60] Lutuli had

declared during the Treason Trial, "It is certainly not Congress policy to do away with private ownership of the means of production. The African business community has a full place in Congress and I personally regard African business enterprise as something to be encouraged."[61] The PAC was more explicit than the ANC in its rejection of capitalism and imperialism. In Sobukwe's commencement speech at Fort Hare in 1949, he stated that the destruction of capitalism was central.[62] But, Hirson points out, Sobukwe never spoke in these terms again.[63] He was a co-signatory of the Youth League's proposed Programme of Action whose economic demands were limited to the establishment of peoples cooperatives and incorporation of African trade unions into the ANC. The final Programme of Action accepted by the ANC called merely for the establishment of commercial, industrial, transport and other enterprises in both urban and rural areas and the consolidation of trade unions to improve the workers' standard of living.[64]

Fatton apparently believes that the Black Consciousness Movement advances beyond these conceptions. Certainly, Biko believed that South African blacks were "colonised" in terms of economic exploitation: "Their cheap labour has helped to make South Africa what it is today."[65] He saw economic greed as the reason for

apartheid. Biko wrote, "The leaders of the white community had to create some kind of barrier between blacks and whites such that the whites could enjoy privilege at the expense of blacks and still feel free to give a moral explanation for the obvious exploitation that pricked even the hardest of white consciences."[66] And he was aware that a substantial economic sacrifice would be required of whites in order for blacks to attain equity.[67]

But, Biko was far from seeing the struggle for independence in class terms. He explained, "There is for instance no workers in the classical sense among whites in South Africa, for even the most down-trodden white worker still has a lot to lose if the system is changed."[68] The white worker is protected through job reservation laws from competition with the majority, and because it is considered almost a sin to be black, poor whites demand the distinction between themselves and blacks. Hence, "the greatest anti-black feeling is to be found amongst the very poor whites whom the Class Theory calls upon to be with black workers in the struggle for emancipation."[69]

In short, if Biko rejected Capitalism, he rejected Communism as well. He saw a third way, based on the African past, as the basis of the new society under

African leadership.[70] At its 1976 convention, the Black Peoples Convention adopted "Black communalism" as its economic policy, which it defined as "an economic system which is based on the principle of sharing, lays emphasis on community ownership of land and its wealth and riches, and which strikes a healthy balance between what may legitimately be owned by individuals and what ought to be owned by the community as a whole...."[71] Aspects of African culture, such as mutuality, cooperation, and neighborliness which had made poverty foreign to Africans in pre-colonial times, would be revived.[72]

Criticizing capitalism, Biko did not, however, make replacing it the central aspect of liberation. Like Lutuli, his attack on apartheid was based more on its assault on the dignity of man than on its economic exploitation of him. SASO held that liberation is primarily a "search for humanity and for existence as a God-created being."[73] Therefore, Biko was interested in the non-material aspects of black liberation. Because of that, Fatton argues, he "failed to analyze in any systematic way the issues of class and economics."[74] That task, he writes, was left to later Black Consciousness leaders who ascended afer his banning and subsequent death.[75]

For Biko, the central problem was racism, not

capitalism. "The cause of our suffering is the colour of our skin," he opined.[76] Racial superiority, an ideology originally conceived for capitalism's demands for cheap labor, in time came to be believed, so that the race problem "has now become a genuine problem on its own."[77]

The Church

Biko's preoccupation with the church stemmed from his study of its past role in giving religious justification for apartheid. He was also critical of the present efforts of the churches. Whereas African clergymen within the ANC had tended to emphasize the importance of "bridge building" and inter-racial cooperation, the Black Consciousness Movement, writes Gerhart, "can only be seen as representing a highly significant shift in opinion, perhaps auguring a period of reorientation among many black Christians."[78] Of course, this reorientation had actually begun with the PAC's efforts at self-reliance, and in a sense, black consciousness is merely a refinement of the PAC's "Africanism." But it is true that the BCM experienced greater legitimacy among black churchmen within the English-speaking churches than had the PAC. For while the PAC identified with the African Independent Churches, it never developed an alernative theology that could "challenge the hegemony of bourgeois Christian

ideology."[79] An "eccentric messianism" that expressed itself in "Africans' immunity to the white man's bullets" was not generally appealing to the educated black churchmen outside the African Independent Churches.[80]

Ironically, it was a white churchman, Basil Moore, who offered the following indictment of multiracialism in which the black churchman is blamed for choosing a phony reconciliation with whites over a true reconciliation with his own suffering people:

> Show us the black churchmen who have taken time off from attending multi-racial meetings to take seriously the de-humanising plight of the 75% illiterate Blacks, and to gain the skills to devote themselves to enable this mass of their people to read and write. Where are the Black churchmen who are gaining the skills to serve their people in their waterless starvation on South Africa's rural wastes to enable them to feed themselves and their children? Which black churchmen are to be found at Bantu Commissioner's offices with a real knowledge of the host of influx control laws, helping their people to find a home and hold their families together?... Courting rich Whites they have lost contact with the poor Blacks. "Reconcilliation" between races has been gained, if at all, at the expense of "reconciliation" between the potential Black leaders and the forgotten Black masses. This, above all else, has been the Black tragedy of our middleclass multi-racialism.[81]

Moore's criticism sounds similar to Sobukwe's judgment that multiracialism represented the aspirations of an African elite that wanted to be integrated into white society while the masses of Africans are being exploited. SASO, too, lashed out at the churches in South Africa with "their over-emphasis of inter-racial

fraternization as a solution to the problems of this country, whereas they are fully aware that the basic problem is that of land distribution, economic deprivation and consequently the disinheritance of the Black people."[82]

Although criticizing the churches' interest in multiracialism, Biko did not reject the role of Christianity in the struggle. However, he did write that the message of Christianity had to be made relevant. In the following passage, Biko denounces the practice of Christianity in South Africa:

> What is the white man's religion -- Christianity? It seems the people involved in importing Christianity to the black people steadfastly refuse to get rid of the rotten foundation which many of the missionaries created when they came. To this date black people find no message for them in the Bible simply because our ministers are too busy with moral trivialities. They blow these up as the most important things that Jesus had to say to the people. They constantly urge people to find fault in themselves and by so doing detract from the essence of the struggle in which the people are involved. Deprived of spiritual content, the black people read the bible with a gullibility that is shocking. While they sing in a chorus of "mea culpa" they are joined by white groups who sing a different version -- "tua culpa". The anachronism of a well-meaning God who allows people to suffer continually under an obviously immoral system is not lost to young blacks who continue to drop out of Church by the hundreds.[83]

However, he goes on to offer possibilities for change:

> Too many people are involved in religion for the blacks to ignore. Obviously the only path open for us now is to redefine the message in the bible and to make it relevant to the struggling masses. The

> bible must continually be shown to have something to say to the black man to keep him going in his long journey toward realisation of the self.[84]

Biko attacks Western religion for creating "a false understanding of ourselves."[85] It is the job of Black Consciousness, therefore, to infuse the black man with a true knowledge of himself and with pride in his culture and his religion.[86] In an address to black ministers at a conference in 1972, Biko explains what he means by false religion. First, he accuses it of being culture-bound: "Whereas Christianity had been through vigorous cultural adaptations from ancient Judea through Rome, through London, through Brussels and Lisbon, somehow when it landed in the Cape, it was made to look fairly rigid."[87] The acceptance of the colonialist-tained version of Christianity, writes Biko, marked the turning point in the resistance of African people. "If the white missionaries were 'right' about their God in the eyes of the people, then the African people could only accept whatever these new know-all tutors had to say about life."[88]

Even at this late stage, notes Biko, the Church's teaching is mostly irrelevant to the realities of life for blacks in South Africa:

> In a country teeming with injustice and fanatically committed to the practice of oppression, intolerance and blatant cruelty because of racial bigotry; in a country where all black people are made to feel the

> unwanted stepchildren of God whose presence they cannot feel; in a country where father and son, mother and daughter alike develop daily into neurotics through sheer inability to relate the present to the future because of a completely engulfing sense of destitution, the Church further adds to their insecurity by its inward-directed definition of the concept of sin and its encouragement of the "mea culpa" attitudes.[89]

For instance, black ministers on Sunday preach against robbing, stabbing, murdering, and adultery without ever attempting to relate these vices to the poverty, unemployment, overcrowding, lack of schooling, and migratory labour brought about through apartheid.[90] Related to the Church's often irrelevant theology is its unwieldy bureaucracy which removes the Church from important priorities in order to concentrate on secondary issues like structures and finance, making the Church an "ivory tower."[91] Another feature which made the Church irrelevant to blacks is white control of that bureaucracy. While the membership of most non-Afrikaner churches is 90 percent black, 90 percent of the controlling power is in white hands. Thus, by allowing this situation, black Christians are allowing a minority which is not interested in making Christianity relevant to blacks remain in control of the workings of the Churches.[92]

Black Theology

Despite his criticism of the Church, Biko never

rejected the validity of Christianity, for he recognized that "essentially the Black community is a very religious community."[93] Rather, he proposed that Black Theology be used to analyze the South African situation. He wrote, "Christianity can never hope to remain abstract and removed from the people's environmental problems. In order to be applicable to people, it must have meaning for them in their given situation. If they are oppressed people, it must have something to say about their oppression."[94]

He applauds Black Theology for relating the Christian faith to the black man's suffering. "It shifts the emphasis of man's moral obligation from avoiding wronging false authorities by not losing his Reference Book, not stealing food when hungry and not cheating police when he is caught, to being committed to eradicating all cause for suffering as represented in the death of children from starvation, outbreaks of epidemics in poor areas, or the existence of thuggery and vandalism in townships."[95] It shifts the emphasis from petty sins to major sins, "thereby ceasing to teach the people to 'suffer peacefully.'"[96] It teaches that the real sin is "to allow oneself to be oppressed."[97]

The role of the black theologian accordingly is to redirect the black man's understanding of God. Religion

is significant for the black struggle against apartheid because for Biko "no nation can win a battle without faith...."[98] But it must be a proper faith for "if our faith in our God is spoilt by our having to see Him through the eyes of the same people we're fighting against then there obviously begins to be something wrong in that relationship."[99]

Biko's evident interest in religion was inspired by the writings of James Cone and other African-Americans on black theology. One African theologian, commenting on the contribution of Cone, said: "We feel...what Cone says in our bones."[100] South African blacks were receptive to the ideas of Cone, such as God's identification with the oppressed, but the more militant aspects of American Black Theology were somewhat moderated in South Africa.

Cone had written, "There is no use for a God who loves whites the same as blacks.... Black theology will accept only a love of God which participates in the destruction of the white enemy."[101] SASO, on the other hand, argued, "There is a mile of difference between preaching Black Consciousness and preaching hatred of whites. Telling people to hate whites is an outward and reactionary type of preaching which, though understandable, is undesirable and self-destructive. It makes one think in negative terms and preoccupies one

with peripheral issues."[102] In fact, SASO saw hatred of whites as the expression of an inferiority complex "where the sufferer has lost hope of 'making it' because of conditions imposed upon him. His actual aspirations are tc be like the white man and the hatred arises out of frustration."[103] For SASO, Black Consciousness "takes cognisance of one's dignity and leads to positive action.... In the end you are a much more worthy victor because you do not seek to revenge but to implement the truth for which you have stood all along during your struggle. You were no less angry than the man who hated whites but your anger was channeled to positive action."[104]

However, within the Black Consciousness Movement one finds examples of a virulent militancy reminiscent of Cone. Biko's close colleague, Aubrey Mokoape, urged at a BPC meeting, "Brothers and sisters, I think these words have been spoken by no less authority [than the] Rev. Baartman, who felt that the White man has become subhuman, that the White man is in the way, has become a devil, that the White man has become a beast and that he can only be helped by one thing, by quite quickly removing him."[105] Biko himself had written, "Clearly black people cannot respect White people, at least not in this country. There is such an obvious aura of

immorality and naked cruelty in all that is done in the name of white people that no Black man, no matter how intimidated, can ever be made to respect White society."[106] Biko also wrote that underneath the black fear of whites is "a naked hatred."[107] In fact, writes Biko, "... Blacks see Whiteness as a concept that warrants being despised, hated, destroyed and replaced by an aspiration with more human contact in it ... The secret determination in the innermost minds of most Blacks ... [is] to kick Whites off those comfortable garden chairs ... and to claim them for himself."[108]

Links To Religious Organizations

If Lutuli was viewed as a messiah to some multiracial groups, then surely Biko was that to all-black audiences. He was for them, writes Davis, "an authentic disciple of Jesus." But, Davis continues, this special brand of discipleship was "mainly exogenous to the institutional Church," for Biko did not find a close association with the Church helpful. Davis states that in a sense, Biko never left the Church, as the community of the redeemed and faithful. Rather, the Church, defined as an organization of accomodation to the world, left him.[109] As Bishop Zulu stated, "He was too big for the Church."[110] Because Biko saw the churches as man-made institutions devoid of divine authority, while

at the same time he acknowledged the need for total obedience to God's will, he had to stand apart from the church in order to prevent himself from becoming completely agnostic.[111] Although not involved personally in the organized church, Biko, nevertheless, sought converts to his cause there.

Given the BCM's emphasis on religion, it is not surprising that links grew between SASO and the Black People's Convention (BPC), with the Inter-Denominational African Ministers Association (IDAMASA), and the African Independent Churches Association (AICA). A member of the latter organization, Victor Magatula, minister of the Bantu Bethlehem Christian Apostolic Church of Africa, saw a natural affinity between Black Theology and the African Independent Churches, for the key concern of both is liberation. In the Ethiopian churches, he says, the emphasis is on physical liberation; in the Zionist churches it is on psychological liberation.[112] Comaroff's assertion that the Zionist churches were not apolitical[113] makes sense in the context of Black Theology's concern with psychological liberation from inferiority complex, slave mentality, and self-hate. Both black theology proponents and Zionists recognized the importance of liberation not from material and political bondage alone. Liberation of the mind and

spirit is paramount. Biko had written, "If one is free at heart, no human-made chains can bind one to servitude."[114] Perhaps in the absence of imminent political liberation both groups had to be content with spiritual awakening.

But it was not just to the independent churches that Biko turned. Under the auspices of the Black Community Programmes, and in conjunction with the Christian Institute, workshops for ministers of multi-racial churches were held on Black Theology. In 1972, Biko presented a paper at a Black Ministers of Religion Conference. Stubbs notes that Biko realized the importance of trying to "conscientise" this key section of the black community. Biko was correct in seeing that these black churchmen, paid less than their white counterparts and denied leadership opportunities, were vulnerable to politicisation.[115]

Biko explained to these men that in order to change the church, "we have first to gain ascendance over [it] ... and then turn [it] into one we cherish, we love, we understand, and one that is relevant to us."[116] He urged that black people learn the method of caucasing to put black people in control of churches. Since 90% of the English-Speaking church membership is black, Biko felt that by numerical strength it would be possible for their

religious doctrine -- Black Theology -- to become the predominant theology in South Africa.

He urged, "It is the duty, therefore of all black priests and ministers of religion to save Christianity by adopting Black Theology's approach and thereby once more uniting the black man with his God."[117] In fact, under the influence of the BCM, IDAMASA, the largest and possibly oldest African church movement, had decided in 1971 to exclude white ministers from their executive.[118] By 1972, writes Herbstein, IDAMASA was "won over to black consciousness."[119]

SASO also found the South African Council of Churches (SACC) sympathetic to its aims. Twenty-seven churches and church organizations, including the Christian Institute, IDAMASA, and UCM, were members of the Council in 1968. However, Hirson notes, the relationship between SACC and SASO was equivocal. In many respects SASO was attracted to the Council, and especially the more radical CI, but at the same time it sought to be an African organization acting independently of any white body.[120] Nevertheless, Biko chose to take part in SPROCAS, the Study Project on Apartheid Society, established by the SACC in 1969, to seek alternatives to apartheid.

This ambivalence toward the multiracial bodies is

also evident in SASO's decision to exclude the Christian Institute from the inaugural meeting to launch the BPC in 1971, and yet to use the publishing house of CI to produce its literature. The BCM organizations also relied on church bodies abroad to finance their projects. Hirson notes, "To speak of 'using black resources', or of exclusive 'black identification', did not present an accurate picture of how the organization functioned."[121]

Predictably, seminary students were among the earliest proponents of Black Consciousness. The Federal Theological Seminary [FEDSEM] at Alice, adjacent to Fort Hare University, and founded by the Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians for theological training of black ministers, quickly became the center for SASO and Black Theology.[122] Also, the Lutheran Seminary in Mapumulo, and the Catholic Seminary in Hammanskraal were places where Black Theology was debated and sometimes taught. Regehr comments, "Black theology students have been in the vanguard of Black opposition to apartheid, and all-Black schools have become the center of a growing Black Consciousness Movement."[123]

It was perhaps to be expected that the exclusivist nationalist position buttressed by an exclusivist black theology would come mainly from this generation educated

not in the multiracial mission schools but in the ethnicly segregated schools. By the time Biko attended Lovedale, for instance, it had been under the control of the Bantu Education Department for ten years. The limited contact with whites no doubt had a part in shaping an exclusivist nationalism.[124] Prior writes, "The ageing 1960 generation of leaders which was schooled in the Christian liberal aspirations of becoming participants in the running of the South African state is being replaced with the 1976 generation which was socialised only in apartheid society and for which participation is a morally unacceptable compromise."[125]

Violence

There is no doubt a relationship between an exclusive nationalism and the advocacy of violence. Lutuli had felt fortunate to know whites and work alongside them in multiracial organizations, feeling that this experience had prevented a hatred that would result in violence against them. Biko's view on the merits of violence, however, was different. Biko wrote, "Black theology seeks to depict Jesus as a fighting God who saw the exchange of Roman money -- the oppressor's coinage -- in His father's temple as so sacrilegious [sic] that it merited a violent reaction from Him -- the Son of Man."[126] Although Biko believed that God acted in

history, it was mainly through his agents on earth. Biko reminded a group of black ministers, "God is not in the habit of coming down from heaven to solve people's problems on earth."[127] Rather, He challenges his followers to identify with Christ, a "fighting, not a passive God who allows a lie to rest unchallenged."[128] Biko's acceptance of violence as a means of struggle corresponds with his belief in a transcendent God who though identifying with man's suffering empowers man to fight his own battles.

As a defense witness for the SASO-9[129] in 1976, however, Biko testified that he was not interested in armed struggle and distanced himself from those policies of the exiled ANC and PAC: "We believe that there is a way of getting across to where we want to go through peaceful means. And the very fact that we decided to actually form an aboveboard movement implies that we accepted certain legal limitations to our operations."[130] However, SASO could hardly openly advocate violent revolution in its constitution and documents and expect to remain a legal operation in South Africa. The fact that there was no specific rejection of violence in the documents of SASO and BPC probably means that they wanted to keep that option open. In addresses to black audiences, Biko, like Sobukwe, emphasized the importance

of revering African heroes who had fought against white conquest.[131] His identification with both Cone and Fanon, who very explicitly advocated the use of any means at their disposal to destroy their oppressors, tends to support the view that Biko was in favor of some sort of armed struggle.

Other BC leaders, including Aubrey Mokoape, urged, "... we have only one road, and that road is total unadulterated revolution."[132] And SASM, a Black-Consciousness oriented youth organization, developed secret cells where the question of armed struggle was debated.[133] Jennings confirms that Biko, too, clearly saw the inevitability of violence.[134]

Biko was aware, of course, of the possible negative consequences of violence: "When there is violence, there is messiness. Violence brings too many residues of hate into the reconstruction period. Apart from its obvious horrors, it creates too many post-revolutionary problems. If at all possible, we want the revolution to be peaceful and reconciliatory." (emphasis added).[135] Biko implied that the decision to engage in violence would be determined by the government's actions.

Biko's position is ambiguous, but it has been suggested that his disavowal of violence was based on tactical, rather than ideological, considerations given

the strength of the South African security and police forces. Gerhart concludes, "The only accurate label for Biko is revolutionary." She asserts his public rejection of violence was based on a "fine-tuned sense of what factors would best promote his cause under the conditions prevailing in South Africa."[136] In Fatton's estimation, proponents of Black Theology came to envisage violence "as a regrettable and inevitable if not morally justifiable agent of revolution, given the intransigence of South Africa's white power structure."[137] Certainly, the youth of Soweto later demonstrated that "Black Consciousnes can and most probably will lead to violent confrontation."[138]

Soweto Uprising

In 1976 the government mandated that Afrikaans would be the language of instruction for Social Studies and Mathematics in secondary schools. Students viewed the requirement not only as an attempt to force the language of the oppressor on the oppressed but also the means to cut them off from English proficiency which was the key to the better paid jobs. The new law was but another step in the government's ongoing campaign to provide blacks an inferior education.

As early as 1953, the government had passed the Bantu Education Act, which took control of schools away

from the churches and mandated that black children attend blacks-only schools under government control.[139] Lutuli had said this about the Act:

> The door has to be slammed shut hard in the faces of the younger generation, and a system devised which will recondition us to accept perpetual inferiority and perpetual isolation from Western learning and culture. To isolate us and to convince us of our permanent inferiority -- these two motives lie behind much legislation from the Act of Union until now, and the Bantu Education Act is a major means to this end... It is a tool in the hands of the White Master for the more effective reduction and control of the Black Servants.[140]

On June 16, 1976 students in reaction to the enforced use of Afrikaans, staged a mass protest, refusing to attend classes. The boycott centered not just on the language issue but on a whole host of grievances with Bantu Education: poor instruction, overcrowded schools,[141] inadequate funding for African education, and limited employment opportunities after graduation. The grievances extended even beyond complaints with education. Hirson writes, "The widespread opposition to the new regulation, which brought together conservatives and radicals, teachers and taught, indicated that the many strands of opposition -- based on very different premises -- were uniting against something more than on instruction over language."[142] The united stand against Afrikaans was the manifestation of deep resentment inside the townships against the

entire administration.

Neither SASO or any other BCM organization was directly responsible for planning the boycott of schools. Like the PAC before it, the BCM took non-collaboration seriously. It planned no acts of resistance, led no defiance campaigns, offered no resolutions, sent no deputations, requested no negotiations. Motlhabi notes that on no occasion did the BCM attempt to make any direct demands or protest to the government regarding the black condition.[143] Biko believed that confrontation was "self-destructive" and that "side isues became main issues."[144] Consequently, any condemnation of the regime was made in addresses to the black community, since the primary concern was with the building-up process for future action.

But, SASM (South African Students Movement), the counterpart in the high schools to SASO, helped organize the protest after the spontaneous uprising of the students. SASM had not originated from SASO but independently from high school students in the Transvaal townships. Youth clubs in three Soweto high schools -- Diepkloof, Orlando, and Orlando West - formed the African Students Movement in 1971 and by 1972 changed its name to SASM to indicate its national character.[145] Although autonomous from SASO, it did have direct links with SASO

and BPC. By the time of the Sowewto Uprising, SASM was a country-wide organization with branches in Cape Town, the Transvaal, Eastern Cape, and Durban.

On June 13, the Naledi branch of SASM called a meeting at a church hall, where an Action Committee of SASM,[146] composed of two delegates from each Soweto school, was placed in charge. The 300-400 students present decided tc launch the protest that became known worldwide as the "Soweto Uprising." Some 10,000 pupils from seven Soweto schools took to the streets on June 16, and "mass protest was reborn."[147] Police opened fire into the crowd of advancing students, killing one child at Orlando West High School.

Demonstrations and police retaliation spread from Soweto to other townships on the Witwatersrand and then to black urban ghettos in Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, and East London. In Cape Town, Coloured students from both the University of the Western Cape and the secondary schools joined their African peers in demonstrations. More than 600 communities were involved and 600-1000 blacks were killed, including many children. Fierce rioting broke out as blacks, as well as some Indians and Coloureds, struck out at symbols of apartheid -- government offices, beer halls, post offices, and administration-run buses -- and burned collaborators'

homes.[148] In August 60% of the labor force stayed home from work for two days in "an impressive if short-lived show of solidarity" the likes of which had not been seen since the Defiance Campaign of 1952.[149]

Following Soweto, hundreds of Africans were detained without trial. Four thousand young South Africans fled the country that year alone to join the ANC in exile. That decision was based less on ideological identification with the expatriate movement than a need for an organizational base, material resources, and international connections "necessary for the transition to armed violence."[150] (By this time the ANC had altered its strict non-violent policy.)

Biko died in detention on September 12, 1977.[151] When asked for proof that black consciousness was a force to be reckoned with, Biko had once responded, "In one word: Soweto!"[152] The causal relationship was perhaps not that clearcut,[153] but it is widely believed that the philosophy of the Black Conscousness Movement instilled in the Soweto youth a pride and self-confidence to dare to defy the government's new educational policies. Nengwekhula does not exaggerate when he states that the uprising started in Soweto because of the diffusion of black consciousness there: "The kind of leadership ... there [was] more radical than the leadership throughout

the whole country.... The uprising started in Soweto, not because these people were more oppressed there but because SASM was centered there."[154] Stubbs suggests that Biko's courage in the face of hostile cross-examination at the SASO-9 trial also may have inspired the boys and girls of Soweto to face death bravely just six weeks later.[155]

The legacy of Black Consciousness lies not in providing any new ideological content; in many respects Biko's ideas are but a refinement of Sobukwe's. Even though censorship and banning laws made the PAC's and ANC's views not easily accessible, Biko had visited Sobukwe in Kimberley and Sobukwe remained there as a resource for and sometimes critic of the new movement, writes Silk.[156] The legacy of the Black Consciousness Movement, then, is in its <u>regalvanising</u> black militancy. De Gruchy writes, "Soweto could not have happened if the message of black dignity and protest, a message which had its greatest impact upon young black students, had not been preached and heard during the years before it took place."[157]

In the aftermath of Soweto, the black community found few friends among the whites, except for a handful of liberals and a group of committed Christians who had established ties with BCM organizations.[158] The

Christian Institute in response to Soweto published Is South Africa a Police State?, an account of political trials, detentions, and bannings, and the next year, Torture in South Africa? In March 1977, the BPC, calling for a week of mourning for those killed at Sharpeville and Soweto, had a message for the church:

> We call upon all the churches in this country to respond positively and cooperate with the spirit expressed in this message. We believe that the true Christian gospel supports the struggle for human dignity. We say the true Christian must ask himself, "What shall I tell the Lord on the day of reckoning? Shall I say I have not been able to put my hand in the effort to endorse God's image in the black man, as much as in the white man?[159]

Also that year, SASM made its first appeal to the churches. It urged that religions should be made more indigenous and should promote the black struggle.[160] This attitude on religion, deeply entrenched in the attitude of SASO and BPC, was new to SASM and probably arose out of the students' positive experiences during the uprising with the churches whose pastors counseled the protesters and offered them refuge.

In October, 1977 SASO and SASM, along with seventeen other mainly Black Consciousness organizations were banned, but Black Conscicusness continued to be heard. As Bishop Tutu noted at Biko's funeral, "Steve has started something that is quite unstoppable...."[161] By necessity, following the mass bannings of the 1970s,

political leadership has increasingly been provided by religious leaders. Black theologians have been in the forefront of the struggle, using biblical symbols and terminology in an effort to "conscientise" blacks and motivate them to defy apartheid. One of the most significant figures to emerge in the 1980s has been the Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu. His leadership in the United Democratic Front's protest against the new constitution is the subject of the next chapter.

Notes

1. Biko was expelled from Lovedale because of his brother's political activities in Poqo.

2. It is sometimes stated that Biko had a love/hate relationship with Christianity or that he sat on the border between belief and nonbelief. A better reading is that he was disillusioned with the organized church but retained personal belief in God. See Donald Woods, Biko (New York: Paddington Press, 1978), p. 69. See also John de Gruchy, The Church Struggle in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 155.

3. Gail Gerhart, Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), p. 260.

4. Mokgethi Motlhabi, The Theory and Practice of Black Resistance to Apartheid (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1984), p. 109.

5. UCM was formed by a white minister, Basil Moore, in 1966, the year of the birth of Black Theology in the U.S.

6. NUSAS had been banned on black campuses in 1967. UCM was banned on black campuses in 1969 and later dissolved itself in 1972 with the statement: "We no longer believe in multiracialism as a strategy to bring about change." See David Thomas, Councils in the Ecumenical Movement in South Africa (Johannesburg: SACC, 1979), p. 67.

7. Apart from the ideological justification, the decision reflected different problems of Africans, who since the beginning of the 1960s were educated at isolated ethnic universities.

8. Millard Arnold, ed. Steve Biko: Black Consciousness in South Africa (New York: Random House, 1978), p. 9.

9. B. A. Khoapa, Black Review (1972), pp. 41-42. Cited by Ernie Regehr, Perceptions of Apartheid: The Churches and Political Change in South Africa (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1979), p. 200.

10. SASO, "Black Students' Manifesto" in Hendrik

van der Merwe, ed. African Perspectives on South Africa: A Collection of Speeches, Articles and Documents (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), p. 97.

11. Steve Biko, I Write What I Like. Edited by Aelred Stubbs (London: Heinemann, 1979), p. 91.

12. Biko, p. 91.

13. Biko, p. 66.

14. Biko, p. 64.

15. Biko, p. 65.

16. Biko, p. 65.

17. Biko, p. 91.

18. Biko, p. 89.

19. SASO, "Policy Manifesto" in van der Merwe, p. 100.

20. Biko, p. 97.

21. Bennie Khoapa, "Black Consciousness" South African Outlook (June/July, 1972), p. 101. Cited by Heribert Adam, "The Rise of Black Consciousness in South Africa," Race, 15, 2 (1973), p. 159.

22. Biko, p. 48.

23. Arnold, p. 145.

24. Arnold, p. 145.

25. Biko, pp. 80-86.

26. Biko is referring to Kaiser Mantazima of Transkei and Gatsha Butelezi of Zululand.

27. Biko, p. 84.

28. SASO Newsletter, 6, 1 (March/April 1976), p. 2. Cited by Robert Fatton, Black Consciousness in South Africa (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986), p. 93.

29. Biko, p. 39.

30. Biko, p. 49.

31. Biko, p. 51.

32. Biko, p. 25.

33. Biko, p. 90.

34. Biko, p. 26.

35. Biko, p. 91.

36. Arnold, p. 289.

37. Biko, p. 24.

38. SASO, "Policy Manifesto" in van der Merwe, pp. 99-100.

39. Biko, p. 48.

40. Biko, p. 49.

41. SASO, "Understanding SASO" in van der Merwe, p. 103. See also Woods, p. 34.

42. Biko, p. 29.

43. SASO, "Policy Manifesto" in van der Merwe, p. 99.

44. Arnold, p. 42.

45. Biko, p. 52.

46. Biko, p. 139.

47. Biko, p. 98.

48. Biko, p. 97.

49. Biko, p. 136.

50. Kortright Davis, "Racism and God: Steve Biko in Context," A.M.E. Zion Quarterly Review, 97, 4 (January, 1986), p. 21.

51. Barrington Moore, Injustice: The Social Basis of Obedience and Revolt (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1978),

pp. 458-459. Cited by Fatton, p. 40.

52. Biko, p. 72.

53. Arncld, p. 116.

54. Arnold, p. 120.

55. Biko, p. 149.

56. Biko, p. 40.

57. Biko, p. 69.

58. Arnold, p. 296.

59. Biko, p. 91.

60. Fatton, p. 127.

61. Albert Lutuli, "Statement Taken from Chief Albert Lutuli," Treason Trial lawyer's brief (Carter-Karis Collection). Cited by Gerhart, pp. 119-120.

62. Thomas Karis and Gwendolyn Carter, From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964. 4 Volumes, Volume 2 (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972-1977), p. 334.

63. Baruch Hirson, Year of Fire, Year of Ash (London: Zed Press, 1979), p. 320.

64. Karis and Carter, Volume 2, p. 338.

65. Biko, p. 96.

66. Biko, p. 88.

67. Motlhabi, Theory and Practice, p. 120.

68. Biko, p. 50.

69. Biko, p. 50.

70. Biko's "third way" was inspired by Kaunda's African Humanism, Senghor's Negritude, and Nyerere's African Socialism.

71. Fatton, p. 103.

72. Biko, pp. 42-43. See also SASO, "Understanding SASO" in van der Merwe, pp. 102-103.

73. Nyamelo Pityana, "What Is Black Consciousness?" in Basil Moore, Black Theology: The South African Voice (London: C. Hurst & Co., 1973), p. 63.

74. Fatton, p. 126.

75. For a discussion of AZAPO's economic policies, see Fatton, pp. 130-131.

76. Biko, p. 97.

77. Biko, p. 88.

78. Gerhart, p. 295.

79. Fatton, p. 66.

80. Gerhart, p. 204.

81. Basil Moore, p. 4.

82. SASO, "Resolution on Black Theology" in van der Merwe, p. 309.

83. Biko, p. 31.

84. Biko, p. 31.

85. Biko, p. 52.

86. Biko, p. 59.

87. Biko, p. 56.

88. Biko, p. 56.

89. Biko, p. 56.

90. Biko, p. 57.

91. Biko, p. 58.

92. Biko, p. 58.

93. Arnold, p. 118.

94. Biko, p. 59.

95. Biko, p. 59.

96. Biko, p. 59.

97. Biko, p. 31.

98. Biko, p. 60.

99. Biko, p. 60.

100. Mokgethi Motlhabi in Gayraud Wilmore and James Cone, Black Theology: A Documentary History 1966-1979 (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979), p. 223.

101. James Cone. A Black Theology of Liberation (Philadelphia: Lippincourt, 1970), p. 136.

102. SASO, "Understanding SASO" in van der Merwe, p. 103.

103. SASO, "Understanding SASO" in van der Merwe, p. 103.

104. SASO, "Understanding SASO" in van der Merwe, p. 103.

105. Arnold, p. 277.

106. Biko, p. 76.

107. Biko, p. 76.

108. Biko, p. 77.

109. Davis, pp. 12-14.

110. Davis, p. 14.

111. Davis, p. 14.

112. David Bosch, "Currents and Crosscurrents in South African Black Theology," Journal of Religion in Africa, 6, 1 (1974), p. 11.

113. See footnote 81 in Chapter 2.

114. Biko, p. 92.

115. Biko, p. 54. See also Louise Kretzschmar, The

Voice of Black Theology in South Africa (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1986), p. 61.

116. Biko, p. 59.

117. Biko, p. 94.

118. Hirson, p. 82. IDAMASA was founded as a Transkei institution in 1915. It went national in 1946. Its purpose was "to achieve a more effective propogation of the Gospel and create a forum through which Africans and Coloured clergymen could speak to topical ecclesiastical and political issues with a united vcice." At its 1951 conference, the president, J.H. Calata, said it was sheer hypocrisy to speak of Christian brothers among blacks and whites. See Elfriede Strassberger. Ecumenism in South Africa 1936-1960 (Johannesburg: SACC, 1974), pp. 97-98.

119. Denis Herbstein, White Man, We Want to Talk to You (London: Deutsch, 1978), p. 70.

120. Hirson, p. 81.

121. Hirson, pp. 85-86.

122. FEDSEM, established in 1961, was expropriated by the government for use by the adjacent Fort Hare College in 1974. The rector said the buildings could be rented by the Seminary for one year on condition that students and staff refrain from provocative statements and actions. See Ernie Regehr, Perceptions of Apartheid: The Churches and Political Change in South Africa (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1979), p. 93.

123. Regehr, p. 92.

124. Adams, where Lutuli had taught, was closed. Fort Hare and Lovedale had become government institutions of a vastly different character. Students had little meaningful contact with whites, so they tended to be suspicious of all whites. See de Gruchy, p. 150.

125. Andrew Prior, "Political Culture and Violence: A Case Study of the ANC," Politikon, 6, 2 (December, 1984), p. 13.

126. Biko, pp. 31-32.

127. Biko, p. 60.

128. Biko, pp. 31-32.

129. The SASO-9 were on trial for inculcating anti-white feelings and encouraging racial hositilities in order to prepare for a violent revolution. In the same way that the Freedom Charter was on trial during the Treason Trial of 1956-1961, so too were the ideas of Black Consciousness on trial.

130. Biko, p. 134.

131. Biko, p. 70, p. 95.

132. Arnold, p. 273.

133. Fatton, p. 100.

134. Theodore Jennings, "Steve Biko: Liberator and Martyr," Christian Century 94 (November 2, 1977), p. 998.

135. Woods, p. 71.

136. Gail Gerhart, Cited by Arnold, p. xxv.

137. Fatton, p. 117.

138. Thomas Ranuga, "Frantz Fanon and Black Consciousness in Azania," Phylon, 47, 3 (1986), p. 190.

139. Under the Act, the Churches could choose to continue their schools without government financial aid. Most chose not to.

140. Albert Lutuli in Regehr, p. 49.

141. A change in 1975 permitted students with a pass mark over 40% to enter secondary schools; previously the pass mark was 50%.

142. Hirson, p. 175.

143. Mokgethi Motlhabi. The Challenge to Apartheid: Toward a Moral National Resistance (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), p. 61.

144. Arnold, p. 102.

145. Fatton, p. 100.

146. This committee was renamed Soweto Students Representative Council (SSRC).

147. Shaun Johnson, "Youth in the Politics of Resistance" in Shaun Johnson, ed., South Africa: No Turning Back (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 102.

148. See Muriel Horrell, A Survey of Race Relations, 1976 (Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1977), pp. 51-82. See also Hirson, p. 182.

149. Peter Walshe, Church Versus State in South Africa: The Case of the Christian Institute (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1983), p. 207. There was an outbreak of violence of migrant workers against students, but it appears to have been incited by the government.

150. Fatton, p. 135. It has been estimated that over 12,000 young blacks have left South Africa, 75% of whom joined the ANC in exile. See Prior, p. 16.

151. Biko was the forty-sixth person detained under South Africa's security legislation to die in police custody.

152. James Leatt, Theo Kneifel, and Klaus Nurnberger, eds., Contending Ideologies in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 112.

153. It is known that SASO was able to keep in contact with Biko after he was banned in 1973. See Andrew Silk, "Understanding the Master: Robert Sobukwe's Legacy," The Nation, 226, 12 (1978), p. 369.

154. Randwedzi Nengwekhula, "Black Consciousness Movement of South Africa," Speech given to Assembly of IUEF in Geneva (November 22, 1976), p. 3. Cited by Fatton, p. 101.

155. Biko, p. 121.

156. Andrew Silk, p. 369. In an interview in 1975, Sobukwe said that he feared SASO may have become anti-white. But he still believed there was a need for a blacks-only organization. See "Robert Sobukwe of the PAC," Africa Report, 20, 3 (1975), p. 20.

157. De Gruchy, p. 172.

158. Hirson, p. 6.

159. Hirson, p. 270.

160. Hirson, p. 276.

161. Desmond Tutu in Deane Ferm, Third World Liberation Theologies: An Introductory Survey (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986), p. 65.

Chapter IV:
Bishop Tutu and the United Democratic Front

A major figure of protest in the 1980s is the Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu. Tutu was born in 1931 in the Transvaal to Methodist parents and was educated at St. Ansgar, a Swedish mission boarding school, and Madibane, an Anglican institution, before attending a teacher training college in Pretoria. For four years he taught school until the Bantu Education Act led him to resign in protest. After leaving the teaching profession, he received ordination training at St. Peter's Theological College in Johannesburg, a school run by the Fathers of the Community of the Ressurection for the training of Africans for the ministry.[1]

The Priesthood

He attributes his view of the interrelatedness of the spiritual and secular to his experiences at St. Peter's. It was here that he learned that it is "impossible for religion to be sealed off in a watertight compartment that has no connection with the hurly burly business of ordinary daily living."[2] For Tutu, spirituality had to be expressed in dealing with our neighbor, "whose keeper we must be..."[3]

However, he was still not active in political protest. During this time he met Sobukwe, and marveled

at how Sobukwe seemed untouched by bitterness and was endowed with both gentleness and steadfastness.[4] But, still, the Defiance Campaign of 1952 made little impact on him, living the somewhat isolated life of the student. By the time of the Freedom Charter in 1955, Tutu was a little closer to political events through his earlier association with Father Trevor Huddleston, an activist priest who had visited young Tutu weekly in the hospital when he was recovering from tuberculosis, and was now involved in the Congress of the People. Later, the Sharpeville Massacre, though shocking him, did not draw him into politics; he was busy finishing requirements for ordination in the Anglican Church.[5]

Tutu saw the Church as "a likely means of service" and viewed his transition from teaching to ministry as being "grabbed by God by the scruff of the neck" in order to serve Him.[6] He attributes his interest in the Church to the early example of the white Bishop Trevor Huddleston: "His speaking up for the oppressed showed me what a man of the Church can do."[7]

International Experience

Travel abroad also gave him a chance to meet other white individuals. Tutu won a scholarship to study at King's College in England from 1962 to 1966 and described the experience of living in a non-racial society as

"liberating" as Lutuli had described his sojourn in America. (Tutu admits that he used to seek out a policeman on his walks just to hear himself referred to as "sir" by a white man.[8]) At King's College and in the church he served in Great Britain, he had the opportunity to know personally many whites. He discovered, as Sobukwe and Biko had earlier, that he tended to defer to whites because he was conditioned to think more highly of whites than of himself. He explained that in South Africa: "You are brainwashed into an acquiescence in your oppression and exploitation. You come to believe what others have determined about you, filling you with self-disgust, self-contempt, and self-hatred, accepting of a negative self-image ... and you allow the white person to set your standards and provide your role models."[9] Tutu understood how a sense of inferiority manifested itself among blacks: they turn on one another and "treat each other as scum."[10] Although his diagnosis of the African condition was similar to the Africanists, both Sobukwe and Biko, his prescription was different. He did not withdraw from white association, but, rather, overcame his self-doubt as he learned to hold his own in inter-racial gatherings, in debates with white students, and encounters with parishioners.

He credits his time in England with forestalling

bitterness against whites, for he discovered his fellow students at King's College and his parishioners at St. Alban's "are ordinary human beings, some of them good human beings and some bad...."[11] Even "bad" whites, those acting like "bullies" were behaving that way because they failed tc see their infinite worth. "Whites amass material wealth to prove their worth. But [whites] have infinite worth because God created [them] in his image."[12]

He saw clearly that black liberation was the flip side of white liberation. Deep down in their hearts, he believed whites certainly know that the security of all of us depends upon a population "reasonably contented because they share mcre equitably in the good things of life."[13] He wrote, "At the present time we see our white fellow South Africans investing much of their resources to protect their so-called separate freedoms and privileges. They have little time left to enjoy them as they check the burglar proofing, the alarm system, the gun under the pillows, and the viciousness of the watch dog."[14] To a group of white university students, he suggested that they too suffered from apartheid. He pointed out that they couldn't choose freely their neighbors or their spouses. Nor could they participate in open discussions because certain topics

are considered subversive by the government. He concluded, "You will never be free until we blacks are free."[15]

Although Tutu believed whites were enslaved by their sinfulness, he did not consider them irredeemable "devils." The "good news" of the gospel for the white sinner was forgiveness. Just as many white Christians felt that Lutuli cared about them, certainly many whites who knew Tutu felt the same. He prayed for them -- for President Botha, for jailers, and police -- "because they are God's children too," he explained.[16] He sympathizes with whites, realizing it would be difficult to give up so much privilege, admitting he too would need "a lot of grace" to do it if he were in their position.[17]

Contact With Black Consciousness

Tutu returned from England to take a position at his alma mater, St. Peter's, which in the intervening years had moved from Johannesburg to Alice, and had become part of the Federal Theological Seminary (FEDSEM).[18] He arrived on campus at the time that Black Theology was percolating there.[19] During this time, he was also the chaplain at the government-controlled black university, Fort Hare, where the ideas of Black Consciousness were surfacing. He was in total sympathy with the young students' aims, but his non-racial attitude was too

firmly entrenched after four years in England for him to support them totally, for he was at odds with their racially exclusive approach and militant tone. Not surpisingly, the students at Fort Hare and FEDSEM found his views both too moderate and overly optimistic of whites' willingness to change.

Later, while Dean of Johannesburg, he was encouraged by Father Aelred Stubbs, his earlier teacher, to meet with the young activists centered around Biko. Since Biko was in detention at the time, he met with others in the group, and, again, was in broad agreement with their aims. By the time of the Soweto Uprising in 1976, as Dean of Johannesburg, he was thrust into politics, talking to the parents of children in Soweto and criticizing his own congregation for a less than whole-hearted response: "We have been really shattered by the deafening silence from the white community. You will say, what could you do? And all I would say to you is, what would you have done had they been white children? And that is all we would have wanted you to have done."[20]

Tutu, unable to meet Biko personally, nevertheless was invited to speak at his funeral in recognition of his support for the objectives of the Black Consciousness Movement.[21] Tutu said that God had called Biko to found the Black Consciousness Movement by

which God "sought to awaken in the black person a sense of his intrinsic value and worth as child of God...."[22] He praised Biko for encouraging "blacks to glorify and praise God that he had created them black."[23] In his oration, he emphasized what he considered his point of agreement with Biko: "Steve saw, more than most of us, how injustice and oppression can dehumanize and make us all, black and white, victim and perpetrator alike, less than God intended us to be."[24] However, this compassion for whites is more properly what Tutu shared with Lutuli, not Biko, who was on record as hating whites.

Despite his disappointment with his parishioners' lack of response to Soweto, in general Tutu was proud of St. Mary's Cathedral Parish. A multi-racial congregation, the church was a microcosm of what the future South Africa could be, Tutu believed. He described officiating at the Eucharist with a multiracial crowd, a mixed team of clergy, and an integrated choir, servers, and sidesmen in "apartheid-mad South Africa" and "then tears sometimes streamed down my cheeks, tears of joy that ... Jesus Christ had broken down the walls of partition and here were the first fruits of the eschatological community right in front of my eyes."[25] Just as Lutuli believed that the oneness in Christ actualized in the Congregationalist Church could be a

prototype of a future South Africa, so too did Tutu see that exemplified in the Anglican church.

South African Council of Churches

Following his tenure as Dean of Johannesburg, Tutu held the positions of Bishop of Lesotho, Bishop of Johannesburg, and most recently Archbishop of Cape Town. But it is for his work with the South African Council of Churches (SACC),[26] the umbrella group of churches critical of the government's race policies, that Tutu has become especially famous. From 1978 to 1984 Tutu held the position of General-Secretary, and it was under his leadership that SACC developed into an important vehicle of black protest. He instituted two new programs -- the Dependents Conference, which serves banned, detained, and imprisoned persons and their families, and the Asingeni Fund, which provides financial assistance for funerals (which themselves have become political events) and legal aid.

Underpinning the efforts of the SACC is a theology of opposition to apartheid articulated by Tutu. His disavowal of apartheid rests on twin doctrines: man as the image of God, and reconciliation through Christ's redemption. Tutu regarded man's creation in the image of God as "man's most important attribute. The Bible at this point makes no reference to racial, ethnic or

biological characteristics...."[27] But apartheid says some are more like God than others. "Skin colour and race become salvation principles, since in many cases they determine which people can participate in which services -- who are believed to be of saving significance."[28] In short, apartheid "can make a child of God doubt that he is a child of God."[29]

Secondly, apartheid denies the central act of reconciliation which the New Testament declares was achieved by God in His Son, Jesus Christ. For Tutu, the heart of the Christian message is that Christ's work on the cross has restored human brotherhood which sin had destroyed. Whereas the Bible says God's intention for humankind is harmony, peace, justice, wholeness, and fellowship, "apartheid says that human beings fundamentally are created for separation, disunity, and alienation."[30] Apartheid says that Christ has not in fact broken down the dividing wall of partition that used to divide Jew from Gentile, rich from poor, slave from free. Apartheid denies the unity of the family of God. But for Tutu, there is neither Black, White, Indian, or Colored, but a brother, a sister -- one family, God's family.

Tutu also condemns apartheid for the suffering it causes its victims. He believes that God is concerned

with the whole man, not just his spirit, and that the gospel accordingly preaches total liberation. Responding to the Marxist charge that religion is an opiate of the people, Tutu writes that Christianity never used religion that way, promising them pie in the sky when you die. Rather, God "knew that people want their pie here and now, and not in some future tomorrow...."[31] The prophets, too, "condemned, as worthless religiosity, a concern with offering God worship when we were unmindful of the socio-political implications of our religion."[32] He writes, "If we are to say that religion cannot be concerned with politics then we are really saying that there is a substantial part of human life in which God's writ does not run."[33]

God's interest in the whole man translates into His desire to secure justice for the oppressed:

> We must proclaim that in a country of injustice and oppression, where Blacks receive an inferior education, are forced to live in matchbox houses, cannot move freely from place to place, and have to leave their wives and families behind them when they want to work in town -- we must declare that this is God's world. He is on the side of the oppressed, of the poor, of the despised ones. We must say these things even if they make us suffer. It is not politics. It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ the liberator who will set us free.[34]

If God Be For Us

In setting His children free, God has chosen "to enlist us in His service as co-workers with

Himself...."[35] Therefore, the Church cannot be neutral:

> If certain laws are not in line with the imperatives of the Gospel then the Christian must agitate for their repeal by all peaceful means. Christianity can never be a merely personal matter. It has public consequences and we must make public choices. Many people think Christians should be neutral, or that the Church must be neutral. But in a situation of injustice and oppression such as we have in South Africa, not to choose to oppose, is in fact to have chosen to side with the powerful, with the exploiter, with the oppressor.[36]

The Church, according to Tutu, must sustain the hope of a people tempted to grow despondent by taking the side of the oppressed. If it does not do this, then when liberation does come, the church will be consigned to the outer darkness for having retarded the liberation struggle.[37]

Tutu believed that liberation was inevitable:

> Injustice and evil and oppression will not last forever. They have been overcome by God in the cross of Jesus Christ our Lord. As we protest the evil ... we must do so knowing that victory is ours already. The authorities will ultimately fail because what they're doing is evil and against God's law.[38]

He had hope in the future because "Our cause is just ... Our freedom is an inalienable right bestowed on us by God."[39] The government, he wrote, will end up as "mere marks on the pages of history, part of its flotsam and jetsam."[40] Even when the situation looks dismal, Tutu urges faith because "He is a God of surprises..."[41] His sense of being held up and buoyed by prayers of

Christians throughout the world also encouraged him: "What hope has the government got of defeating us when we are being prayed for every day in Arizona?" he queried.[42] His Christian faith is a source of courage, too. The worst that can happen he often says is for them to kill us, but "death," he insists, "is not the worst thing that can happen to a Christian."[43] Receiving the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 was a source of hope, a boost to morale, "Hey, we're winning!" Tutu exclaimed.[44]

Tutu's assurance of ultimate victory derives from the parallels between South African blacks and the Israelite slaves in the Exodus story. He points out that at times it must have seemed to the slaves that God did not care but in time they did reach the Promised Land:

> This God did not just talk - he acted. He showed himself to be a doing God. Perhaps we might add another point - He takes sides. He is not a neutral God. He took the side of the slaves, the oppressed, the victims. He is still the same even today, he sides with the poor, the hungry, the oppressed, the victims of injustice.[45]

God later confirmed his preferential option for the oppressed by sending Hebrew prophets to denounce injustices perpetrated by the powerful against the powerless -- the widows and orphans.[46] He again showed his siding with the poor in his coming to earth as one of the oppressed, a man acquainted with sorrows. Tutu places great store in the fact that in becoming human in

Christ, God was not born into sumptuous surroundings but in a stable. God chose to empty the Godhead of divine glory to take on the form of a servant. In doing so, God chose to identify with and to share human suffering and pain. Like black South Africans, Tutu points out, Jesus was numbered among those rejected by society. He identified in the manner of his birth, life, and death with the marginalised. He deliberately chose as his friends not the mighty, the Bothas, but the "scum of society."[47]

While some Black Theology proponents associated with Biko believed blacks were morally superior to whites, Tutu was quick to denounce this notion. He wrote that God is on the side of the oppressed not because they are better or more deserving than their oppressors, but simply because they were oppressed. We say that God is on our side, wrote Tutu, "not as some jingoistic nationalist deity who says 'my people right or wrong' but as one who saves and yet ultimately judges those whom he saves."[48]

One gets the impression that Biko and the black theologians supporting his movement felt that suffering had made blacks more moral than whites, and hence the political order following black majority rule would be a Golden Age of justice and compassion. Tutu warns against

this notion:

> [We] have too much evidence that the removal of one oppressor means the replacement by another; yesterday's victim quite rapidly becomes today's dictator. [We] know only too well the recalcitrance of human nature and so accept the traditional doctrines of the fall and original sin....[49]

Tutu has shown remarkable restraint in resisting the temptation to preach a liberation which excludes whites and fails to criticize blacks. In this respect, Tutu's thinking is closer to the Christianity proclaimed by Lutuli than that of Biko.

Multiracial Moderation

Tutu states that he is determined to work alongside all concerned individuals -- black and white -- for a non-racial democratic society. This includes the Communists in South Africa. Though he rejects Communism as too materialistic and atheistic to satisfy the deep spiritual aspirations of Africans, like Lutuli he is grateful for any assistance from whatever source. He wrote, "I hate Communism with every fibre of my body, as I believe most blacks do -- but when you are in a danger and a hand is stretched out to help you, you do not ask the pedigree of its owner."[50] He does not include among those with whom he will work the homeland leaders, such as Chief Gatsha Butelezi of Kwa-Zulu. Like Biko, he denounces them as "corrupt men looking after their own interests, lining their pockets ... [and] lacking

integrity."[51]

Like Lutuli, Tutu advocates non-violent methods in the pursuance of multiracialism. Because our cause is just, he writes, "we cannot afford to use methods of which we will be ashamed when we look back..."[52] He supports the aims of the exiled ANC, whom he makes a point to visit when he is overseas, but has condemned their methods:

> We as a Council deplore all forms of violence, and have said so time without number. We deplore structural and legalized violence that maintains an unjust socio-political dispensation, and the violence of those who would overthrow the state.[53]

But he knows that many ANC members, such as Nelson Mandela, are Christians who took up arms when peaceful methods failed. In fact, in recent years, his criticism of the ANC's methods have been muted. He explains that although he will never tell someone to pick up a gun, he will "pray for the man who picks up the gun, pray that he will be less cruel than he might otherwise have been."[54]

He has consistently warned that oppressed people will become desperate, and desperate people will use desperate methods. He clarified his position in an interview:

> I am a man of peace, but not a pacifist. Clearly, the Christian Church is not entirely pacifist -- I need only refer to the position of Western Christendom during the struggle against Nazism. The idea of a 'just war' is very much alive. How could I commend nonviolence to Blacks who know that

> resistance movements in Europe were praised to the skies, and who hear similar movements condemned because they are black?[55]

While Tutu is uncomfortable with dependence on violence, he recognizes that "those of us who still speak 'peace' and 'reconciliation' belong to a rapidly diminishing minority"[56] and writes that "it is a miracle of God's grace that blacks can still say they are committed to a ministry of justice and reconciliation and that they want to avert a bloodbath."[57]

The New Constitution

On May 5, 1983 President Botha introduced to Parliament the new constitution bill which extended the franchise to Indians and Coloureds. The government stated that blacks were not given a chamber because they already had their own constitutional path to follow in the homelands and in black local government structures. The new framework mandated three separate chambers of Parliament for Coloureds, Indians, and Whites, whose members would be selected on separate voters rolls in separate elections. There would be 178 seats in the White House of Assembly, eighty-five in the Coloured House of Representatives and forty-five in the Indian House of Delegates. Coloureds and Indians would have control over matters that pertain to them alone, such as education and housing, with the president deciding which

issues properly were there "own" matters and which were of "general" concern.

Issues of general concern would be voted on in the three chambers, and differences in the bills between the three chambers would be hammered out by the President's Council, consisting of sixty members, twenty elected in the white chamber, ten in the coloured chamber, and five in the Indian chamber. Twenty-five would be appointed proportionately by the President from opposition members in the three chambers. The decision of the President's Council would be final.[58]

Tutu was vociferous in his rejection of the proposal. He saw it as a refinement rather than a refutation of apartheid. Tutu accused it of co-opting a segment of the oppressed as junior partners in order to add their numbers to the white oppressors. He told a meeting of the Natal Indian Congress that Indians and Coloureds were being included in the system because whites couldn't defend the system alone any longer. Whites were finding total repression too costly internally and internationally (in terms of legitimacy.) If they accepted the Tricameral Parliament, Africans would regard them as traitors in the liberation struggle, he warned.[59]

Tutu also issued a statement from the SACC noting

that since the bill excluded 73% of the population from sharing political power, and it effectively ensured whites would get their parliamentary majority (with four whites to every two Colcureds and one Indian in the President's Council), fundamental change would be blocked. He urged SACC's member churches to reject the new constitution and to urge their parishioners to boycott the upcoming elections to the two new chambers.[60]

The United Democratic Front

The United Democratic Front was inaugurated in Cape Town on August 20, 1983 as an umbrella group of 600-700 student, community, religious, professional, and trade union organizations to oppose the new constitution. Although Tutu was a patron of the United Democratic Front, he could not be present at its Cape Town launch, and so Dr. Allan Boesak, a minister in the Coloured Dutch Reformed Church[61] gave the keynote address. Boesak appealed for unity of all opponents of apartheid, including whites, for the struggle could not be "by one's skin color but rather by one's commitment to justice, peace, and human liberation."[62] He spoke of apartheid as a "thoroughly evil system, and, as such, it [could] not be modified, modernized or streamlined. It [had] to be eradicated irrevocably."[63]

The highlights of Boesak's speech were adopted in

the "UDF Declaration" which stressed the goal of a single, non-racial South Africa free of bantustans and "groups areas" in which all individuals would have the vote. The UDF adopted the slogan, "Apartheid Divides -- UDF Unites."[64] Just as the ANC associated with white groups through the Congress Alliance, the UDF also permits affiliation of white organizations in the belief that "all the oppressed sections of the community had an over-riding interest in the destruction of apartheid."[65] The UDF believes that the stategy of "closing ranks" had achieved its purpose of conscientisation and that now is the time for all enemies of apartheid -- black and white -- to join forces. Committed to multi-racialism, the UDF also endorses the ANC's Freedom Charter as its guiding document.

From the launching of the UDF until the first elections under the new constitution in 1984, campaigns were instigated throughout the country to discredit the upcoming elections under the banner of "One Million Signatures." The UDF's boycott of the elections was wildly successful: only 17.5% of eligible Coloureds and 15.5% of Indians participated.[66]

At the same time that the multiracial UDF was inaugurated, the National Forum (NF) was also being formed as an umbrella group whose all-black affiliates

include the Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO),[67] ex-PAC members, and Black Consciousness groups. In the 1980s we witness the histcrical competition between the two approaches fought out between the earlier organizations. Meredith writes, "The nationalist movement was still affected by the same split which had prevailed since the 1940s, between the ANC/Charterist camp and the Africanist/black consciousness camp."[68] The groups affiliated with the National Forum accept no part for whites in the struggle against apartheid but allow for their inclusion in a post-apartheid society. Like the PAC and BCM before them, the NF excludes whites because "however well-intentioned [whites] cannot identify with the class interests of the oppressed Black Masses."[69]

The political document of the National Forum, the "Manifesto of the People of Azania," calls for the black working class to lead the struggle toward a "democratic antiracist and socialist Azania."[70] The land must be "wholly owned and controlled by the Azanian people."[71] The National Forum is critical of thw UDF's support of the Freedom Charter, because it preserves racial groups and recognizes minority rights. But, despite their different tactics, the NF and the UDF have the same goal: a non-racial society based on the principle of one

man-one vote within a socialist economic framework.[72]

Although Tutu was an executive member of the NF Committee, helping to prepare for its inaugural in 1983, his dual commitment to it and the UDF could not be maintained.[73] His profound belief in multiracialism, which earlier kept him from wholeheartedly embracing Biko and his movement, likewise kept him from close contact with the NF. But his initial interest shows, as Sparks puts it, a "streak of militancy within moderation."[74]

Indeed, a statement in a letter to Prime Minister John Vorster in 1976 clearly shows an amalgam of the inclusive liberalism of Lutuli and the exclusive Africanism of Biko: "Blacks are grateful for all that has been done for them, but now they claim an inalienable right to do things for themselves, in cooperation with their fellow South Africans of all races.[75] Likewise, he has adopted the Black Theology approach associated with the Africanist inspired Black Consciousness Movement, but employs it differently than Biko to stress the unity of the family of God. Perhaps Tutu, who admits to abhoring capitalism, based as it is on the survival of the fittest and on man's lower instincts,[76] admired AZAPO's forceful stand against capitalism, and so was drawn to the National Forum. What Tutu's equivocation may represent is a cross-fertilisation of ideas between the two

approaches.

In any event, multiracialism has re-emerged and replaced Africanism as the dominant element in black politics. Johnson notes that there was a movement away from Black Consciousness ideology to a commitment to the Charterist philosophy around 1980, and that by mid-1987 the dominance of the Charterist position was complete. To be sure, several ex-BC members have found a political home in the UDF.[77] Terror Lekota, a leading figure in the BCM, has become active in the UDF, which he attributes to the influence of Mandela upon him while imprisoned with the ANC leader on Robben Island.[78] One explanation of the popularity of the multiracial UDF is that the ANC's successful military activities since 1979 have given it (and its policies) certain prestige that legitimates the internal organization that most closely reflects its ideology.

Tutu is quick to state that the UDF does not purport to be a substitute for the ANC. It was conceived as a transitional front, not a political party, and certainly not as a rival but as a supplement to the exiled ANC.[79] Its acceptance of former ANC members within its ranks means, writes McKean, that the "relationship between the UDF and the ANC ... goes well beyond symbolism and similarities."[80]

But, if it served as the internal wing of the then exiled ANC, it nevertheless lacked the experienced political leadership of the ANC. Tutu is clear on that point. He says that Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo, and Walter Sisulu of the ANC are the true political leaders of black South Africans, not clerics like himself and Boesak.[81] He is primarily a priest who happens to see the connection between "Our Father in heaven" and "our brothers on earth." With the mass bannings in 1977, the government effectively decimated African political leadership, and Tutu stepped in to fill the void. He points out that his meetings with De Klerk were "talks about talks" and that the real negotiations for a new political settlement would have to be between the government and the ANC leaders. He sees himself not as a politician but as a prophet, a modern day Jeremiah, speaking "under the influence of God's hand."[82] Likewise, DuBoulay sees him as a Moses figure, but not in the sense of doing the leading, whih he defers to the ANC, but in sharing the vision.[83]

The UDF did not cease to exist after the Coloured and Indian elections. Rather, the campaigns "opened a new chapter of resistance,"[84] and the UDF initiated the longest sustained period of agitation in the history of black resistance since 1960.[85] The UDF has become

involved in all kinds of political demonstrations -- work stay-aways, rent, consumer, and bus boycotts, anti-sports campaigns, and campaigns for the unbanning of the ANC. The flurry of activity is reminiscent of the ANC's activities in the 1950s, and like the ANC, the UDF has come under a wide array of security provisions including preventive detentions of key figures, treason charges against leaders, and bans on meetings and key affiliates.[85]

Violence/Non-Violence Debate

Like the BCM organizations of the 1970s, the UDF realized that to operate above ground it had no other option but to commit itself publicly to nonviolence. However, despite its non-violent stance, the UDF has found Tutu at times too moderate and has stated its doubts especially about Tutu's doctrine of reconciliation. UDF members feel that changes have to be made to political structures before reconciliation can take place.

But Tutu, like Lutuli before him, is convinced that the Gospel can change the hearts of white Christians, and that black South Africans must continually try to persuade whites. DuBoulay explains that his instincts are to negotiate rather than to confront, to reconcile rather than to attack.[86] Although aware that militant

blacks would see him as politically naive, Tutu persisted in this view and attempted to meet with Botha time and time again. He has remarked that Moses went to see Pharoah not once but several times and whether or not Botha had hardened his heart, he would try again.[87] He explains, "Whether I like it or not, Mr. P.W. Botha and I are brothers, members of the same family. I cannot write him off. I cannot give up on him because God, our common Father, does not give up on anyone."[88]

Indeed, the black theology espoused by Tutu has come under increasing attack from radical township youths. The Washington Post suggests that the "relative moderation and restraining influence" of Tutu is "in danger of being swamped by the rising tide of anger in the townships."[89] A group of mainly black theologians, following the State of Emergency in 1985, published the Kairos Document, which expresses the sentiments of the young township militants and their growing differences with Tutu.

The Kairos Document states that it is wrong for the established churches to preach "reconciliation" in the present circumstances of South Africa. There can be no reconciliation between justice and injustice, good and evil. To be reconciled to the intolerable crimes committed against black South Africans is nothing short

of sinful. It is to become accomplices in our own oppression.[90]

For the Kariros Document theologians, reconciliation and negotiation can only follow white repentance and a clear commitment to fundamental change. But true repentance on the part of the government is belied by the state of emergency, military repression in the townships, and jailing of political opponents. Until some evidence of true repentance, negotiation is a waste of time; premature negotiation only prolongs African bondage.[91]

Rather than preach negotiation and reconciliation, it advises the Church to urge confrontation until the state indicates it is willing to undergo fundamental change. Instead of trying to convince those in power to change, the churches should commit themselves to the struggle of the oppressed against unjust structures.

The Kairos Document attacks the multiracial churches for pleading with those in power to act justly. Justice that is determined from above, by the oppressor, necessarily is a justice of reformism -- a justice of concessions that leaves untouched the basic structural injustice of apartheid.[92] What is required instead is church support for those who are below, the oppressed, in their efforts to rid the country of unjust structures. The Church should not only pray for a change of

government.[93]

The Kairos Document, while not explicitly supporting violence in the struggle for liberation, is very critical of the way non-violence has been absolutized by the churches. "Non-violence has been made into an absolute principle without regard for who is using it, which side they are on or what purpose they have in mind."[94] Violence becomes associated in peoples' minds with the actions of those seeking to overthrow unjust structures, but not with the violence of the structures themselves, or the violence used by the state to maintain the structures.[95]

Tacitly, the Kairos Document legitimizes the use of violence. It supports the notion of "just revolution" which is part of the Christian tradition of "just war",[96] stressing the principles of "last resort" and "lesser of two evils". Perhaps the Kairos Document inadequately deals with the principle of "probability of success". It can be argued, as Inkatha's Buthelezi has, that the state's power is such that the probability of a successful revolution is minimal.[97] Clearly, the Kairos Document is not a directive to revolution but an analysis of the possibilities open to black South Africans. It argues that black South Africans have a right to defend

themselves against the violence of the state, because the government is tyrannical, "an enemy of the common good" that relies on terrorism to maintain its power.[98]

Although the state is tyrranical, the document makes clear that is no excuse for hatred, since the Bible calls us to love our enemies. But to love does not mean to sit back and wait for our enemies to see the light. The present crisis is proof of the ineffectiveness of "years and years of Christian moralising about the need for love."[99] Sometimes the most loving thing we can do for the both the oppressed and our enemies, the oppressors, is "to eliminate oppression, remove the tyrants from power, and establish a just government for the common good of all the people."[100]

The acceptance of violence to counter the violence of the state relies on a radical interpretation of Christianity. Perhaps only a radical gospel is sufficient for the times, if resistance is not to be severed totally from its religious roots. In fact, the radical message of the Kairos Document has met with great response among the township youth. Mayson describes how instead of asking, "Is it in the Bible?" the youth ask, "Is it in the Kairos Document?"[101] Conversely, a day of prayer to end violence that was called for by Tutu and other moderate church leaders on July 16, 1985, the ninth

anniversary of the Soweto Uprising, was received unenthusiastically by blacks. In the call for prayer, the Church's efforts, next to the Kairos Document's prescriptions, sound remarkably timid:

> We have prayed for our own rulers, as is demanded of us in the Scriptures. We have entered into consultation with them as is required by our faith. We have taken the reluctant and drastic step of declaring apartheid to be contrary to the declared will of God, and ... have declared it... a heresy. We now pray that God will replace the present structures of oppression with ones that are just, and remove from power those who persist in defyng his laws, installing in their place leaders who will govern with justice and mercy.[102]

The feeling that the church is too timorous is voiced not only by township youths and the black theologians associated with the Kairos Document, but increasingly by the once moderate South African Council of Churches. The Christian Science Monitor reported in July 1987 that the SACC "inched a step closer toward accepting the use of violence to overthrow the current system."[103] In its annual meeting, the SACC by a large majority adopted for urgent reaction from its member churches a statement drawn up earlier that year by the exiled ANC. "The statement," writes the Monitor, "while not directly associating the SACC with political violence, would in effect accept the use of violence by the ANC."[104] The action reflects perhaps the impact of the Kairos Document on the Council.

Tutu himself, though not a signatory, has admitted he is in "general agreement" with the Kairos Document and just wishes the tone were not so strident.[105] Like Lutuli, he prefers to employ moderate language perhaps in order to allay white fears and further repression. For instance, he is careful to say he is for "majority" rule not "black rule" and that he is for "power sharing", not "one man-one vote."

Following the publication of the Kairos Document, Tutu's view of reconciliation underwent some modification. Reconciliation, Tutu now writes, does not rule out confrontation. Just as there can be no cheap grace for the Christian, neither can there be cheap reconciliation. That reconciliation is costly is demonstrated by our reconciliation with God which cost God the life of Jesus.[106]

Tutu has said he fears "time may be running out for a peaceful resolution" and that he could envisage a time in which he would endorse violence as the only way of ensuring a just society.[107] He increasingly expresses sympathy with those who call for a violent response against a violent regime. He told an audience, "There may be a time when we have to take up arms and defend ourselves."[108] In June 1986, to a crowd in Toronto, he said that if sanctions failed: "The Church would have no

alternative but to say it would be justifiable to use violence and force to overthrow an unjust regime."[109] For Tutu, violence may be the lesser of two evils, the greater evil being oppression. But, he would like to give the international community "yet another chance" through economic sanctions and disinvestment to bring about change "by the least violent means possible."[110]

Notes

1. Tutu was baptized a Methodist, later became a member of the AME Church, and finally in 1943 became an Anglican. The changes did not reflect changing religious beliefs but rather changes in circumstances. His parents would switch denominations depending upon which church-sponsored school their children were attending or where Tutu's father would be teaching.

2. Shirley DuBoulay, Voice of the Voiceless (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), p. 48.

3. DuBoulay, p. 48.

4. DuBoulay, p. 38.

6. DuBoullay, p. 54.

7. Marjorie Hope and James Young, The South African Churches in a Revolutionary Situation (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1981), p. 112.

8. Charles Moritz, ed. Current Biography Yearbook 1985 (New York: The H. H. Wilson Co., 1986), p. 419.

8. Denis Wepman, Desmond Tutu (New York: Franklin Watts, 1989), p. 45.

9. DuBoulay, p. 22.

10. Desmond Tutu, Hope and Sufering (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), p. 52.

11. DuBoulay, p. 60.

12. DuBoulay, p. 140.

13. Desmond Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness: The Struggle for Justice in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1982), p. 87.

14. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 87.

15. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 43.

16. DuBoulay, p. 140.

17. DuBoulay, p. 163.

18. The buildings and property of FEDSAM were confiscated by the government in 1974.

19. Tutu was later exposed to South American Liberation Theology as an employee with the World Council of Churches' Theological Education Fund.

20. DuBoulay, pp. 106-107.

21. Tutu also spoke at Sobukwe's funeral six months after Biko's funeral, calling him a "holy man, devoted to Jesus Christ, his Lord and Master." See Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 66.

22. Kortright Davis, "Racism and God: Steve Biko in Context," AME Zion Quarterly Review, 97, 4 (January 1986), p. 17.

23. Davis, p. 17.

24. DuBoulay, p. 118.

25. DuBoulay, p. 98.

26. SACC consists of twenty member churches, and seven Christian organizations that have observer status. Among the largest members are the mainline Protestant churches -- Presbyterian, Methodist, Anglican, and Congregationalist. Member churches of SACC have 12-15 million adherents, 80% of whom are black. Following the banning of the Christian Institute in 1977, the more moderate SACC under Tutu's direction became both Africanized (with more Africans taking over positions of responsibility) and radicalized. Some churchmen accuse it of being a "black power base." See David Thomas, Councils in the Ecumenical Movement in South Africa (Johannesburg: SACC, 1979), p. 63.

27. Desmond Tutu, "Christianity and Apartheid," in John W. de Gruchy and Charles Villa-Vicencio, eds., Apartheid is a Heresy (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1983), p. 40.

28. Tutu, "Christianity and Apartheid", in de Gruchy and Villa-Vicencio, p. 45.

29. Tutu, "Christianity and Apartheid," in de Gruchy and Villa-Vicencio, p. 46.

30. Tutu, "Christianity and Apartheid," in de Gruchy and Villa-Vicencio, pp. 41-42.

31. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, pp. 28

32. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 29.

33. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 170.

34. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, pp. 31-32.

35. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 60.

36. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 34.

37. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 87.

38. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 42.

39. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 89.

40. DuBoulay, p. 179.

41. Tutu, Cited by Bonganjalo Goba, "A Theological Tribute to Archbishop Tutu," in Buti Tlhagale and Itumeleng Mosala, eds. Hammering Swords into Ploughshares: Essays in Honour of Archbishop Mpilo Desmond Tutu (Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1986), p. 63.

42. DuBoulay, p. 140.

43. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 18.

44. DuBoulay, p. 201.

45. DuBoulay, p. 86.

46. Tutu, Cited by Simon Maimela, "Archbishop Desmond Mpilo Tutu, A Revolutionary Political Priest or Man of Peace?" in Tlhagale and Mosala, p. 48.

47. "General Secretary's Report, 1984", p. 5. Cited by Maimela, "Archbishop Desmond Mpilo Tutu, A Revolutionary Political Priest or Man of Peace?" in Tlhagale and Mosala, p. 47.

48. DuBoulay, p. 86.

49. Tutu, "The Theology of Liberation in Africa" in Kofi Appiah-Kubi and Sergio Torres, eds. African Theology

En Route: Pan-Africanist Conference of Third World Theology, Accra, 1977 (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979), p. 167.

50. DuBoulay, p. 237.

51. DuBoulay, p. 168.

52. Naomi Tutu, ed., The Words of Desmond Tutu (New York: Newmarket Press, 1989), p. 48.

53. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 181.

54. Naomi Tutu, p. 51.

55. Hope and Young, p. 111.

56. Desmond Tutu, "Black South African Perspectives and the Reagan Administration," TransAfrica Forum, 1, 1 (Summer, 1982), p. 15.

57. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 99.

58. See Muriel Horrell, A Survey of Race Relations, 1983 (Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1984), pp. 71-77. As "consolation," the Koornhoff bills were introduced, the most controversial of which is the Black Local Authorities bill which gives urban blacks some control over local affairs. It would have the effect of dividing townspeople from the migrant laborers and enforcing stricter pass laws on those in bantustans.

59. DuBoulay, p. 165.

60. DuBoulay, pp. 165-166. 66% of whites voting on the referendum for the new constitution were in favor of it.

61. Boesak is a pastor in the Colcured Nederduitse Gereformeerde Sendingker (NGK) and past president of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches.

62. Mokgethi Motlhabi, Challenge to Apartheid: Toward a Moral National Resistance (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), p. 84.

63. Motlhabi, pp. 89-90.

64. Motlhabi, p. 93.

65. Howard Barrel, "The UDF and the NF: Their

Emergence, Composition, and Trends," South African Review, 2 (1984), p. 8.

66. Jo-Anne Collinge, "The UDF," South African Review, 3 (1986), p. 253. The official results were 30% for Coloureds and 20% for Indians.

67. AZAPO, founded in 1978, is the leading Black Consciousness organization. It sees the problem as racial capitalism which benefits the minority of whites, and their allies, the white workers and the reactionary section of the black working class.

68. Martin Meredith, "The Black Opposition," in Jesmond Blumenfeld, ed., South Africa in Crisis (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp. 79-80.

69. Motlhabi, p. 83.

70. Francis Meli, South Africa Belongs to Us: A History of the ANC (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 198.

71. See Tom Lodge, "The UDF: Leadership and Ideology" in John Brewer, Can South Africa Survive: Five Minutes to Midnight (London: Macmillan, 1989), p. 214.

72. The economic policies they advance are reminiscent of Biko's "communalism". All the resistance movements reflect tinges of socialism.

73. One explanation for Tutu's distancing himself from the NF is that AZAPO boycotted the visit of Senator Edward Kennedy, whom Tutu had invited to South Africa. Two explanations for the boycott are usually advanced: (1.) That Kennedy also planned to meet with Gatsha Butelezi and (2.) That Kennedy represented an imperialist country that helps to buttress apartheid. In any event, Tutu was disturbed by the boycott.

74. DuBoulay, p. 198.

75. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 31.

76. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 100 and p. 112.

77. Johnson, "Youth in the Politics of Resistance," in Johnson, p. 140.

78. John Brewer, "Internal Black Protest" in Brewer, p. 193.

79. William Claiborne, "DeKlerk, Tutu Group to Meet," The Washington Post (October 7, 1989), p. A25.

80. David McKean, "The UDF and the Anti-Apartheid Struggle," TransAfrica Forum, 4, 1 (Fall, 1986), p. 39.

81. DuBoulay, p. 220.

82. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 22.

83. DuBoulay, p. 264.

84. Meli, p. 95.

85. In 1985, the UDF became the third South African organization to be declared an "affected organization" which meant it could not receive funds from abroad. CI and NUSAS are the other two organizations that had been declared affected.

86. DuBoulay, p. 168.

87. DuBoulay, p. 168.

88. Tutu, "Spirituality: Christian and African" in John de Gruchy and Charles Villa-Vicencio, eds., Resistance and Hope: South African Essays in Honour of Beyers Naude (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), p. 163.

89. Allister Sparks, "South African Protagonists Invoke Christianity," The Washington Post (October 2, 1985), p. A21.

90. The Kairos Document: The Challenge to the Churches (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 10.

91. The Kairos Document, p. 11.

92. The Kairos Document, p. 11.

93. The Kairos Document, p. 12.

94. The Kairos Document, p. 13.

95. The Kairos Document, p. 13.

96. The recognized criteria of just war are:
(1.) All other possibilities of non-violent change have been exhausted.
(2.) The cause must be just.
(3.) The methods used must involve no unnecessary or excessive violence.
(4.) There must be reasonable prospect that the ends will be attained.

97. John Brewer, "Inkatha in South African Politics," in Johnson, pp. 365-366.

98. The Kairos Document. p. 24.

99. The Kairos Document, p. 12.

100. The Kairos Document, pp. 24-25.

101. Cedric Mayson, "Christianity and Revolution," Sechaba (October, 1987), p. 14.

102. Tutu, Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 52 (September, 1985), p. 58. Cited by John de Gruchy, "The Church and the Struggle for South Africa," in Tlhagale and Mosala, pp. 196-197.

103. Ned Temko, "Shift to left by Key South African church council taken as sign that change is too slow coming," The Christian Science Monitor (July 7, 1987), p. 1.

104. Temko, p. 1.

105. Margaret Novicki, Interview with Bishop Tutu, Africa Report, 31, 2 (March/April, 1986), p. 53.

106. Tutu, Hope and Suffering, p. 38.

107. Temko, p. 32.

108. DuBoulay, p. 244.

109. Duboulay, p. 244.

110. Novicki, p. 54.

Conclusion

There have been other ideclogical influences besides Christianity on African nationalism -- Liberalism, Garveyism, Pan Africanism, and Ccmmunism -- to name but a few. Christianity did not compete with these philosophical systems; African leaders borrowed from various secular ideologies what was compatible with their faith and personal predisposition and what made sense in the context of the prevailing conditions in South Africa.

Lutuli especially was influenced by Liberalism. Gradualism, optimism, and faith in constitutional methods -- all hallmarks of the Liberal tradition -- held sway over Lutuli's thinking and that of the early ANC. The first half of the twentieth century, writes Walshe, was devoted to attempting to "prise open the doors of discrimination so as to establish a gradual and evolutionary process of African participation in the structures set up by whites."[1] While Liberalism's emphasis on conciliation, compromise, and constitutional methods did not survive the second half of the twentieth century, Liberalism's other tenets -- multiracialism and rejection of violence -- endured, the latter until 1960 and the former still flourishing in the newly legalized ANC.

Lutuli's mission education was no doubt responsible for his predisposition towards Western Liberalism. Steeped in the liberal tradition, students from mission schools invariably accepted the belief in man's capacity for enlightenment and the inevitability of progress. Thus, writes Gerhart, they were predisposed towards wishful thinking, tending to substitute moralistic analyses for hard political calculations.[2]

In addition to the impact of Western education was the example of the black American experience. Blacks in America were struggling for the extension of civil liberties, and the emphasis there on cooperation across color lines made an impression on black South Africans. Added to this was the tradition of the Cape, where a non-racial franchise had existed until 1936, offering a working precedent of the liberal principle of non-racialism.

Kuper remarks that the ANC under Lutuli was proceeding "... on the basis of a liberal humanitarian creed, which asserts the dignity of the human personality, the belief that all men are born equal, the conviction that the human being is educable, and the assumption that history is the story of the unfolding of freedom."[3] The acceptance of liberal creeds was reinforced by Christian beliefs that stressed the

equality of all men as brothers under the fatherhood of God. The oneness made possible by Christ, who had broken down the walls of partition between Jew and Greek, male and female, was seen as having a practical implication: the unity of all people born in South Africa in one multiracial society. Furthermore, the Christian command to love one's neighbor required nonracialism and nonviolence, so thought Lutuli and his fellow liberals in the ANC.

By the time of the Defiance Campaign, however, Lutuli had become disillusioned with Liberalism as a creed and with white liberals in particular. "Only a few," he lamented, "like Huddleston and Reeves and Blaxall ... share our troubles with us."[4] The truly commited few, unfortunately, were peripheral to the power structure and hence proved ineffectual at promoting reforms. Lutuli never gave up hope that white South Africans could change, but experience made him more realistic about the persistence of self-interest among white South Africans. Realizing that moral suasion alone would not sufice, he was forced to face up to the implications of his faith, writes Robertson.[5]

A proper understanding of the doctrine of original sin would have gone far in preventing his initially overly optimistic view of human nature. The Christian

view of man emphasizes not only man's glory but also his misery. A "mature" faith[6] would have prevented the unfounded optimism of the early ANC regarding the white man's willingness to change. It recognizes that there "is clearly something more stubborn and mysterious in human wrongdoing than some easily corrected sloth or malice."[7] Man's egotism and will-to-power are persistent and not readily overcome. Thus, preaching the Gospel will not overcome evil in history, and moral entreaties are insufficient in restraining one group from taking advantage of another.[8] The implication of the doctrine of original sin in time became clear to Lutuli: Political pressure buttressed by power was necessary to back up moral claims.

Sobukwe and Biko appear to have commenced their political lives with a realistic appraisal of the whites' unwillingness to change without having to evolve to that position. One explanation why they so readily stressed the sinfulness of whites can be found in their longer historical perspective than Lutuli from which to view white intransigence to political reform and the failure of the moral regeneration of white society. Lutuli had been born into a society in which apartheid had not yet been institutionalized. His world was one in which economic advancement for middle class blacks was not

altogether impossible. The South Africa that Sobukwe and Biko entered, on the other hand, was a harsher world in which every aspect of their lives was controlled by a myriad of apartheid laws and in which there were progressively fewer opportunities for success. They grew up with fewer illusions about the nature of white rule, according to Gerhart.[9]

Ever the realist, Sobukwe asserted: "History has taught us that a group in power has never voluntarily relinquished its position."[10] He had litle faith in the inherent goodness of the white man. Experience had taught him the tenancious hold of interest on group behavior and the stubborness of sin in all political communities.[11] His rejection of multiracialism as a strategy reflects a profound awareness of the limits of self-sacrifice in politics. It is not in the interest of other groups -- white liberals and communists -- to bring about black majority rule; hence, alliances with these groups would stifle black aspirations, he believed. Both Sobukwe and Biko rejected Liberalism's penchant for gradualism, constitutional methods, multiracialism, and non-violence.

The Africanists' political realism stems from a "more profound version" of the Christian faith[12] than the early Charterists that stresses the sinfulness of man and

hence the need for action, not sermons. Their political program was based on the recognition that pure conscience seldom defeats an unjust system.[13] They recognized that inordinate power tempts its holders to abuse it, and that only power can challenge power. The inability of humans to transcend their own interests significantly to consider the rights of others in contrast with their own makes force inevitable,[14] they discovered. Armed with the truth about man's nature which Christian teaching supplies, Sobukwe and Biko, and later Tutu, accepted the need for force in politics. However, given the gross inequality in strength between blacks and whites, the Africanists were content to emphasize psychological emancipation.[15] Forced to face the truth that only commensurate power could counter power to wrench changes, the PAC and BCM instigated status campaigns aimed at increasing black confidence and bargaining power in order to eventually confront whites on an equal footing.

Sobukwe and Biko appear to apply the doctrine of original sin exclusively to the white man and assume that the downtrodden Africans possesed a monopoly on virtue. Given their view of the nearly total depravity of the white man, it is not surprising that the Africanists found Garveyism, which stressed the evils of the white man and the moral superiority of the black man,

congenial. Garvey's ideas were in circulation in South Africa beginning in the 1920s, but his racialist assertions and visions had litle influence on the ANC, given its strong belief that God's fatherhood of all men pointed to the ideal of nonracialism. Garvey's impact on South Africa was a delayed one, writes Walshe, contributing to the ideas of the later Africanists.[16]

Garveyism had been brought to South Africa by James Thaele, who had picked up its tenets from study in the United States.[17] It also found its way to the separatist churches through their contacts with black exclusivist sects in America who were its champions. Mangena Mokone established the Ethiopian Church in Pretoria under Garvey's slogan: "Africa for the Africans." In addition, the newspaper Abantu Batho defended Garvey's ideas in its columns.[18]

Garvey's racialism was compatible with that of the Africanists in the PAC and BCM, who embraced his slogan "Africa for Africans." And although the PAC dissociated itself from the corollary slogan "to hurl the white man into the sea", one PAC member admitted: "[People] liked it privately! But we didn't want to go down on paper ... it would damage us with our friends overseas."

Closely related to the racialist overtones of Garveyism was the equally racialist ideology of Pan

Africanism. Pan Africanism, which stressed predominant African power, had a negligible effect on the ANC, which had sought throughout its history the extention of rights to Africans, not the seizure of power from whites. The concept of predominant political power was subsequently developed within the Youth League and later by the Africanists of the PAC and BCM. In the process of developing an ideology of African nationalism, they began to direct their attention to the African continent as a whole,[20] envisioning a Pan African unity stretching "from Cape to Cairo, Madagascar to Morocco."[21]

According to Walshe, Pan-African thinking was largely the product of political and economic frustration and was stimulated by the hopes for self-determination enunciated in the Atlantic Charter, and spurred by the anti-colonial efforts elsewhere -- in Africa, Asia (especially India) and the United Nations.[22] He writes, "A sense of Pan-African solidarity had ... emerged concurrently with, and dependent upon, the new determination to assert the power and ideals of African nationalism."[23] Expediency also encouraged the adoption of Pan Africanist ideology. Gerhart notes that if all Africa could be viewed as a single nation, it became easy to dismiss as insignificant a few million whites.[24] Also, appealing to the "higher authority" of such greats

as Nkrumah, Nyerere, and Kenyatta helped to justify to the people the exclusive nationalist approach.[25]

Another link between racialist theories from abroad and the Africanist movement was forged in the 1960s. The Black Power movement in the United States was having an impact on South Africa through the writings of Eldridge Cleaver, Stokeley Carmichael, and Charles Hamilton. Debates on the similarities and differences between blacks in the United States and South Africa were popular among Black Consciousness groups. The widespread use of the term "black" as a positive expression is a legacy of the Black Power movement in the United States, and the raised fist to connote black power was adopted enthusiastically from that movement.[26] The religious wing of the Black Power Movement, represented by Black Theology, was having an equally strong impact. A taped address by American black theologian James Cone on black theology was heard at the first conference on Black Theology in South Africa. While the Black Theology movement was largely coterminous, not dependent upon, the American variety, there is no doubt that American Black Theology was the single most important external influence on South African politics in the 1960s and 1970s.

By the 1970s, Gerhart writes, never had such a thorough going effort been made to selectively adapt

foreign ideas to the South African situation. This she attributes to the general explosion in worldwide telecommunications and the widespread availability of overseas literature on race relations.[27] But the political conditions in South Africa better explain why foreign exclusivist ideologies took root in the hearts and minds of young Africans. Racialist ideas from abroad predictably found a warm reception on the now blacks-only campuses throughout South Africa. This should not be surprising: Lutuli had attributed his education in an integrated environment with forestalling hatred against whites. Likewise, Tutu looked back at his time in England, where normal relations between the races was possible, as significant in instilling in him a commitment to the multiracial ideal. These experiences were not available to the generation of Africans coming of age in the 1960s. The generation of leaders schooled in Christial liberal aspirations of being accepted as participants with whites in running the state was replaced by a generation for whom domination, not assimilation, was sought.

Garveyism, Pan Africanism, and Black Power -- secular ideologies which stress black exclusivism -- are all compatible with Christian doctrines that stress God's preferential option for the poor, which in the hands of

Black Theology comes to mean God's siding with the oppressed black nation. Scriptures that stress God's special relationship with the elect support the Africanists' claim for a special destiny based on the color of their skin, the cause of their oppression. The Exodus story -- a favorite with the Afrikaners who saw a parallel between God's deliverance of the Israelites from the Egyptian oppressors and their own Great Trek away from the English imperialists -- has been appropriated by black theologians to describe God's special concern for the oppressed black nation under white domination. Tutu and other moderate black theologians have been quick to warn their more racialist brothers that God sides with them, not because they are better or more deserving than their oppressors, but simply because they are oppressed.[28] Neither did Tutu see the whites as "irreedemable devils" as do some Black Theology proponents.[29]

Communism was another salient ideology at play in South African society. The Communist Party opened its membership to Africans in the mid-20s, and there were always some Africans with simultaneous membership in the CP and ANC until the CP was banned in 1950. Lutuli and Tutu have been receptive to working with individual communists but less receptive to communist ideas, which

they considered to be based on a "false religion," the deification of a particular class and worship of the state.[30]

Lutuli and Tutu, consistent with their belief in multiracial efforts, have welcomed assistance from all quarters. The fact that the Communists have been the most radical voice in South African politics in terms of urging the complete dismantling of apartheid explains the historically warm relations between ANC members and CP members. In addition, communist countries have welcomed visiting Africans, who on their return helped spread knowledge of communist theory. The fact that the Soviet Union challenged apartheid in the United Nations in a voice less equivocal than the West also explains the cameraderie between the communists and ANC members.

During the Treason Trial, Lutuli conceded that they had "picked up the language" of communist theory. This is evident in the economic platforms of the Freedom Charter: "The People Shall Share in the Country's Wealth!" and "The Land Shall Be Shared Among Those Who Work It." The Freedom Charter's economic policies advanced the earlier Program of Action's aim of winning political rights. Obviously, the new emphasis on the redistribution of wealth and land reflected the views of the communists in the Congress of the People as well as

the general realization by the ANC that it was necesary to champion the ideas of the rank and file in order to build the ANC into a true mass movement. However, the fact that there was no detailed economic program indicates the less than perfect correlation between the ANC's priority, political democracy, and the communists' ultimate aim for a socialist revolution following the democratic one. The CP's commitment to eradicate capitalism was not synonomous with the ANC's deepest concerns. In fact, Lutuli favored retaining some ownership of private property and hoped that blacks would join whites as capitalists.[32]

Sobukwe and Biko more so than the Charterists were deeply hostile to Communism. They rejected communist theory as irrelevant in a country where race, not class, was the decisive division. They were convinced that communists' interests could not coincide with black aspirations, because (white) communists would lose out in a black majority government. Benson writes that their opposition to communism sprang from their religious training. They had been taught, she explains, that Communists were the anti-Christ.[33] Their religious background predisposed them to reject a materialist view of man as simply an "economic animal."[34]

However, the Africanists borrowed from communist

theory in devising economic policies that aimed at the redistribution of wealth. There was a recognition that without deep economic changes, political equality would be inconsequential. But their commitment to the socialization of property was conditioned as much by their belief that Christianity required economic justice as by a belief in scientific socialism. God's concern for the whole man translates into interest in his physical as well as spiritual well-being, the Africanists argued. Later, Tutu was to insist that Christianity did not preach an other worldy pie-in-the-sky-when-you-die theology but recognizes that "people want their pie here and now, and not in some future tomorrow..."[35] Socialism, he believed was superior in providing economic justice than was Capitalism, which he believed was based on man's baser instincts.[36]

Although the BCM borrowed more extensively from Marxism-Leninism than the earlier resistance movements, Biko claimed that his economic views were based on an indigenous African socialism rather than a "foreign" import. He endorsed "African Socialism", which was presumably based on aspects of pre-colonial Africa such as mutuality, cooperation, and neighborliness. Like Lutuli and Sobukwe before him, Biko was clearly more interested in the non-material aspects of liberation, as

Tutu would be later. As Christians, they based their assault on apartheid more on its devaluation of the dignity of God-created beings than on its economic exploitation of them.

What these four leaders shared -- despite their interest in sometimes opposing secular ideologies -- was a belief in a transcendent God to whom one owed total allegiance. Rather than a force that pushes in the direction of apolitical escapism, Christianaity requires resolute action in the world, for there is no area of life "in which God's writ does not run."[37] The greatest sin, they agreed, was "to allow oneself to be oppressed."[38] Niebuhr writes: "The promises of another world may prompt the weak man to resign, but they will encourage the strong man to deeds of superhuman heroism."[39] Certainly, this applies to Lutuli, Sobukwe, Biko and Tutu, as they strove to approximate the Kingdom of God within history. Despite the moral ambiguities inherent in politics, they felt called to enter the fray, taking their faith with them, as Lutuli had said, "and praying that it may be used to influence for good the character of the resistance."[40] Lutuli, Sobukwe, Biko, and Tutu were courageous men of action who were persuaded that religious faith had implications for politics, even if they saw those implications somewhat differently.

****

We have seen over the last half century the competition between the two approaches to politics -- the Charterist position, represented by Lutuli and Tutu, and the Nationalist position, adopted by Sobukwe and Biko. How South African politics in the 1990s will play out is not certain. The Charterist wing, represented by Tutu and Boesak and expressed institutionally in the newly legalized ANC and UDF, appears to have the support of the majority of black South Africans and of the international community as well. An indication of the relative strengths of the political movements can be found in reports by the Washington Post of turnouts at political rallies this year: about 35,000 people packed Jabulani stadium for an ANC/UDF rally commemorating Soweto, while only 1,000 attended a rally held by the PAC, and just 200 participated in an event organized by AZAPO.[41]

It appears that the Charterist and Nationalist positions are beginning to coalesce around a middle ground. The violence associated with the exclusivist position is being married to the multiracial tactics of the Charterist position. Violence has now become an acceptable option not only to the PAC/BC/NF wing but to

the ANC and UDF as well. Mandela's release from prison, in the final analysis, could never have been made contingent upon his disavowal of viclence because he and the ANC are unequivocal on their position.

Black Consciousness buttressed by Black Theology has been successful in creating an assertive, proud black people who can now engage in multiracial alliances to destroy apartheid without fear of being directed, controlled, and stifled by whites. Some Africanists in the ANC Youth League, such as Mandela and Tambo, have claimed that their early "go it alone" attitude had been an adolescent phase they have long outgrown.[42] We are witnessing today the culmination of a growing-up process that has resulted in a mature united front resistance. Gerhart asserts, "The generation coming of age today in South Africa is the embodiment of the Africanist vision ...: proud, self-reliant, determined."[43] The major contribution of the Africanist approach of the PAC and BCM has been the creation of a population psycholcgically prepared for confrontation. Certainly, the new multiracial movements have absorbed a tone of militancy and determination to use whatever means necessary to achieve liberation and dismantle apartheid.

Because viclence has become an acceptable option to both groups, the possibility of revolution erupting is

probably more a function of the government's speed in negotiating a new political settlement than of the dominance of either the Charterist or Africanist position. Township youths[44] are clearly impatient and feel that Mandela, released from prison in February 1990, "should have produced the goods."[45] One ANC source states that the young "believe in just putting fire to everything."[46]

The fact that the African Independent Churches are the largest and fastest growing religious group in South Africa with six million members (25% of the black population) may ensure the victory of the radical approach if one accepts with Sobukwe and Biko that there is a latent militancy to tap from these all-black congregations. Villa-Vicencio apparently believes that their numbers and the grassroots nature of their membership could prove them to be more politically relevant than previously.[47]

Curiously, the centrality of religion in the struggle against apartheid has only been recognized in recent years. The Christian Science Monitor notes that with the February 1988 bannings of eighteen anti-government groups, including the 2,000,000-member strong UDF, the church is emerging as the "new focus of dissent...."[48] Certainly, as one of the few institutions

untouched by the two-year state of emergency, the church is in a unique position. But with the recent unbanning of the ANC and the lapsing of the state of emergency, it is doubtful that religion's impact will diminish. Christianity will continue to serve as an ethical critique of apartheid, as a source of righteous anger that inspires action, and as a wellspring of confidence in eventual victory.

As has been argued here, religion has always been a force to be reckoned with in South Africa. At the center of the struggle against apartheid in the twentieth century is the struggle of black leaders to prove to their fellow blacks that "Christianity is not the 'opiate of the people' but the hope for the future and therefore the word of salvation for today."[49]

Notes

1. Peter Walshe, Black Nationalism in South Africa (Johannesburg: Ravan Pres, 1973), p. 33.

2. Gail Gerhart, Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 34-35.

3. Leo Kuper, Passive Resistance in South Africa (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1957), p. 109.

4. Anthony Sampson, The Treason Cage: The Opposition on Trial in South Africa (London: Heinemann, 1958), p. 195.

5. Janet Robertson, Liberalism in South Africa (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 104.

6. See Reinhold Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy: Essays on the Christian Interpretation of History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), p. 141.

7. Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 141.

8. See Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II: Human Destiny (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964), p. 49.

9. Gerhart, p. 46.

10. Mangaliso Robert Sobukwe, Speeches of Mangaliso Sobukwe, 1949-1959 (no publishing information available), p. 11.

11. See Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932) for a discussion on the differences between individual and group morality.

12. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II, p. 87.

13. See Niebuhr, Beyond Tragedy, p. 285.

14. See Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society, p. 6.

15. Tutu, on the other hand, sought greater strength for the UDF through wider and wider alliances.

16. Peter Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa: The ANC 1912-1952 (Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1971), p. 165.

17. Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa, p. 168.

18. Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa, p. 168.

19. Cited by Gerhart, p. 216.

20. Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa, p. 335.

21. "Manifesto of the Africanist Movement," Cited by Gerhart, p. 207.

22. Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa, p. 336.

23. Walshe, The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa, p. 350.

24. Gerhart, p. 208.

25. Gerhart, p. 210.

26. Gerhart, p. 295.

27. Gerhart, p. 273.

28. Shirley Du Boulay, Voice of the Voiceless (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), p. 237.

29. Albert Luthuli, Let My People Go (London: Collins, 1962), pp. 153-154.

30. Tutu would no doubt agree with Niebuhr's assertion that when one assumes that his prophetic interpretation of the Gospel guarantees him superior virtue, he is guilty of the sin of self-righteousness. Humility, born from the knowledge of the finiteness and partiality of even one's highest religious truth, must be the fruit of religion. Christian humility, Niebuhr writes, does not destroy moral ardour; it merely destroys moral arrogance and prevents righteousness from degenerating into self-righteousness. The oppressed that rise up against an unjust government may be the executor

of divine judgment in history, but they are not themselves immune to divine judgment. Christian faith ought to persuade us that political conflicts are conflicts between sinners, not between sinners and the righteous, and that yesterday's oppressed upon gaining victory exhibit the same will-to-power as their oppressors. (See Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume I, p. 226; The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II, p. 239; Beyond Tragedy, p. 247; Christianity and Power Politics, p. 22, p. 137.)

31. Robertson, p. 171.

32. Albert Luthuli, "Statement taken from Chief Albert Luthuli," Treason Trial lawyer's brief (Carter-Karis Collection). Cited by Gerhart, pp. 119-120.

33. Mary Benson, Nelson Mandela (London: Panaf, 1980), p. 33.

34. James Leatt, Theo Kneifel, and Klaus Nurnberger, eds. Contending Ideologies in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 94.

35. Desmond Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness: The Struggle for Justice in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1982), p. 28.

36. Tutu, Crying in the Wilderness, p. 100, p. 112.

37. Desmond Tutu, Hope and Suffering (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), p. 170.

38. Steve Biko, I Write What I Like, Edited by Aelred Stubbs (London: Heinemann, 1979), p. 31.

39. Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society, p. 65.

40. Luthuli, pp. 154-155.

41. David Ottaway, "Mandela's Message: Hold Fast on Sanctions," The Washington Post (June 20, 1990), p. A34.

42. Gerhart, p. 116.

43. Gerhart, p. 315.

44. 40% of black South Africans are under age 15. See Shaun Johnson, "Youth in the Politics of Resistance,"

in Johnson, Shaun, ed., South Africa: No Turning Back (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 96.

45. Lynn Duke, "South Africa's Comrades: The Wild Card," The Wshington Post (June 20, 1990), p. A32.

46. Duke, p. A34.

47. "An Interview with Charles Villa-Vicencio" in Jim Wallis and Joyce Hollyday, eds., Crucible of Fire: The Church Confronts Apartheid (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1989), pp. 86-87. There is some question about the actual numbers of AIC members. Marks and Trapido believe that the vast majority of black Christians belong to AICs. See Shula Marks and Stanley Trapido, "South Africa since 1976: An Historical Perspective" in Johnson, p. 35.

48. Lynda Schuster, "South African churches step in front line of dissent," The Christian Science Monitor (March 3, 1988), p. 1.

49. John de Gruchy, The Church Struggle in South Africa (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), p. 51.

Bibliography

Adam, Heribert. "The Rise of Black Consciousness in South Africa." Race, 15, 2 (1973), pp. 149-165.

Africa Watch. No Neutral Ground: South Africa's Confrontation with the Activist Churches. New York: Human Rights Watch, 1989.

Appiah-Kubi, Kofi and Torres, Sergio, eds. African Theology En Route: Pan Africanist Conference of Third World Theology, Accra, 1977. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979.

Arnold, Millard, ed. Steve Biko: Black Consciousness in South Africa. New York: Random House, 1978.

-----. ed. Steve Biko: No Fears Expressed. Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers, 1987.

Baartman, Ernest. "Black Consciousness." Pro Veritate (March 1973), pp. 4-6.

-----. "The Significance of the Development of Black Consciousness for the Church." Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 2 (1973), pp. 18-22.

Barkat, Ankar M. "Churches Combating Racism in South Africa." Journal of International Affairs, 36, 2 (Fall/Winter, 1982/83), pp. 297-305.

Barrell, Howard. "The UDF and the NF: Their Emergence, Composition, and Trends." South African Review, 2 (1984), pp. 6-20.

Becken, Hans Jergen, ed. Relevant Theology for Africa. Durban: Lutheran Publishing House, 1973.

Benson, Mary. Chief Albert Lutuli of South Africa. London: Oxford, 1963.

-----. Nelson Mandela. London: Panaf, 1980.

-----. South Africa: The Struggle for a Birthright. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969.

-----. "The Struggle in South Africa Has United All Races." Notes and Documents (August, 1984), United Nations Centre Againt Apartheid.

-----. The Sun Will Rise: Statements From the Dock by South African Political Prisoners. London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1974.

Bentley, Judith. Archbishop Tutu. Milwaukee: G. Stevens, 1988.

Bernstein, Hilda. No. 46. Steve Biko. London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1978.

Biko, Steve. I Write What I Like. Edited by Aelred Stubbs. London: Heinemann, 1979.

Birt, Robert E. "An Examination of James Cone's Concept of God and its Role in Black Liberation." The Philosophical Forum, 9, 2-3 (Winter-Spring, 1977-1978), pp. 339-349.

Blumberg, Myrna. "Durban Explodes." Africa South in Exile (October-December, 1959), pp. 9-18.

Boesak, Allan. Black and Reformed. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986.

-----. A Call For an End to Unjust Rule. Edinburgh: St. Andrew's Press, 1986.

-----. A Farewell to Innocence. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1977.

-----. The Finger of God. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1982.

-----. Walking on Thorns. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

-----. When Prayer Makes News. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.

-----. "Liberation and Theology in South Africa." in Appiah-Kubi, Kofi and Torres, Sergio, eds. African Theology En Route: Pan-Africanist Conference of Third World Theology, Accra, 1977. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979.

Bosch, David. "Currents and Crosscurrents in South African Black Theology." Journal of Religion in Africa, 6, 1 (1974), pp. 1-22.

Du Boulay, Shirley. Voice of the Voiceless. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Brewer, John D. After Soweto: An Unfinished Journey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

-----, ed. Can South Africa Survive?: Five Minutes to Midnight. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Briggs, D.R. and Wing, J. The Harvest and the Hope: The Story of Congregationalism in Southern Africa. Johannesburg: United Congregationalist Church of Southern Africa, 1970.

Brooks, Alan and Brickhill, Jeremy. The Whirlwind Before the Storm. London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1980.

Bull, Hedley. The Anarchical Society: A Study of World Politics. New York: Columbia University, 1977.

Bunting, Brian. "Chief Luthuli and the Treason Trial" in his Moses Kotane, South African Revolutionary. London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1975, pp. 223-233.

Buthelezi, Manas. "Black Theology and the Le-Grange Commission." Pro Veritate, 13, 6 (October, 1975), pp. 4-6.

Callaghy, Thomas. South Africa in Southern Africa. New York: Praeger, 1983.

Callan, Edward. Albert John Luthuli and The South African Race Conflict. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1962.

Carr, Cannon Burgess. "The Black Consciousness Movement in South Africa and Namibia." Objective: Justice, 7, 3 (July/August/September, 1975), pp. 17-23.

Carter, Gwendolyn. "African Nationalist Movements in South Africa." Massachussetts Review (Autumn, 1963), pp. 147-64.

-----. "African Nationalist Movements" in Davis, John A. and Baker, James K. Southern Africa in Transition. New York: Praeger, 1965, pp. 14-16.

Cawood, Lesley. The Churches and Race Relations in South Africa. Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1964.

"Chief Albert John Luthuli, 1898-1967." African Communist, 31 (1967), pp. 38-44.

Chikane, Frank. "Church and State in Apartheid South Africa." Sechaba, 22, 6 (June, 1988), pp. 2-6.

Choonoo, R. Neville. "Parallel Lives: Black Autobiography in South Africa and the United States." (Ph.D. dissertation, New York: Columbia University, 1982.)

"Church and Liberation." Sechaba (May, 1980), pp. 15-18.

"Church, State Square Off." Africa News, 30, 15 (April 11, 1983), pp. 3-4.

"The Church and Violence: Who Stands Where." Clarion Call, 3 (1986).

Claiborne, William. "De Klerk, Tutu Group To Meet." The Washington Post (October 7, 1989), p. A25, p. A28.

Cochrane, James. Servants of Power: The Role of English-Speaking Churches, 1903-1930: Towards a Critical Theology Via an Historical Analysis of the Anglican and Methodist Churches. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987.

Collinge, Jo-Anne, "The United Democratic Front." South African Review, 3 (1986), pp. 248-266.

Comaroff, Jean. Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1985.

"Communists and Christians in the South African Revolution." African Communists, 110 (1987), pp. 52-71.

Cone, James. Black Theology and Black Power. New York: Seabury Press, 1969.

-----. A Black Theology of Liberation. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1970.

-----. Speaking the Truth. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.

Daniel, John. "Radical Resistance to Minority Rule in South Africa: 1906-1965." (Ph.D. dissertation, Buffalo: State University of New York, 1975.)

Davey, Cyril. Fifty Lives for God. London: Oliphants, 1973, pp. 108-110.

Davidson, Basil. "Questions about Nationalism." African Affairs, 76, 302 (January, 1977), pp. 39-46.

Davis, John and Baker, James. Southern Africa in Transition. New York: Praeger, 1966.

Davis, Kortright. "Racism and God: Steve Biko in Context." A.M.E. Zion Quarterly Review, 97, 4 (January, 1986), pp. 2-19.

Davis, Stephen. Apartheid's Rebels: Inside South Africa's Hidden War. New Haven: Yale University, 1987.

Davies, Robert; O'Meara, Dan; and Dlamini, Sipho. The Struggle for South Africa: A Reference Guide to Movements, Organizations and Institutions. London: Zed Books, 1984.

Desmond, Cosmas. Christians Or Capitalists? Christianity and Politics in South Africa. London: The Bowerdean Press, 1978.

Dollie, Na-Iem, "The National Forum." South African Review, 3 (1986), pp. 267-277.

Dubb, A.A. and Schutte, A. G., eds. "Black Religion in South Africa." Johannesburg: African Studies, 33, 2 (1974).

Duggan, William R. "Three Men of Peace." Crisis, 81 (1974), pp. 331-38.

El-Khawas, Mohamed A. "The Liberation Struggle in South Africa: Will the 1980s Be Decisive?" TransAfrica Forum. 3, 2 (Fall, 1983), pp. 79-91.

Fanon, Frantz. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Fatton, Robert. "The ANC of South Africa: The Limitations of a Revolutionary Strategy." Canadian Journal of African Studies, 18, 3 (1984), pp. 593-608.

-----. Black Consciousness in South Africa. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986.

Feit, Edward. African Opposition in South Africa: The Failure of Passive Resistance. Stanford: Hoover Institution, 1967.

-----. South Africa: The Dynamics of the ANC. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Ferm, Deane William. Third World Liberation Theologies: An Introductory Survey. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986.

-----. Third World Liberation Theologies: A Reader. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986.

Forman, Lionel and Sachs, E.S. The South African Treason Trial. London: John Calder, 1957.

Franklin, Raymond S. "The Political Economy of Black Power." Social Problems, 16, 3 (Winter 1969), pp. 286-301.

Frederikse, Julie. South Africa: A Different Kind of War. Johannesburg: Ravan, 1986.

Gerhart, Gail. Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Gibson, Richard. African Liberation Movements: Contemporary Struggles Against White Minority Rule. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Gordimer, Nadine. "Chief Luthuli." Atlantic Monthly (April 1959), pp. 34-39.

Gray, Tony. Champions of Peace: The Story of Alfred Nobel, the Peace Prize and the Laureates. New York: Praeger, 1976.

Grobler, Jackie. A Decisive Clash? A Short History of Black Protest Politics in South Africa 1875-1976. Pretoria: Acacia, 1988.

de Gruchy, John W. The Church Struggle in South Africa. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.

-----. Cry Justice! Prayers, Meditations and Readings from South Africa. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986.

de Gruchy, John W. and Villa-Vicencic, Charles, eds. Apartheid is a Heresy. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1983.

-----, eds. Resistance and Hope: South African Essays in Honour of Beyers Naude. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1985.

Gqubule, Simon. "What is Black Theology?". Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 8 (1974), pp. 16-23.

Grundy, Kenneth W. "South Africa: The Combatants Regroup." Current History, 87, 529 (May, 1988), pp. 205-207, p. 226.

Guma, Alex La (ed.) Apartheid: A Collection of Writings on South African Racism by South Africans. New York: International Publishers, 1985.

Harcourt, Melville. "Albert Lutuli" in his Portraits of Destiny. New York: Sheed and Worrel, 1966, pp. 99-173.

Hastings, Adrian. "The Christian Churches and Liberation Movements in Southern Africa." African Affairs, 80, 320 (July 1981), pp. 345-354.

-----. A History of African Christianity 1950-1975. London: Cambridge University, 1979.

Hein, David. "Religion and Politics in South Africa." Modern Age, 31, 1 (Winter 1987), pp. 21-38.

Herbstein, Denis. White Man, We Want to Talk to You. London: Deutsch, 1978.

Hewson, Leslie. An Introduction to South African Methodists. Cape Town: Methodist Publishing House, 1951.

Hinchliff, Peter. The Church in South Africa. London: SPCK, 1968.

-----. "The English-Speaking Churches and South Africa in the Nineteenth Century." Journal of Theology for Southern Africa (December 1979), pp. 28-38.

Hindson, D.C. (ed.). Working Papers in South African Studies, 3 (1983).

Hirson, Baruch. Year of Fire, Year of Ash. London: Zed

Press, 1979.

Hoekema, David A. "Is Reconciliation Possible?" (An Interview with Allan Boesak). Christian Century (May 23, 1984), pp. 546-550.

Hooper, Charles. "Chief Luthuli: He Knows the Woes of the Landless Squatters." Fighting Talk, 16 (February, 1962), unpaged.

Hope, Marjorie and Young, James. The South African Churches in a Revolutionary Situation. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1981.

Horrell, Muriel, ed. A Survey of Race Relations. (Yearbooks: 1952, 1960, 1976, 1983) Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1953-1984.

Hughes, John. "Apartheid's Compassionate Antagonist." Saturday Review, 45 (June 16, 1962), p. 22.

Jennings, Theodore, "Steve Biko: Liberator and Martyr." Christian Century, 94 (November 2, 1977), pp. 997-999.

Johanson, Brian. Church and State in South Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan, 1973.

Johnson, Shaun, ed. South Africa: No Turning Back. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

Joseph, Helen. If This Be Treason. London: Andrew Deutsch, 1963.

The Kairos Document: The Challenge to the Churches. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.

Kane-Berman, John. South Africa: The Method in the Madness. London: Pluto Press, 1979.

Karis, Thomas and Gwendolen Carter. From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964. 4 Volumes, Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1972-1977.

Karis, Thomas. "Revolution in the Making". Foreign Affairs, 62, 2 (Winter, 1983/1984), pp. 378-406.

---. "The Resurgent ANC" in Callagy, Thomas. South Africa in Southern Africa. New York: Praeger, 1983, pp. 191-236.

Kerr, Alexander. Fort Hare, 1915-48: The Evolution of the African College. London: C. Hurst & Co., 1968.

Kiernan, J. P. "Where Zionists Draw the Line: A Study of Religious Exclusiveness in An African Township." African Studies, 33, 2 (1974), pp. 79-90.

de Klerk, William A. The Puritans in Africa: The History of Afrikanerdom. London: Rex Collings, 1975.

Kotze, D.A. African Politics in South Africa 1964-1974: Parties and Issues. London: C. Hurst & Co., 1975.

Kretzschmar, Louise. The Voice of Black Theology in South Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan, 1986.

Kuper, Leo. Passive Resistance in South Africa. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Lamola, John. "Does The Church Lead the Struggle?" Sechaba, 22, 6 (June 1988), pp. 7-11.

Leatt, James, Theo Kneifel, and Klaus Nurnberger, eds. Contending Ideologies in South Africa. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.

Legum, Colin and Legum, Margaret. The Bitter Choice: Eight South Africans' Resistance to Tyranny. New York: World Publishing Co., 1968, pp. 49-69.

Lodge, Tom. "The ANC, 1982." South African Review, 1 (1983), pp. 50-54.

-----. "The ANC, 1983." South African Review, 2 (1984), pp. 21-25.

-----. Black Politics in South Africa Since 1945. New York: Longman, 1983.

-----. "The United Democratic Front: Leadership and Ideology" in Brewer, John. Can South Africa Survive?: Five Minutes to Midnight. New York: Macmillan, 1989, pp. 206-230.

Loewen, Jacob A. "Mission Churches, Independent Churches, and Felt Needs in Africa." Missionalia, 4, 4 (1976), pp. 404-425.

Luthuli, Albert. "Africa and Freedom." Vital Speeches, 28 (February 1962), pp. 267-71.

Luthuli, Albert. "Boycott Us." Spectator, 204 (1960), p. 208.

-----. "Change Sweeps Over Zululand." Rotarian, 68 (June, 1946), pp. 40-42.

-----. "The Effect of Minority Rule on Nonwhites" in Spottiswoods, Hildegarde. South Africa, The Road Ahead. London: Bailey Bros. and Swinfen Ltd., 1960, pp. 109-118.

-----. "Foreword" to Joseph, Helen. If This Be Treason. London: Andrew Deutsch, 1963.

-----. "Foreword" to Rubin, Leslie and Rubin, Neville. This Is Apartheid. London: Christian Action, 1966.

-----. "Freedom Front in the Congress." The Listener, 15 (Septemer 20, 1956), pp. 422-423.

----. Let My People Go. London: Collins, 1962.

-----. "Let Us Speak Together of Freedom." Fighting Talk, 10 (1956), pp. 4-5.

-----. "Luthuli Speaks on Liquor Rights and Bantu Authorities." Race Relations News, 23 (August, 1961), pp. 106-107.

-----. "No Arms for South Africa" in Statements and Addresses: Notes and Documents. New York: United Nations Centre Against Apatheid, 1969, pp. 30-33.

-----. "On the Rivonia Trial" in Statements and Addresses: Notes and Documents. New York: United Nations Centre Against Apartheid, 1969, pp. 34-35.

-----. "A Program for a New South Africa." Saturday Night, 77 (January 20,
), pp. 9-18.

-----. Statements and Addresses [1952-1964]. Notes and Documents, 22/69 (1969), New York: United Nations Centre Against Apartheid.

-----. "The Visicn of Democracy in South Africa." Fellowship, 25, 9 (1959) pp. 5-9.

-----. "We are Bound to Struggle." Dissent, 3 (1956), p.

7.

-----. "What I Would Do If I Were Prime Minister." Ebony, 17 (February, 1962), pp. 20-29.

Mafeje, Archie. "Soweto and Its Aftermath" in Murray, Martin, ed. South African Capitalism and Black Political Opposition. Cambridge: Schenkeman, 1982, pp. 739-759.

Magubane, Bernard. "Soweto: Ten Years After." TransAfrica Forum, 4, 1 (Fall, 1986), pp. 63-75.

Maimela, Simon Proclaim Freedom to My People. Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1987.

Mandela, Nelson. The Struggle is My Life. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1986.

Mayson, Cedric. "Christianity and Revolution." Sechaba (October, 1987), pp. 12-15.

-----. "The Liberation of Christians." Sechaba (November, 1983), pp. 22-25.

Mbali, Zolile. The Churches and Racism: A Black South African Perspective. London: SCM Press, 1987.

McKean, David. "The UDF and the Anti-Apartheid Struggle." TransAfrica Forum, 4, 1 (Fall, 1986), pp. 31-46.

Mdlalore, Thoko. "The Place of the Church in Our Liberation Struggle." African Communist, 104 (1986), pp. 18-27.

Meli, Francis. South Africa Belongs to Us: A History of the ANC. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

van der Merwe, Hendrik, ed. African Perspectives on South Africa: A Collection of Speeches, Articles and Documents. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978.

van der Merwe, Hendrik and Welsh, David, eds. Student Perspectives on South Africa. Cape Town: David Philip, 1972.

"The Missing Man." New Commonwealth, 39 (April, 1961), p. 211.

Mitchell, Louis. "Steve Biko: South Africa's Modern Symbol." Crisis, 85, 4 (1978), pp. 123-135.

Molteno, Frank. "South Africa 1976: A View From Within the Liberation Movement." Social Dynamics, 5, 2, (1975), pp. 66-74.

Moodie, T. Dunbar. The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Moore, Basil, ed. Black Theology: The South African Voice. London: C. Hurst & Co., 1973.

Moritz, Charles, ed. Current Biography Yearbook 1985. New York: The H. H. Wilson Co., 1986, pp. 418-421.

Mosala, Jerry. "African Traditional Beliefs and Christianity." Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 43 (1983), pp. 15-24.

Mosala, Jerry and Tlhagale, Buti, eds. The Unquestionable Right to Be Free: Essays on Black Theology. Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1986.

Motlhabi, Mokgethi. Challenge to Apartheid: Toward a Moral National Resistance. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.

---, ed. Essays on Black Theology. Johannesburg: University Christian Movement, 1972.

-----. The Theory and Practice of Black Resistance to Apartheid. Johanessburg: Ravan, 1984.

Mphahlele, Ezekiel. "Albert Luthuli: The End of Nonviolence." Africa Today, 14 (August, 1967), pp. 1-3.

Murray, Martin. South Africa: Time of Agony, Time of Destiny: The Upsurge of Popular Protest. London: Verso, 1987.

-----. (ed). South African Capitalism and Black Political Opposition. Cambridge: Schenkeman, 1982.

Muzorewa, Gwinyai H. The Origins and Development of African Theology. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985, pp. 101-24.

Nash, Margaret. Ecumenical Movements in the 1960s. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1975.

Ngcokovane, Cecil Mzingisi. Apartheid in South Africa:

Challenge to Christian Churches. New York: Vantage Press, 1984.

Ngubane, Jordan. An African Explains Apartheid. London: Pall Mall, 1963.

-----. "Albert Luthuli: President of Congress." Drum (February, 1953), p. 21.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. Beyond Tragedy: Essays on the Christian Interpretation of History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

-----. The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defense. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.

-----. Christian Realism and Political Problems. Fairfield, New Jersey: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1977.

-----. Christianity and Power Politics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.

-----. The Irony of American History New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

-----. Moral Man and Immoral Society New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

-----. The Nature and Destiny of Man New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

-----. The Nature and Destiny of Man , Volume II: Human Destiny. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.

Nkosi, Robert. "Robert Sobukwe: An Assessment." Africa Report, 7, 4 (April, 1962), pp. 7-9.

Nkosi, Z. "The Lessons of Soweto." African Communist, 78 (1977), pp. 18-33.

Nolan, Albert. God in South Africa: The Challenge of the Gospel. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Norman, Edward. Christianity in the Southern Hemisphere: The Churches in Latin America and South Africa. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Novicki, Margaret. Interview with Bishop Tutu. African Report, 31, 2 (March/April, 1986), pp. 53-54.

Nurnberger, Klaus. Ideologies of Change in South Africa and the Power of the Gospel. Durban: Lutheran Publishing House, 1979.

Nyameko, R. S. and Singh, G. "The Role of Black Consciousness in the South African Revolution." African Communist, 68 (1977), pp. 34-47.

Ojo-Ade, Femi. "Stephen Biko: Black Consciousness, Black Struggle, Black Survival." Journal of Modern African Studies (Great Britian), 3 (1981), pp. 539-546.

Ottaway, David. "Mandela's Message: Hold Fast on Sanctions." The Washington Post (June 20, 1990), p. A34.

PAC. PAC in Perspective. London: PAC, 1973.

PAC. Time for Azania. Toronto: Norman Bethune Institute, 1976.

Paton, Alan. "Chief Albert Luthuli: His Crime is Loyalty" in Callan, Edward, ed. The Long View. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1968, pp. 201-03.

-----. "In Memorium: Albert Luthuli." Christianity and Crisis, 27, (1967), pp. 206-207.

"Portrait of a Traitor." Africa Today (January-February, 1957), pp. 2-5.

Prior, Andrew. "Political Culture and Violence: A Case Study of the ANC." Politikon, 6, 2 (December, 1984), pp. 12-20.

Randall, Peter. A Taste of Power. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1973.

Ranuga, Thomas. "Frantz Fanon and Black Consciousness in Azania." Phylon, 47, 3 (1986), pp. 182-191.

Rathbone, Richard. "The People and Soweto." Journal of Southern African Studies, 6, 1 (October 1979), pp. 124-132.

Reeves, Richard Ambrose. Shooting at Sharpeville: The Agony of South Africa. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Regehr, Ernie. Perceptions of Apartheid: The Churches and Political Change in South Africa. Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1979.

Republic of South Africa. Report of the Commission of Inquiry into South African Council of Churches. Pretoria: Government Printing Office, 1983.

Ritner, Peter. The Death of Africa. New York: Macmillan, 1960. pp. 69-74.

"Robert Sobukwe of the PAC." Africa Report, 20, 3 (1975), pp. 18-20.

Robertson, Janet Liberalism in South Africa Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

"The Role of Chief Luthuli." African Communist, 70 (Fall, 1977), pp. 14-19.

Roux, Edward. Time Longer Than Rope: The Black Man's Struggle for Freedom in South Africa. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

St. Laurent, Philip. "The Negro in World History." Tuesday Magazine, 3, (July, 1968), pp. 14-15, 21, 30.

Sampson, Anthony. The Treason Cage: The Opposition on Trial in South Africa. London: Heinemann, 1958.

Sechaba. ANC 70th Anniversary, (January 1982), pp. 3-7.

Segal, Ronald. African Profiles. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962.

-----. Political Africa. A Who's Who of Personalities and Parties. New York: Praeger, 1961.

Shepherd, Robert. Lovedale, South Africa: The Story of a Century, 1845-1945. Lovedale: Lovedale Press, nd.

Shultz, George. "The Church as a Force for Peaceful Change in South Africa." Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of State, August, 1986, pp. 30-32.

Sikakane, Enos. "The Need for Black Theology." Pro Veritate (April, 1974), pp. 20-23.

Silk, Andrew. "Understanding the Master: Robert Sobukwe's

Legacy." The Nation, 226, 12 (1978), pp. 368-370.

Simons, Jack and Simons, Ray. Class and Colour in South Africa 1850-1950. London: International Defence Aid Fund for South Africa, 1983.

Simpson, Theodore. "Black Theology -- And White." Pro Veritate (March, 1974), pp. 16-20.

Sobukwe, Mangaliso Robert. Speeches of Mangaliso Sobukwe 1949-1959. (No publishing information available.)

Sparks, Allister. "South African Protagonists Invoke Christianity." The Washington Post, October 2, 1985, pp. 1, A21.

Spottiswoode, Hildegarde. South Africa: The Road Ahead. London: Bailey Bros. and Swinfen Ltd., 1960.

Strassberger, Elfriede. Ecumenism in South Africa 1936-1960. Johannesburg: SACC, 1974.

Study Commission on U.S. Policy Toward Southern Africa. South Africa: Time Running Out. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Sullivan, Michael. "Total Power: The Evolution of Apartheid." TransAfrica Forum, 4, 1 (Fall, 1986), pp. 47-62.

Sundermeier, Theo, ed. Church and Nationalism in South Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1975.

Sundkler, Bengt G. M. Bantu Prophets in South Africa. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Tambo, Oliver. "The Black Reaction". Issue, 4, 3 (1974), pp. 3-5.

-----. Prepare for Power. New York: G. Braziller, 1988.

Tatum, Lyle, ed. South Africa: Challenge and Hope. New York: Hill & Wang, 1987.

Temko, Ned. "Shift to left by key South African church council taken as sign that change is too slow coming." The Christian Science Monitor (July 7, 1987), pp. 1, 32.

Templin, J. Alton. Ideology on a Frontier: The Theological Foundation of Afrikaner Nationalism,

1652-1910. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Thomas, David. "Church-state Relations in South Africa: Uncomfortable Bedfellows." South Africa International, 13, 1 (July, 1982), pp. 49-61.

-----. Councils in the Ecumenical Movement in South Africa. Johannesburg: SACC, 1979.

"Three African Freedom Movements." FreedomWays, 2, 1 (Winter, 1962), pp. 75-87.

Tthhagale, Buti, and Itumzleng Mosala. Hammering Swords into Ploughshares. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Turner, Harold W. "The Place of Independent Religious Movements in the Modernization of Africa." Journal of Religion in Africa, 2, 1 (1969), pp. 43-63.

-----. "African Religious Research -- New Studies of New Movements." Journal of Religion in Africa, 11, 2 (1980), pp. 137-153.

Turner, Ruth. "Violence and Non-violence in Confrontation: A Comparative Study of Ideologies. Six Historical Cases. Paine, Lenin, Hitler, Gandhi, Luthuli, and King." (Ph.D. dissertation, Amherst: University of Massachussetts, 1979.)

Turok, Ben. Revolutionary Thought in the Twentieth Century. London: Zed, 1980.

Tutu, Desmond. "Black South African Perspectives and the Reagan Administation." TransAfrica Forum, 1, 1 (Summer, 1982), pp. 7-15.

-----. "Black Theology/African Theology -- Soul Mates or Antagonists?" in Wilmore, Gayraud and Cone, James. Black Theology: A Documentary History, 1966-1979. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979, pp. 483-491.

"Christianity and Apartheid" in de Gruchy, John W. and Villa Vicencio, Charles, eds. Apartheid is a Heresy. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1983.

-----. Crying in the Wilderness: The Struggle for Justice in South Africa. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1982.

-----. "Freedom Fighters or Terrorists?" in Villa-Vicencio, ed. Theology and Violence: The South African Debate. Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1987.

-----. "God Intervening in Human Affairs." Missionalia, 5, 2 (1977), pp. 111-117.

-----. "God and Nation in the Perspective of Black Theology." Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 15 (1976), pp. 5-11.

-----. Hope and Suffering. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984.

-----. Nobel Peace Prize Lecture. New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1986.

-----. "Some African Insights and the Old Testament." Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 1 (1972), pp. 16-22.

-----. "Spirituality: Christian and African" in deGruchy, John and Villa-Vicencio, Charles, eds. Resistance and Hope: South African Essays in Honour of Beyeres Naude. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1985, pp. 159-164.

-----. "The Theology of Liberation in Africa" in Appiah-Kubi, Kofi and Torres, Sergio, eds. African Theology En Route. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979, pp. 162-168.

-----. "Viability" in Becken, Hans-Jergen. Relevant Theology for Africa. Durban: Lutheran Publishing House, 1973, pp. 34-39.

-----. "Whither African Theology?" in Fashole-Luke, Edward, ed. Christianity in Independent Africa. London: Rex Collings, 1978, pp. 364-369.

-----. The Words of Desmond Tutu. Edited by Naomi Tutu. New York: Newmarket Press, 1989.

Villa-Vicencio, Charles. "The Church: Discordant and Divided." Africa Report, 28, 4 (July-August, 1983), pp. 13-16.

-----. Churches Trapped in Apartheid. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988.

-----, ed. Theology and Violence: The South African Debate. Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1987.

Walls, Andrew. "The Challenge of African Independent Churches," Evangelical Review of Theology, 4, 2 (1980), pp. 225-234.

Wallis, Jim and Hollyday, Joyce. Crucible of Fire: The Church Confronts Apartheid. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1989.

Walshe, Peter. Black Nationalism in South Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1973.

-----. "Church versus State in South Africa: The Christian Institute and the Resurgence of African Nationalism." Journal of Church and State, 19, 3 (Autumn, 1977), pp. 457-479.

-----. Church Versus State in South Africa: The Case of the Christian Institute. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1983.

-----. The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa: The ANC 1912-1952. Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1971.

Webster, John, ed. Bishop Desmond Tutu, The Voice of One Crying in the Wilderness. London: Mowbray, 1982.

Weissman, Stephen. "Dateline South Africa: The Opposition Speaks." Foreign Policy, 58 (Spring, 1985), pp. 151-170.

Welsh, David. "The 1983 Constitutional Referendum and the Future of South Africa: View One." South Africa International, 14, 3 (January 1984), pp. 427-434.

Wepman, Dennis. Desmond Tutu. New York: F. Watts, 1989.

West, Martin. Bishops and Prophets in a Black City. Cape Town: David Philip, 1975.

-----. "Independence and Unity: Problems of Cooperation Between African Independent Church Leaders in Soweto." African Studies, 33, 2 (1974), pp. 121-129.

Wiechers, Marinus. "The 1983 Constitutional Referendum and the Future of South Africa: View Two." South Africa International, 14, 3 (January, 1984), pp. 435-439.

Wilmore, Gayraud. Black Religion and Black Radicalism. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1972.

-----. "Steve Biko, Martyr." Christianity and Crisis, 37

(October 17, 1977), pp. 239-240.

Wilmore, Gayraud S. and Cone, James. Black Theology: A Documentary History 1966-1979. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979.

Wilson, Francis. Outlook on a Century: South Africa 1870-1970. Transvaal: Lovedale Press, 1973.

Wilson, Monica and Leonard Thompson, eds. A History of South Africa to 1870. Cape Town: David Philip, 1982.

-----, eds. The Oxford History of South Africa: 1870-1966, Volume 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Witvliet, Theo. A Place in the Sun: An Introduction to Liberation Theology in the Third World. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "South African Crucible: Two Prophetic Voices in a Land of Racial Pain." Sojourners, 9 (March, 1980), pp. 30-33.

Woods, Donald. Biko. New York: Paddington Press, 1978.

Woodson, Dorothy. "The Speeches of Albert J. Luthuli." Africana Journal, 13, 1-4, pp. 41-49.

-----. "Albert Luthuli and the African National Congress: A Bio-Bibliography." History in Africa, 13 (1986), pp. 345-362.

Young, James. "South African Churches: Agents of Change." The Christian Century (November 24, 1982), pp. 1199-1201.

Zulu, Alphaeus. "Whither Black Theology?" Pro Veritate (March, 1973), pp. 11-13.

Zulu, Lawrence B. "Nineteenth Century Missionaries: Their Significance for Black South Africa" in Motlhabi, Mokgethi, ed. Essays on Black Theology. Johannesburg: University Christian Movement, 1972, pp. 85-90.