

A Critique of Crucial Concepts in the Freedom Charter,

(Adopted 26 June 1955)

Wim J Boooyse

Senior Research Fellow, International Freedom Foundation, Southern African Branch

INTRODUCTION

The Freedom Charter, adopted by 2 884 people (on 26 June 1955), at Kliptown, is in this epoch one of the most controversial documents in South Africa. Some proclaim that it is an honest blueprint for a future South Africa, whilst other approach the document with caution, question its all-embracing content, its origin and its aims. Custodians of the Freedom Charter are as numerous as the different approaches to it. One of its claimed custodians is the African National Congress (ANC)/South African Communist Party (SACP) alliance, whose claim to the Freedom Charter is questioned, because even between members of the ANC/SACP alliance, contradictions exist on both the value and applicability of this document.

Although the ANC/SACP claim that the Freedom Charter was a spontaneous result of people's demands in the early 1950's, a claim based on the fact that hundreds of fieldworkers travelled around South Africa to collect so-called "demands", — it is quite evident from David Mahopa that this is not entirely accurate.¹⁾ The real aim of the

volunteers was to politically educate the masses.

Arguments as to how and by whom the Freedom Charter was drafted, is for the purpose of this article of no importance. What is of importance, is the perception and conceptual meaning of the Charter, as perceived by the ANC/SACP alliance. Although, Nelson Mandela has said that the Freedom Charter is a revolutionary document²⁾ and Mzala, (a major contributor to the SACP mouthpiece African Communist) that the Freedom Charter is a statement of aims, and does not go into real depth³⁾, the important issue in this modern epoch remains the conceptual meaning of the Freedom Charter. The aim of this article is to make a contribution to the current Freedom Charter debate and to finally challenge its custodians to clarify once and for all, the exact meaning of crucial concepts. For this reason analysing concepts within the Freedom Charter and for so-called "custodians" of the Freedom Charter, to clarify the meaning of these concepts, is important.

The Freedom Charter for the purpose of this article, will be divided into

eleven clauses i.e., the preamble; 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 equal 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; and, there shall be peace and friendship, clauses.

1. THE PREAMBLE

"WE, THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA, DECLARE FOR ALL OUR COUNTRY AND THE WORLD TO KNOW:

*that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the **will of all the people**;*

that our people have been robbed of their birthright to land, liberty and peace by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality;

*that our country will never be **prosperous or free** until all our people live in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities;*

*that only a **democratic state**, based on the will of all the people, can secure to all their birthright without distinction of colour, race, sex or belief;*

And therefore, we, the people of South Africa, black and white together — equals, countrymen and brothers — adopt this Freedom Charter. And we pledge ourselves to strive together,

*sparing neither strength nor courage, until the **democratic changes** here set out have been won."*

1.1 "The People"

The concept of "the people" as used in the Freedom Charter tends (on paper in anycase) to include all individuals.

However, when analysing the concept in Marxist-Leninist terminology a totally different meaning of the concept becomes evident. Lenin said: "(t)here are enormous numbers of people, because the working class and the most diverse strata of society, year after year, advance from their ranks an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest, who are ready to render all the assistance they can in the fight against absolutism, the intolerableness of which is not yet recognized by all, but is nevertheless more and more acutely sensed by increasing masses of the people".⁴⁾ Does the concept "people" in the Freedom Charter imply only the working class, which is conceived as the revolutionary class?

Mao Tse-tung clarified this even further, when he said: "(a)t the present time the 'people' are the working class, the peasant class, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. These classes have united under the working class and the communist party in order to form their own state and select their own government to establish dictatorship over lackeys of imperialism the class of landowners and bureaucratic capital".⁵⁾ Custodians of the

Freedom Charter must clearly indicate who the **people** and the **anti-people** are. The Freedom Charter should when addressing the people, imply all individuals in South Africa and not only the strata of society indicated by the self-appointed Marxist-Leninist custodians.

1.2 “The Will of the People”

Doubts exist as to what is implied by the concept “the people” leading to the next question as to what is implied by the concept of “the will of the people”, and what this “will” entails. Assuming that the Marxist-Leninist interpretation prevails, in the form of the Vanguard Party: — that is, the will of the Vanguard Party is by definition the will of the people.⁶⁾ In fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, printed in Moscow, 1961, the “will” is defined as: “(o)ne of the greatest sources of the strength of the proletariat dictatorship lies in the very fact that all its activity shows its unanimous will and is directed by the party according to a single plan. The party bases itself on Marxist-Leninist theory and a study of the concrete conditions in working out a political program in all the spheres of socialist construction — economic, administrative, military, education and foreign — and guides its implementation in practice”.⁷⁾

The Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter must clearly state what they mean by “the will of the people”. Is it the will of a revolutionary minority?

1.3 “Prosperous or Free”

Prosperity and freedom, as concepts, have different meanings when they are analysed according to the intellectual mindset of Marxist-Leninist semantics. Campbell concludes in his analysis of the concept “prosperity and free” that it implies: “. . .that our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live under Marxism”.⁸⁾ As stated in a dictionary of Scientific Communism: “(M)arxism-Leninism correctly orientates people in life, helps them to realise their place in the world and their relationships with others. . .”.⁹⁾ The Marxist-Leninist programme will thus orientate individuals to accept the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of prosperity and freedom.

Lenin wrote in “The State and Revolution” in 1917 that: “(o)nlly in communist society, when the resistance of the capitalists has been completely broken up, when the capitalists have disappeared, when there are no classes (i.e. when there is not difference between the members of society as regards their relations to the social means of production), only then does ‘the state cease to exist’ and it becomes possible to speak of freedom”.¹⁰⁾ Freedom, as perceived in the Western World (the real democratic world) is not the same as the Marxist-Leninist interpretation. Masherov described freedom in the World Marxist Review as follows, “(s)ocialism . . . rejects the distorted

idea of freedom of the individual which bourgeois propaganda usually associated with egoistic and individualistic aspiration. The price of such freedom is the alienations of the individual from society, morality from humanism, conscience from reason . . . Only socialism and communism assent genuine freedom by assuring every citizen real opportunities to create the present and future for the good of the society and for his own good".¹¹⁾ Vasely state that, "'True' and 'genuine' freedom exist only where 'capitalist' exploitation is abolished, . . .".¹²⁾

The Marxist-Leninist (ANC/SACP) self-acclaimed custodians of the Freedom Charter must state clearly whether their interpretation of the concept "prosperous or free" coincides with the abovementioned approach. The time has come for them to stop misleading South Africans.

1.4 "Democratic State"

Democracy in the Western world is seen as so-called bourgeois democracy which according to Marxist-Leninist thinking is not "true democracy". Does the ANC/SACP alliance envisage a Western world-type democratic state, or a so-called "Socialist Democratic state". Lenin said, ". . . in capitalist society we have a democracy that is curtailed, wretched, false; a democracy only for the rich, for the minority. The dictatorship of the proletariat will, for the first time,

create democracy for the people, for the majority, in addition to the necessary suppression of the minority — the exploiters. Communism alone is capable of giving really complete democracy, and the more complete it is the more quickly will it become unnecessary of itself".¹³⁾

Democracy which is the basis of a "democratic state" is explained in Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, as follows: "(a)s for socialist democracy, it is not directionless democracy, but directed democracy, i.e. democracy directed by the party and the state in the interest of the further development of socialism and the building of communism".¹⁴⁾ It is clear that Marxist-Leninists are of the opinion that democracy can only be instituted by them. A belief further reinforced when they state: "(w)hile exposing the fraud of bourgeois democracy, the communists remain convinced champions of democratic ideals. They are against bourgeois democracy precisely because they are protagonists of genuine democracy, democracy for the people, which can be won only as a result of the liquidation of the exploiter system".¹⁵⁾ The proposed "democratic state" will thus be a communist state, which in real terms means a dictatorship. "History confirms that dictatorship and democracy could very well go together. Being a dictatorship in relation to certain classes, the state can at the same time be a democracy in relation to others".¹⁶⁾

No freedom will prevail in a socialist "democratic state", Stalin said: "(i)t is an impossible policy of course to preach general political freedom: during the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat (the so-called democratic state) there can be no policy of universal freedom in our country, i.e. no freedom of speech, press, etc".¹⁷⁾ Vyshinsky wrote in, **The Law of the Soviet State**: "(i)n our state, naturally there is not and can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on. . .".¹⁸⁾ The Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter then envisage a so-called democratic state devoid of freedom for all South Africans. This envisaged "democratic state" contradicts any liberal interpretation of the Freedom Charter.

1.5 "Democratic Changes"

"Democratic changes" in Marxist-Leninist semantics, are closely related to their interpretation of Democracy, and the method of bringing about this so-called "democracy". Democratic changes can only, according to Marxism-Leninism, be brought about by a violent revolution, — this revolution will transform the political, economic and social components of society. In Third World countries, such as South Africa, it also includes a so-called "national liberation revolution": "(a) modern national liberation revolution does not deal directly with socialist tasks during its initial stage. Its main aim is liberation

from colonialism and **democratic change**".¹⁹⁾

The ANC/SACP, who perceive themselves as the custodians of the Freedom Charter, are internationally recognised as a so-called "National Liberation Movement", who are the driving force behind a national liberation revolution. In claiming that they are custodians of the Freedom Charter, it is obvious that "democratic changes" to them means a violent revolution and not a free, multiparty parliamentary democracy. "The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the outcome of the peaceful development of bourgeois society (western society) and bourgeois democracy. It can only arise as the outcome of the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucracy, and bourgeois police force".²⁰⁾

When analysing certain crucial concepts in the Preamble of the Freedom Charter, it becomes evident then, that should the interpretation and implementation of the Freedom Charter be left to the Marxist-Leninist orientated ANC/SACP alliance, the freedom they proclaim is the very antithesis of the western concept of "democratic freedom".

2. THE PEOPLE SHALL GOVERN!

"Every man and woman shall have the right to vote for and to stand as a candidate for all bodies which make laws;

All people shall be entitled to take part in the administration of the country; The rights of the people shall be the same, regardless of race, colour or sex; All bodies of minority rule, advisory boards, councils and authorities shall be replaced by democratic organs of self-government”.

At face value this clause is seemingly legitimate and without any hidden agenda. But, as discussed previously, the concept “people” does not imply all individuals in South Africa, it refers to the revolutionary minority, the Communist Party. This party represents within Marxist-ideology, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin stated that: “(t)he dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule of one class, which takes into its hands the whole apparatus of the new state, which vanquishes the bourgeoisie and neutralises the whole of the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the lower-middle class, and the intelligentsia”.²¹⁾ The proletarian government can only be brought about, through violent revolution. The ANC/SACP alliance has stated clearly that the people shall govern after a successful armed revolution has put an end to the state of affairs and an “Assembly of the people” has been created.²²⁾ This implies a so-called “people’s democracy” which, “. . .ensures participation by the workers and all working people in administration of the state, electivity and rotation of the working people’s representatives on governmental bodies, the unity of legislative and executive

power, establishment of the state administrative system based on the principle of democratic centralism and leadership by the Communist party.²³⁾

This clause of the Freedom Charter possesses a universal appeal, but, the perceptions and intentions of its Marxist-Leninist custodians differ radically from this universal appeal. The ANC/SACP’s hidden agenda corresponds with the universal appeal of the Soviet Union’s constitution on paper, which in practise is quite the opposite. The political system envisaged consists of a one-party dictatorship, which in no way represents the authentic ideals of democracy. “The leading nucleus of the political system is the Communist Party. Under socialism it is in power and is a ruling party”.²⁴⁾

Every man and woman shall have the right to vote for and stand as a candidate for all bodies which make laws, (The Communist Party), and no other party because there will be no opposition due to the fact that they (the opposition) are perceived as so-called counter-revolutionaries, and will naturally be eliminated.

The universal appeal of “the people shall govern”, is not universally appealing when the intentions and perception of the Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter are carefully analysed and put in perspective.

3. ALL NATIONAL GROUPS SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS!

“There shall be equal status in the bodies

of state, in the courts and in the schools for all national groups and races; All people shall have equal rights to use their own languages, and to develop their own folk culture and customs; All national groups shall be protected by law against insults to their race and national pride; The preaching and practice of national, race or colour discrimination and contempt shall be punishable crime; All apartheid laws and practices shall be set aside."

In the political system which the ANC/SACP envisages, all individuals shall be equal because they will be oppressed by a small communist minority, which will be known as the communist party, or as the dictatorship of the proletariat. The utopia of "developing folk culture and customs" will not materialise because it will be contradictory to the "socialist culture", which the ANC/SACP alliance will force onto all individuals in South Africa. It is stated in the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that: "(c)ommunist culture, which will have absorbed, and will develop all the best that has been created by world culture, will be a higher stage in the cultural progress of mankind. It will embody the versatility and richness of the spiritual life of society, and the lofty ideals and humanism of the new world. It will be the culture of a classless society, a culture of the entire people, of all mankind".²⁵⁾

The noble intentions of this clause will only be noble on paper if the

Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter are allowed to implement them, in South Africa.

4. THE PEOPLE SHALL SHARE IN THE COUNTRY'S WEALTH!

"The national wealth of our country, the heritage of South Africans, shall be restored to the people;

The mineral wealth beneath the soil, the banks and monopoly industry shall be transferred to the ownership of the people as a whole;

All other industry and trade shall be controlled to assist the well-being of the people;

All people shall have equal rights to trade where they choose, to manufacture and to enter all trades, crafts and professions."

This clause clearly advocates socialism, and the ANC has stated that these goals can only be achieved when the existing state has been changed completely. They have also stated that: "(s)ome groups, like the liberals, have the illusion that real democracy can be achieved within the existing constitutional setup. They believe that the repeal of certain laws on the statute book is sufficient. Such a purely reformist attitude is unrealistic and takes no note of history".²⁶⁾ The prerequisite for the achievement of the goals stipulated in this clause is a violent and revolutionary transformation of society in South Africa, which totally negates the concept of freedom for all individuals in South Africa.

The goals stipulated in this clause are Marxist in nature, and can only be achieved in a communist dominated state. Production and the means of production will be transferred into the hands of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the practical consequences of the redistribution of wealth, will merely culminate in the **redistribution of poverty.**

The ANC/SACP alliance has stated clearly that the goals set out in this clause, "...would remain a dead letter without the restoration of the basic wealth of the country to the people (the communist party), and without that the building of a democratic state (Marxist-Leninist state) is inconceivable".²⁷⁾

5 THE LAND SHALL BE SHARED AMONG THOSE WHO WORK IT!

*"Restrictions of land ownership on racial basis shall be ended, and all the land redivided amongst those who work it to banish famine and land hunger;
The state shall help the peasants with implements, seed, tractors and dams to save the soil and assist the tiller;
Freedom of movement shall be guaranteed to all who work on the land;
All shall have the right to occupy land wherever they choose;
People shall not be robbed of their cattle, and forced labour and farm prisons shall be abolished."*

Analysing this clause according to Marxist-Leninist semantics clearly indicates an agrarian-type revolution, where the ultimate aim is the transfer of landownership from private to that of

the Communist Party. "Only an agrarian revolution, whose object is to expropriate large estates, can set in motion the enormous peasant masses: is destined to exercise decisive influence on the struggle against imperialism".

Goals set out in this clause cannot be achieved in a truly free and open society, it will only be possible in a communist controlled society and this is one of the reasons why the ANC/SACP Marxist-Leninist alliance portray themselves as the custodians of the Freedom Charter. They deliberately misled the masses in 1955 when they formulated the Freedom Charter, realising the benefits of promoting a document whose principles are both vague and yet seemingly reasonable to anyone unaware of its Marxist-Leninist interpretation,

6 ALL SHALL BE EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW!

*"No-one shall be imprisoned, deported or restricted without a fair trial;
No-one shall be condemned by the order of any Government official;
The courts shall be representative of the people;
Imprisonment shall be only for serious crimes against the people, and shall be at re-education, not vengeance;
The police force and army shall be open to all on an equal basis and shall be helpers and protectors of the people;
All laws which discriminate on grounds of race, colour or belief shall be repealed."*

The opening statement in this clause, viz that all shall be equal before the law, is a situation that all civilized and right-minded people strive for. Nevertheless, the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of what is implied by the concept of "Law" differs radically from its Western interpretation, as indicated in Vyshinsky's article on, "The Law of the Soviet State" which states that: "(M)arxism-Leninism gives a clear definition (the only scientific definition) of the essence of law. It teaches that legal relationships (and, consequently, law itself) are rooted in the material conditions of life, and that law is merely the will of the dominant class, elevated into a statute. It starts from the proposition that political, legal, philosophical, religious, and literary development is defined by — and is a superstructure over — economics".²⁹⁾ This is a clear indication that the Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter perceive equality before the law, as stated in the Freedom Charter as equality before the law of a revolutionary minority.

The task of a lawyer in a so-called "Socialist Democratic State" is a further indication of what is really meant by the concept of "equality before the law". It has been clearly stated in the **Literary Gazette** of Moscow, that the role of a lawyer involves the following: "(i)t is necessary to give up once and for all the ridiculous ideas of some sort of special lawyer's ethics which by virtue of the peculiarities of the profession justifies a departure from the principles of

communist morality and rules of socialist intercourse which are compulsory for Soviet people. A Soviet lawyer cannot confine his task merely to the interests of the client, as a separate isolated person, but must always think in the first instance of the interests of the people's, the interests of the state"³⁰⁾, and "(i)n the role of lawyer in the work of individual citizens, (the Soviet lawyer) struggles for establishment of the truth, guiding himself by state and public interest. The procurator, representative of the state prosecution, and the judge, who carries out justice, pursue that same goal".³¹⁾

"The courts shall be representative of all the people" in Marxist-Leninist terminology indicates that: "(s)ince the court is one of the organs through which the dominant class exercises its rule, it cannot be outside of politics; what is more, the activities of the courts are always political activities. In our Soviet state, measures are taken to see to it that the court is in reality a conductor of the policy of the communist party and the Soviet regime. The independence of the judges referred to in Article 112 of the Stalin Constitution does not and cannot signify their independence of politics".³²⁾

Within the same ideological parameters, the Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter, fail to guarantee the independence of the judiciary, a cornerstone of any normal and free society; and nor does it guarantee a fair trial to any individual who will appear before a so-called

“people’s court”. This clause of the Freedom Charter does, therefore not propose freedom, but structural and constitutional enslavement, as defined by Marxist-Leninists.

7 ALL SHALL ENJOY EQUAL HUMAN RIGHTS!

“The law shall guarantee to all their right to speak, to organise, to meet together, to publish, to preach, to worship and to educate their children; The privacy of the house from police raids shall be protected by law; All shall be free to travel without restriction from countryside to town, from province to province, and from South Africa abroad; Pass Laws, permits and all other laws restricting these freedoms shall be abolished.”

The aims and intentions of the law as perceived by Marxist-Leninists were discussed in the previous section, and the mere fact that so-called “human rights” shall be protected by law, is a clear indication that human rights as advocated in this clause does not represent human rights that exist in a normal society, which is both free and open. The pass laws have been scrapped in the abnormal society under Apartheid and indications are that all laws restricting human freedom will also be abolished, when creating a normal society that will be free from both racial discrimination and a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship.

8 THERE SHALL BE WORK AND SECURITY!

“All who work shall be free to form trade unions, to elect their officers and to make wage agreements with their employers; The state shall recognise the right and duty of all to work, and to draw full unemployment benefits; Men and women of all races shall receive equal pay for equal work; There shall be a forty-hour working week, a national minimum wage, paid annual leave, and sick leave for all workers, and maternity leave on full pay for all working mothers; Miners, domestic workers, farm workers and civil servants shall have the same rights as all others who work; Child labour, compound labour, the tot system and contract labour shall be abolished”.

This clause is a clear indication of socialism in practise. It is a known fact that trade unions in Marxist-Leninist states are the actual organs controlling the workers and that only state controlled trade unions are allowed to function in industry. In Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism the role of the trade union is described as follows: “(t)he trade union occupy an important place in the state of the proletariat dictatorship. From organs of struggle against capital they became the most active assistants of the state power of the working class, a reserve which supplies leading cadres and a source of practical proposals for improving things. Defining their role after the seizure of

power, Lenin said that the trade unions were a school of administration, a school of management, a school of communism".³³⁾

In the dictionary of Scientific Communism trade unions are defined as: ". . . mass organisations and the movement of the working class and other strata of the working population for protection of their political and economic interest".³⁴⁾ This clearly indicates that the trade union is first and foremost an instrument of state power, because of the rule of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The trade union will in actual fact be in no position to bargain for better wages and working conditions for the worker, due to the fact that the state is the employer and it controls the trade unions.

The goals set out in this clause of the Freedom Charter becomes irrelevant when interpreted from a Marxist-Leninist (ANC/SACP alliance) viewpoint. This alliance will not be in a position to implement the goals that are set out in this clause of the Freedom Charter, they will only enslave most individuals in South Africa for a second time.

9 THE DOORS OF LEARNING AND OF CULTURE SHALL BE OPENED!

*"The government shall discover, develop and encourage national talent for the enhancement of our cultural life;
All the cultural treasures of mankind shall be open to love their people and their culture, to honour human*

*brotherhood, liberty and peace;
Education shall be free, compulsory, universal and equal for all children;
Higher education and technical training shall be opened to all by means of state allowances and scholarships awarded on the basis of merit;
Adult illiteracy shall be ended by a mass state education plan;
Teachers shall have all the rights of other citizens;
The colour bar in cultural life, in sport and in education shall be abolished."*

Within the Marxist-Leninist interpretation, "the doors of learning and culture shall be opened", implies that the educational system will be based on their (the states) parameters of education. Education implies: ". . . installing in the youth the Marxist-Leninist outlook on the world, on the social life, on the role and position of man and his behaviour in society. It means installing in them a materialistic world outlook based on a scientific and materialist philosophy, alien to any superstitions or mysticism, seeking no escape into 'other world', alien to any diversion from real life and. . . inspiring them with confidence in their own power and with a knowledge of the conditions and means of victory".³⁵⁾

These educational parameters do not include religious education. "Freedom of conscience for believers must not be converted into a denial of the freedom of the community and the state to interfere decisively in matters of family education. Parents must be made to

answer for any anti-social (anti-communist), religious education of the children in the family. This responsibility must be not only of a moral but also, if the interest of the state require it, of a legal nature".³⁶⁾ **Why is Freedom of Religion PER SE not mentioned in the Freedom Charter?** Could it be that the three or four people who drafted it, perceived a Marxist-Leninist state as the ultimate outcome of the Freedom Charter? Within the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of this clause of the Freedom Charter, the utopian goals regarding education are not worth the paper they are written on.

10 THERE SHALL BE HOUSES, SECURITY AND COMFORT!

"All people shall have the right to live where they choose, be decently housed, and to bring up their families in comfort and security;

Unused housing space to be made available to the people;

rent and prices shall be lowered, food plentiful and no-one shall go hungry;

A preventive health scheme shall be run by the state;

Free medical care and hospitalisation shall be provided for all, with special care for mothers and young children;

Slums shall be demolished, and new suburbs built where all have transport, roads, lighting, playing fields, creches and social centres;

The aged, the orphans, the disable and the sick shall be cared for by the state;

Rest, leisure and recreation shall be right of all;

Fenced locations and ghettos shall be abolished, and laws which break up families shall be repealed."

The goals that are set out in this clause are utopian absurdities. The belief that the state and only the state capable of addressing the "needs" of people in society, is an assumption which relegates individuals to the whims and dictates of a faceless and prying bureaucracy. This clause is a clear reflection of Marxist-Leninist goals, which in its practical implication means the total centralisation of state power and the means of production. The private sector will not be in a position to accomplish any of the abovementioned goals. The state will have to increase taxation dramatically fulfil these goals, which will lower standard of living.

All the freedoms achievable in a normal society are ignored in this clause. This clause is misleading, because, while the ultimate goals are out, South Africans are not informed the price (their individual rights) they will have to pay, to achieve these objectives.

There will definitely be **no security and comfort** for the individual if the accomplishment of the abovementioned goals is left to the state. This clause of the Freedom Charter is a classical Marxist-Leninist propaganda stunt, making promises they can never keep!

11 THERE SHALL BE PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP!

“South Africa shall be a fully independent state, which respects the rights and sovereignty of all nations; South Africa shall strive to maintain world peace and the settlement of all international disputes by negotiation — not war; Peace and friendship amongst all our people shall be secured by upholding the equal rights, opportunities and status of all; The people of the protectorates — Basotuland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland — shall be free to decide for themselves their own future; The right of all the peoples of Africa to independence and self-government shall be recognised, and shall be the basis of close co-operation.”

What do the Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter mean or imply by the concept “peace”. Peace and the defence thereof is seen by Marxist-Leninists as the struggle against capitalism and so-called Western imperialism.³⁷⁾ Lenin said: “(w)e cannot wiggle out of an imperialistic war, we cannot have a democratic peace, but only a peace imposed by violence, until we overthrow the power of capitalism, until the power of government passes into the hands of a different class, the proletarian class”.³⁸⁾ Peace, according to Marxist-Leninist semantics, is a continuation of War until all individuals of the world have been enslaved by Communism. “Enduring peace is not an obstacle to, but an invaluable ally of

revolution. And, conversely, every revolutionary gain makes for more effective resistance to the forces of war, and is a guarantee of universal security. The link between the two, peace and the class, revolutionary struggle, is a key aspect of communists’ historical optimism”.³⁹⁾

The ANC/SACP alliance has also stated that the socialist democratic state they envisage will support all revolutions against Western democracy (which they see as capitalism and imperialism) to achieve world peace.⁴⁰⁾ This is a clear indication that they support the following Marxist-Leninist definition of peace: “(t)he conviction that communism and peace are indivisible has been firmly established in the people’s consciousness. The struggle for peace is a most important factor in the struggle for socialism. It has now been proved, not only in theory but also in movement of the working class, the national liberation movement, cannot be divorce from the struggle for peace. . .”.⁴¹⁾

Friendship according to the Marxist-Leninist dialectical interpretation can only be achieved amongst socialist states. Within their interpretation of “peace” it becomes evident that peaceful coexistence; which is the basis of friendship amongst states does not imply friendship with other states if they do not adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. It has also been stated in *Izvestiya* (the USSR propaganda mouthpiece) that: “(t)here is not and can be no friendship of

people's, no such real equality of rights for nations, in conditions of capitalism. The capitalists and their servants are stirring up hostility between the peoples and intensifying social and national oppression".⁴²⁾ The Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the concepts "peace" and "friendship" as stated in the Freedom Charter is not the same as its interpretation in normal societies. Peace and friendship then will only become a reality between states and between individuals once all vestiges of capitalism and bourgeois consciousness (individual liberty) has finally been destroyed. The Marxist-Leninist custodians of the Freedom Charter are misleading all South Africans, and the time has come for all freedom loving South Africans to **demand** from the ANC/SACP Marxist-Leninist alliance, that they release their hidden agenda and their amended Freedom Charter.

CONCLUSION

When analysing crucial concepts in the Freedom Charter it becomes clear that this document can be interpreted in many different ways. For this reason it is of utmost importance to question the validity of the Freedom Charter, and most of all, the intentions of those self-acclaimed custodians of the Charter who are ideologically and theoretically speaking not incorrect in attributing their own interpretation to the Freedom Charter. However, it is important that these custodians make their interpretation and hidden agenda

publicly known for all South Africans to discuss and evaluate. Misleading South Africans into supporting the Freedom Charter and failing to openly declare their envisaged so-called Freedom Charter-based South Africa, is a crime against all South Africans.

Against the backdrop of this Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the Freedom Charter, it becomes evident that the ANC/SACP Marxist-Leninist alliance is not in a position to implement the Freedom Charter in a normal and free society. Claiming that they are the true and authentic custodians of the Freedom Charter leaves all rational South Africans with no option, but to simply reject the Freedom Charter.

Until the ANC/SACP Marxist-Leninist alliance publicly state their interpretation of the Freedom Charter, release their hidden agenda and their amended Freedom Charter, the Freedom Charter as it is known must be rejected, because all South Africans have been misled. South Africans should remember the following dictum: **When the ANC/SACP Marxist-Leninist alliance asks you for freedom they do it because it is your convenience and principle. When you ask them for freedom they will not grant you freedom, because it has never been one of their concepts or principles.**



The Impact of Sanctions and Disinvestment on Free Enterprise in South Africa

Mr Leon Louw

Executive Director: Free Market Foundation

The free market position on sanctions and divestment (or disinvestment) is very simple. Voluntary sanctions by anyone, against anyone, anywhere, for any reason, are consistent with free enterprise. Coercive sanctions, imposed by a government, are always and anywhere in conflict with free enterprise. Free enterprise means simply the absence of government interference in the form of ownership or control in economic activity.

From a free market point of view, if a multinational decides to invest in, or withdraw from, South Africa voluntarily, its decision is legitimate regardless of how much one might disagree with their reasons. Given this clear and unambiguous free enterprise position, it is curious that at no time in the international sanctions debate have conservative or liberal groups objected solely on the grounds that government imposed sanctions would be an unwarranted interference in the economy and economic freedom of the country concerned. To the extent that anti-apartheid groups pressurise multinationals to withdraw, there can be no free market objection unless they use

illegitimate methods of persuasion, such as threats of violence or intimidation. A belief in freedom and free markets and a belief that others may have valued behaviour which one strongly disapproves of as long as there is no invasion of free market rights. So for the strictly, value-free, free market position. What are the broader implications?

1. BROADER IMPLICATIONS OF SANCTIONS AND DISINVESTMENT

On a free market analysis, both the international sanction and disinvestment laws in the USA, are essentially the same as the Comprehensive Anti-apartheid Act in the USA, are essentially the same as protectionism and foreign exchange control. The only real difference is that the former is imposed by a foreign government and the latter by a domestic government. The economic consequences are the same. The laws of economic reality, like the laws of gravity in physics, produce the same results from a given interference in the economy regardless of who imposed it or for what it was intended.

Accordingly, it can be predicted that

the consequences of sanctions and divestment will be similar to the effects of protectionism and foreign exchange controls. This has serious implications for both sanctioneers/divestees and their opponents, investors, both of whom seem to have been seriously mistaken throughout the debate. The former have had unrealistic high hopes of what could be achieved, and the latter have been unduly neurotic. Orthodox free market analysis predicted precisely what seems to be happening. Like protectionism and exchange control, sanctions and divestment are likely to produce short-term stimulative effects. Whilst they are unlikely to be the cause of the current economic euphoria — with various indicators of economic growth, a booming stock exchange, and a rising Rand — it is probably no coincidence that the two coincide. I have been told by staunch sanctioneers that they are frustrated and disappointed. Most commentators say that “sanctions have failed”. To free marketers, they have not, in the same that they have had predictable consequences.

Amongst the reasons why sanctions are a short-term economic stimulant, much like protectionism, is that new market opportunities arise for local entrepreneurs, such as import substitution. With divestment, foreign investments are “dumped” at bargain prices for local investors. Indeed, a particular frustration for divestees is that there seems to be no “satisfactory” way to divest. **Divestment of the first**

kind, (à la the sale of Barclays Bank to Anglo-American) is a bitter blow to divestees, most of whom see South African “monopolies”, of whom Anglo is the acetype, as a far greater “evil” than foreign investment.

Divestment of the second kind, (à la the GM management buy-out) means that new, white multimillionaire South Africans take over with very little changing — except, from the divestees perspective, the distressing result that ownership is transferred from “good” people (who divest) to “evil” people (who invest in South Africa). And then, the new owners are no longer impelled to support social programmes such as the Sullivan Code. They become free to sell vehicles (in the GM case) to the South African police and defence force.

Divestment of the third kind, (à la IBM sale to employees) has the effect that little changes other than the name and that because of the nature of the new ownership — including “workers” — action against the multinational for maintaining a distribution network is difficult to justify.

Divestment of the fourth kind, (à la the Coca Cola sale to a black-owned consortium) is lamented because blacks who are willing to buy a multinational subsidiary, are “collaborators”. It is collaborators above all who are to be punished. Certainly not turned into overnight millionaires.

Divestment of the fifth kind, (à la Kodak shutting up shop and leaving)

is, to divestment purists, the "correct" thing to do. But there has been much anguish about the inevitable consequences. Employees, mostly black, are turned out onto the streets to join the unemployed. In Kodak's case, an impressive network of black self-employed photographers had been created. They were being serviced and trained by Kodak. They were naturally left high and dry. Social programmes were summarily terminated. "Evil" competitors now move into the vacuum with relish. The Kodak trademark may, depending on how the courts will interpret the law, be up for grabs by anyone who wants to exploit Kodak's immense reputation. The effects are typical of divestment of the fifth kind.

Divestment of the sixth kind, (à la American churches and universities selling their stock in multinationals with South African interests to other Americans) seems to do no more than, at best, depress the share price in the USA, usually only fractionally. "Good" US stockholders can no longer influence company policy, which is now left to the "evil" ones who refuse to divest. Even more "evil" investors who buy the divested shares at discount prices come on board. Whilst depressing the share price in the USA might penalise the "bittereinder" multinational to a greater or lesser extent, it is doubtful whether there is a detectible impact on South Africa.

In short, divestment of every kind, in the real world, seems to be a pyrrhic

victory for its advocates. The question becomes, in most cases, not whether divestment is good or bad, but whether it is possible.

It turns out that divestment, however desirable or undesirable, may not be possible, except in rare cases, and there may not be a way of doing it that satisfies divestees. This no doubt accounts for so many crossing the floor to join the gloating investees or, at least, putting divestment on the back burner. With sanctions, paradoxes that free market analysis predicted have also arisen. Sanctions whether of imports to or exports from South Africa, do not, and in most cases probably never can, stop trade. The best that can be achieved for the transactions cost, as is known in economics, to be increased, usually only marginally. It becomes more difficult and costly to engage in foreign trade. It doesn't stop it. This has precisely the same effect as an import or export duty. Sanctions on imports of South African goods are like tariff barriers in foreign countries and like various duties the South African government imposes on exports. Sanctions on exports to South Africa are like South Africa's own tariffs and import controls, though less effective.

2. SOUTH AFRICA'S REACTION AND THE EFFECT OF SANCTIONS ON FREE ENTERPRISE

If one wants to be facetious, one could ask why governments who adopt

protectionist and foreign exchange controls intending to benefit their countries, should predict that by imposing them on South Africa, the economy would be harmed. Or why the South African government opposes "assistance" by foreign governments in the application of its own policies. Even more bizarre is the appetite in high places in South Africa for responding to sanctions/divestment by intensified protectionist and foreign exchange controls i.e. self-imposed sanctions/divestment. There is a serious prospect that more damage will be done by the South African government response than by the initial action, since the South African government is much better placed to enforce foreign trade barriers on South Africa than foreign governments. Much more serious is the prevailing "siege economy" impulse. By far the biggest danger on the horizon is that the South African government will "stimulate" (i.e. inflate) the economy by printing money, increase taxes and generally derail the economy just when freer markets are needed more than ever. We find ourselves in a weird Polyanna world in which the anti-apartheid movement rejoices at its success in generating unprecedented international action against the South African government, and their opponents rejoice at the economic euphoria setting in now that "sanctions have failed".

Having said all of this, it is not my intention to lampoon or underestimate

the importance of sanctions or the potential impact on both free enterprise and the economy in general. It seems likely that 1987 will see the peak of the sanctions campaign and the possible adoption of dramatic measures by foreign governments. On my visit to the USA last month I met with highly placed people in the forefront of the battle. The consensus was that the USA is likely to adopt legislation that amounts to cutting off all trade and investment ties, even the freezing of foreign bank accounts. Some EEC countries seem likely to adopt extreme measures and some analysts predict mandatory United Nations sanctions. It seems likely that sanctions legislation could become severe enough to have the impact intended, but my guess is that this is unlikely. It seems to me that the impact could never be more severe than intensified foreign trade and foreign exchange barriers of the kind applied by many governments like that of Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe has intensive self-imposed sanctions, and yet its economy is performing satisfactorily. Whilst damage is done, the economy is not destroyed and the government survives.

The South African government will have the enviable advantage in the fullness of time being able to blame foreign governments for whatever damage is done to the South African economy either by them or by itself. Its counterparts in other countries have to bear the responsibility for the

state of their own economies. Again an extraordinary paradox presents itself in terms of which the South African government could manage the economy disastrously though blamelessly. If sanctions/divestment do cause harm, most of it will probably be attributable to South Africa's self-imposed sanctions/divestment rather than that of foreign governments.

Free marketers, being at variance with conventional wisdom on these matters, do caution investors not to be so smug, so cock-a-hoop, at their apparent unexpected victory, thanks not to their wisdom, but the laws of economics. It seems likely that the stimulative effects of sanctions/divestment will be temporary. The real damage will strike in due course — say, two years — when international activists will not be able to claim a belated victory as they emerge from a period of licking their wounds and regrouping. Attention will be distracted from doing what is necessary to appease international pressure, namely, finding and implementing a genuine solution quickly. When the damage does strike, it will be too remote to link cause and effect. No doubt the economic slump that may ensue will be attributed to the “imperfections of the free market” and the “inevitable” trade cycle. There will be the usual clamour for the use of government instruments to “stimulate” the economy. More of the treatment that

made the patient sick will be administered. There will be more blood-letting — in both senses — and, maybe, the patient does eventually die.

My own objective assessment is that the international pressure for sanctions/divestment did serve the interests of those concerned in the same way that the sport and culture boycotts have done. It seems as if the pressure on South Africa did encourage reform. But when the Presidential veto was overruled, this seemed to backfire. Attention was shifted from reform to overcoming sanctions and maximising security.

Prominent sanctioners tell me that those who still advocate sanctions, do so for two reasons. A handful believe that intensified sanctions can indeed bring the government to its knees. Many ex-sanctioners now believe they have actually strengthened the government's position as witnessed by the election results. The second reason for intrepid sanctioner survivors is the desire to “make a statement”. To “do something”.

3. THE FUTURE OF FREE ENTERPRISE IN SOUTH AFRICA

What of the immediate future of free enterprise in South Africa? Firstly, though not obviously, the need for the South African economy to be purposefully and urgently deregulated and privatized not only remains, but all the more crucial. Secondly, of course — any change — such as

sanctions/divestment creates unprecedented entrepreneurial opportunities. Entrepreneurs being what they are, do not need to be told this. Creative and energetic minds are at work finding ingenious ways of benefiting from the situation. Economics being what it is, every endeavour to do so minimises the impact of sanctions/divestment. In economic terms, competition amongst sanctions-busters lowers the transaction costs that sanctions legislation imposes on foreign trade. Sadly for sanctioneers, white South Africans are best placed in terms of their experience and resources to take up these new opportunities. The only hope for sanctioneers is therefore that in some undefined way "the system" will indeed collapse, so that these gains will be short lived. To my knowledge sanctioneers have never explained by what process, by what scenario, sanctions are supposed to work. Nor have their opponents done so. So sanctions/divestment fervour and neurosis are both unsubstantiated. As some sanctioneers told me, they are frustrated because they seem to be getting the worst of all worlds. Foreign governments are reluctant to impose fully-fledged sanctions and to enforce complete divestment in areas where it would cause significant harm to their own economies. In the absence of a total severance of all South African trade and investment, these measures (a) do not appear to achieve their intended objective; (b) appear to

stimulate the South African economy; (c) benefit "villains" and penalise "virtue"; (d) induce whites to "rally behind the government"; (e) divert attention from reform to repression; (f) disillusion South African blacks who have sacrificed much for "the struggle"; and (g) provide the government with a watertight defence against the effects of economic mismanagement.

4. CONCLUSION

It is easy to say, and so let me say it, that a real, lasting and satisfactory solution must be found with or without sanctions. A "solution" can only be called a solution if it is acceptable to the vast majority of South Africans of all races. It is said that politicians see where the crowd is going, get in front, and say, "Follow me". The only short-term hope, it seems to me, is to identify constitutional provisions that overcome simultaneously white fears and satisfy black demands. It is this which seems so impossible. And yet, I believe that there is a realistic set of principles upon which consensus can be achieved, and that could form the basis for negotiation. These principles entail a strictly limited and depoliticised central government; intensive devolution of power to numerous second, third and fourth tier governments; a truly effective-and extensive bill of rights protecting not only civil liberties but also such rights as property rights and the right of

association and disassociation; an effective and independent judiciary; direct democracy through referenda; and other democratic checks and balances against the abuse of power. But this is not the place to elaborate. Suffice is to say that we need to shift from the struggle for power to the struggle for freedom, properly defined.

Mark Twain wrote: "The trouble with people is not their ignorance; it is the number of things they know that ain't so." And UCLA philosopher, John Hospers, responds to most conclusions that: "It ain't that simple". In speculating on the subject of this article, I am constantly haunted by the dicta of Twain and Hospers. On both sides there are people who know so much "that ain't so", and to whom I say "it ain't that simple". I am reminded of the other trite saying that: "One should not make predictions — especially not about the future!" So, I have done no more than to speculate

on the possible and usually counter-intuitive impact of sanctions/divestment; than to show that both are inconsistent with free enterprise *per se* if coercive in nature; than to argue that neither are likely to than to argue that neither are likely to achieve the intended, and feared, effects. Enterprise, as distinct from free enterprise, is having a field day by capitalising on new opportunities and finding ways to duck and dive, twist and turn, its way through, around and past. Now that more and more observers are concluding that "sanctions/divestment have failed" — albeit that they may be mistaken in that they do not distinguish between the short and long term effects, as we have seen — we are left with another conundrum with which to close off: **the only thing we know for sure is that the future isn't what it used to be.**

Leon Louw is Executive Director of the Free Market Foundation and an internationally recognised expert on South African issues. He is the author of numerous published articles and papers on economics, politics and law. His latest book "South Africa: The Solution" was recently the number one, non-fiction, bestseller in South Africa.

South Africa's Black Community and Socialism

Dr P Nel

Director: Institute for Soviet Studies, University of Stellenbosch

INTRODUCTION

"The vast majority of black workers favour the free enterprise system and are not inherently inclined to socialism or communism."

These words of Chief Mangosutu Buthelezi spoken during a Industrial Relations Seminar in Durban in July 1986¹⁾ contrast starkly with the other claims made by various sources, some as disparate as the South African Communist Party, COSATU and the Free Market Foundation. In the 2nd quarter of 1986-edition of **The African Communist**, the SACP published a statement, titled; "The ideas of socialism are spreading" in which it claimed that "as a result of a growing class consciousness among. . . workers . . ., the ideas of socialism are spreading among the workers and enjoy rising popularity".²⁾

About the same time, Joe Slovo wrote that: ". . .the historically evolved connection between capitalist exploitation and racist domination in South Africa creates a natural link between national liberation and social emancipation (read: socialist reconstruction): a link which is virtually too late to unravel. An increasing

awareness of this link by more and more of our people is evidenced by the growing popularity of our party".³⁾

In equally apocalyptic words Mr Cyril Ramaphosa, the General Secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers, late in 1986 claimed: "It is too late for free enterprise to save South Africa. Workers are now demanding a socialist system".⁴⁾

Mr Leon Louw of the Free Market Foundation despondently declares: ". . .virtually all propaganda to which blacks, especially in the labour movement, are exposed is so-called 'class analysis', i.e. socialism/communism/Marxism. Every black newspaper, magazine, periodical, pamphlet, charter, political figure and so on, with few exceptions, is in the Marxist idiom, often unwittingly".⁵⁾

What is to be made of these contradictory claims? Which is correct: the Buthelezi view that socialist ideas have not made inroads on black conceptions, or that of the SACP/NUM/COSATU? Most importantly, does the evidence suggest that the despondency of Mr Louw is justified, or are there still windows of opportunity for corporate strategy to

forestall the drift towards socialism amongst black employees?

This article aims to provide some answers to these burning questions. I claim no special expertise to do so. I am not an industrial relations expert and my knowledge of business practices is, to say the least, dangerous. Yet I believe any sensible person can do what I intend doing, **and that is to take a hard nosed look at the available evidence and to conclude from that what the real extent of socialist sympathies in South Africa's black community are.** The first two sections of my article will present this account.

I have to point out that a similar, more restricted attempt to do what I intend to do has recently been made by Lawrence Schlemmer in **Indicator SA**.⁶⁾ From those of you who have read Prof Schlemmer's article, I ask forbearance since I do touch on some issues not raised by him, although our conclusions coincide. It is especially in the third part of this article, in which I consider some of the pressures for a socialist choice in the black community and raise some suggestions about corporate strategy to deal with this, that I go beyond his article.

1. The Drive for Socialism

Since at least the 1950's, black spokespersons have emphasized that meaningful change in South Africa must include some measures to redistribute wealth on a more equitable basis. What is important to note,

though, is that most of these persons took great care to distinguish their desired models for doing so from a full scale socialism on Marxist-Leninist lines. Robert Sobukwe, founder president of the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), for example, declared in the 1950's: "Economically, we stand for a planned economy and the most suitable distribution of wealth. Our problems, as we see it, is to make a planned economy work within the framework of a political democracy. It has not done so in any of the countries that practice it today, but we do not believe that totalitarianism is inherent in a system of planned state economy".⁷⁾

On the side of supporters of the Freedom Charter (which the PAC is not) care was taken to distinguish between communism/socialism and the economic measures proposed by the Charter, an interpretation endorsed by Justice Rumpf in the Treason Trial of 1956-1961.⁸⁾

This distinction between what can be called a social democratic policy of redistribution and full scale socialism was carried over into the 1970's. To again quote representative examples from otherwise wide ranging black opposition groups:

In an interview with **Africa** (Nov 1973), Reginald September, at that time Chief Representative of the ANC in Europe, responded thus to a question about the ANC's economic ideals: "Question: *What ideological future do you visualise for South Africa? Will it be*

a socialist country?

September: A socialist democratic South Africa.

Question: Marxist?

September: No, not necessarily Marxist".⁹⁾

Steve Biko, one of the founders of Black Consciousness in SA, and who has been accused of radical socialist tendencies, declared: "The Black People's Convention believes in a judicious blending of private enterprise which is highly diminished and state participation in industry and commerce, especially in industries like mining. . . and forestry, and of course complete ownership of land. Now in that kind of judicious blending of the two systems we hope to arrive at a more equitable distribution of wealth".¹⁰⁾

By 1985, due partly to increasing frustration; partly to rising revolutionary expectations; and, partly to the prevalence of Marxist class analyses of the South African situation, this moderation has made way for a seemingly widespread black commitment to full socialism. Indications in this regard are:

a) In a recent (September 1985) country-wide survey of 800 Black respondents over sixteen years of age, including workers, unemployed, women, students and pensioners, in all ten major metropolitan areas, Mark Orkin of the Community Agency for Social Enquiry found that 77% of the respondents favoured socialism as an economic strategy, while only 22% favoured capitalism.¹¹⁾ These findings, if

accepted (this will be questioned later), indicate a significant radicalization trend when compared with similar findings in 1981. Then, the Market Research Departments of the **Pretoria News, The Star and The Argus**¹²⁾ found that of all the Black respondents in the Johannesburg, Cape Town and Durban areas, only 32% agreed with the statement that the state should own mines and big industries, while 42% disagreed. (The respective figures for Johannesburg alone were 20% agreeing and 56% disagreeing, while Cape Town had 35% agreeing, 17% disagreeing and Durban 49% agreeing and 35% disagreeing. Unskilled Africans favoured state ownership by a margin of 37% to 35%). Even more alarmingly, the Orkin-survey found that 70% of Inkatha members surveyed in 1985 favoured a socialist future.

b) In another 1985-survey, Dr JA Jacobz of the HSRC's Institute of Manpower Research¹³⁾ found that 41% of Black respondents in the PWV area (a major metropolitan area in South Africa) opposed the idea that business undertakings should be privately owned. This compares with the abovementioned Argus-group survey which found that in 1981 only 20% of the respondents in Johannesburg supported the idea of state ownership. Again this superficially indicates a hardening of Black attitudes.

c) On the basis of a survey which is well known, UNISA's School of Business Leadership found that "a great deal of ignorance about business and Free Enterprise exists among corporate

employees in South Africa. Such ignorance is particularly predominant amongst the less-educated, unskilled and semi-skilled workers. These workers regard themselves as grossly discriminated against in terms of remuneration and perceive the Free Enterprise system as . . . beneficial solely to the white managerial staff. Such perceptions of gross inequality. . . do not auger well for the future of industrial relation in this country".¹⁴⁾ (Black employees indicated that they believed 69% of post-tax profit goes towards management bonuses and salaries, 27% to financial and capital investments, only 4% towards bonuses and salary increases for workers, and 0% towards shareholders).

d) Fourthly, important Black spokespersons recently came out much stronger than in the past in favour of a full scale socialist transformation in South Africa, or at least a deep-going restructuring of the economy to allow for a massive re-distribution of wealth. Some trade unions and their leaders have been most explicit about a socialist transformation. During their 1986 congress all 300 delegates from the Metal and Allied Workers Union (33 000 members) unanimously declared **"We are committed to building socialism"**.¹⁵⁾ In an interview with SASPU NATIONAL (No 9/1986) Chris Dlamini, vice-president of the 600 000 strong federation COSATU declared: "What we are talking about is the total change of the present system in its entirety. This change can never be

expected to come about as a result of . . . change of heart from Big Business or a softening of attitudes by the regime".¹⁶⁾

In addition it should be recalled that COSATU President Elijah Barayi argued forcefully in favour of nationalizing mines during the November 1985 launch of COSATU. One of the expressed aims of COSATU, incidentally, is: "To work for a restructuring of the economy which will allow the creation of wealth to be controlled and fairly shared".¹⁷⁾

Commenting on their talks with the ANC and SACTU in late 1985, Jay Naidoo, the general secretary of COSATU added: "I expressed very clearly to them (ANC/SACTU) our commitment to see a society which was not only free of apartheid, but also free of the exploitative, degrading and brutalizing economic system under which black workers suffered. This meant a restructuring of society so that the wealth of the country would be shared among the people".¹⁸⁾

e) Outside the trade union movement, explicit calls for a socialist type transformation have emerged from the Black Consciousness Movement, members of the UDF, various Trotskyist organizations and the Black youth. As far as the BCM is concerned, the Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO) has gradually moved away from a more populist stance in the late 1970's and has accepted the "black working class" as the agent of revolution. Together with the Cape Action League, brought together, in 1983, 200 odd BCM

movements and trade union groupings such as CUSA to form the National Forum Committee which i.a. passed the following resolutions at its inception on 11-12 June 1983: "The struggle waged by the toiling masses is nationalist in character and socialist in content"; and

"The Black working class is the vanguard of this just struggle towards the total liberation from racist capitalism".

At the same meeting an "Azanian Manifesto" was accepted which i.a. claims: "Our struggle for national liberation is directed against the system of racial capitalism, which holds the people of Azania in bondage for the benefit of a small minority of white capitalists and their allies, the white workers and the reactionary sections of the black middle class. . . The struggle against apartheid is no more than a point of departure for our liberation efforts. Apartheid will be eradicated with the system of racial capitalism".¹⁹⁾

In consequent working documents, AZAPO and the NF have spelled out their unambiguous socialist vision and have indicated concrete measures to be adopted in this regard.²⁰⁾

On the other side of the Black political spectrum, i.e. in the so-called Charterist Movement, different kinds of socialist rumblings can also be discerned. Although most affiliates of the UDF still subscribe to a more social democratic interpretation of the economic clauses of the Freedom Charter, dissenting voices are coming to the fore. Important media such as **Work**

in Progress and the **SA Labour Bulletin** are used to air these dissenting views which are basically of two kinds. Both are pressing for a more clear-cut commitment to socialist ideals, but are doing so via two different channels. The first argues that the real socialist content of the Freedom Charter should be acknowledged. Against the argument that the Freedom Charter's political and social demands are primarily of a bourgeois-democratic nature, this approach argues that these demands reflect working class desires for a grassroots democracy in South Africa. It furthermore argues that all the economic demands of the Freedom Charter can be construed as the basics of a socialist transformation; alternatively as a set of minimum working class demands.²¹⁾

The other, more prevalent, approach argues that the Freedom Charter is not socialist enough. It points out that the Freedom Charter was formulated in the 1950's, in the heyday of liberal and social democratic influence in the liberation movement, and had as its audience a real multi-class alliance. Since then the working class has, however, made considerable progress, capitalism, has been unmasked as the unmitigated bedfellow of apartheid, and that real freedom can thus be obtained only through an immediate addressing of economic exploitation. It rejects the classical notion that liberation is a distinct two stage affair; firstly political and secondly economic, and argues for a fusion of the second stage with the

first. In conclusion it calls for a reformulation of the Freedom Charter to incorporate these immediate socialist ideals.²²⁾

Full-blown socialist rhetoric has also surfaces from another source, namely the nascent Trotskyist movement in South Africa. This is centered around the elitist Marxist Workers Tendency (MWT) in the ANC (disavowed by the ANC and expelled in 1985), the Cape Action League of Neville Alexander, and the New Unity Movement (launched in 1985). The central thesis of this seemingly growing tendency is summarized by Alexander in these words: "Because of the peculiarities of capitalist development in South Africa, the only way in which racial discrimination. . . can be abolished is through the abolition of the capitalist structures themselves. The only class, however, which can bring into being such a socialist system is the Black working class".²³⁾

On the specific tactics to be employed these three groups differ. For the MWT the ANC must first be transformed into a mass working class, socialist party, while Alexander, as Cape Town Director of SACHED, views propagandist and educational activity as the immediate task. The latter is also true of the NUM (National Union of Mineworkers).

Lastly, mention should be made of the economic radicalization that has taken place amongst the Black youth, the real power house of the current phase of Black resistance politics. As has been

noted by a respected educationist Ken Hartshorne, one of the major difference between now and the disturbances of 1976 is the socialist content of educational demands being made by schoolchildren in their propagation of a "People's Education". While in 1976 access to equal education and other minor grievances were the focus of action, socialist curricula are now actively propagated as preparation for a new South Africa.²⁴⁾ A recent SACP comment has this to say on this score: ". . . greater numbers of the youth (are) being won over to the socialist perspective. This is of great importance, given the reality that the youth form a sizeable portion of the working class and the population in general, as well as the outstanding role they are playing in the revolutionary struggle, in all its formations".²⁵⁾

2. Evaluating the evidence

Judged superficially, the above evidence tends to give credence to a premonition that black resistance politics have become over radicalized, that the most important trade unions are in toto committed to socialism, and that it is only a question of time before a socialist revolution descends on South Africa.

In this section I would like to take issue with the conclusion that the black commitment to socialism is so widespread that we have reached the point of no return. No matter how hard Marxists and other utopianists try to convince us, there are no historical

inevitably. There are however abundant examples of people in history who have failed to fully understand trends and have not acted in time to address these. I can only hope that South African businessmen and other decision-makers will not in future be referred to, as another example.

The central aspect is that the evidence referred to, neither individually nor taken together, gives any conclusive indication that the majority of employees are totally committed to socialism. To prove this, reference has to be made to the abovementioned section.

a) The most startling piece of evidence is of course that presented by Mark Orkin's survey which found a 77% support for socialist ideals. Yet if one looks at the scientific merits of this survey many reasons to doubt its legitimacy can be advanced. Firstly, Orkin bases his startling conclusion on only one question right at the end of his questionnaire. No care has been taken to slip in a control question. In addition, it is well established that the sequence of questions, especially on highly emotive issues, does have a leading effect. In this case the respondent has been led through a whole series of questions which stack the deck in favour of resistance politics to the detriment of reconciliation politics. Most important though, is the specific wording of the question on which the finding is based. The exact question was:

“Question 9

Suppose South Africa had the

government of your choice. There are two main patterns how it should organize people's work, and the ownership of factories and business. Which view do you most support?

— the capitalist pattern, in which businesses are owned by private businessmen, for their own profit.

— the socialist pattern in which workers have a say in the running of businesses, and share in the ownership and profits.

Apart from restricting the choice to two, the phrasing of the question is obviously very much in favour of the socialist choice. Such a leading question can surely not be regarded as the basis for a scientifically sound conclusion.

b) Other, more scientific surveys do indicate increasing opposition to the idea of privately owned businesses if compared with similar findings in 1981 (from 32% to 41%). It is, however, instructive to look at reasons given by the respondents why business undertakings should not belong to private persons or privately owned companies. Of all the respondents, only 5,7% gave as their reason that the state should own business, while another 5% claimed that private ownership is not in the interest of the public. Thus roughly 10% of the total number of respondents favoured a socialist strategy.

In addition it has be recalled that almost an equal number of respondents in the HSRC survey favoured private enterprise. Again different reasons were given, but 43% of this group indicated that they believe this is morally justified,

11% believed private companies have the skills to conduct business proficiently, 9% believed private companies are financially strong enough. Something that may give rise to concern is that only 8,2% believed privately owned companies eventually contribute to the common good.

Mention should also be made of two surveys done by Prof L Schlemmer; the findings of which fully support my perception. To steer clear of the capitalism-apartheid link in South Africa, Schlemmer asked questions referring to a hypothetical African state ruled by a black government: In 1981 21% of these respondents (being urban blacks in the Transvaal and Natal) favoured state ownership by a black

elected government while 78% preferred private ownership. In 1984 18% of this group (urban industrial workers in the Transvaal and Eastern Cape) favoured state ownership while 60% preferred private ownership. Thus although there was an increase in the number who were unsure, 3% less supported state ownership in 1984 than in 1981. In 1982 he did an identical survey under black migrant workers country-wide, 48% of the respondents favoured state ownership, but this can be explained by their more marginal status as migrant workers in South Africa's economy. The majority did, however, prefer private ownership (52%).²⁶⁾ (See Table 1 for a summary of all recent survey results.)

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RECENT SURVEY RESULTS OF BLACK PREFERENCES OF ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

	Favour Capitalism	Favour Socialism
1. ORKIN'S SURVEY (1985) — Inkatha members	22%	77% (70%)
2. ARGUS-GROUP SURVEY (1981)	Opposed to state ownership of mines and big industries	Favour state ownership of mines and big industries
(Johannesburg)	42% (56%)	32% (20%)
(Cape Town)	(17%)	(35%)
(Durban)	(35%)	(49%)
3. HSRC SURVEY (1985) PWV-area	Prefer private ownership of business 40,7%	Prefer state ownership of business 41,6%
4. SCHLEMMER'S SURVEYS	Hypothetical country: Prefer private enterprise	Hypothetical country: Prefer state ownership
— 1981 (Urban blacks Transvaal and Natal)	78%	21%
— 1984 (Industrial workers in Tvl and Eastern Cape)	60%	18%
—1982 (Migrant workers, country-wide)	52%	48%

Thus, in general, scientific surveys indicate that socialist tenets are not well received amongst the black working class as Orkin would like us to believe.

c) Addressing the policies of some resistance groups and statements of black spokespersons, it is obvious that for the greater part, overtly socialist programmes are restricted to the typically elitist type organizations. So far Trotskyite groups such as MWT, New Unity Movement and CAL have established no significant base in the black communities. So small is their support that Orkin's survey amongst urban blacks in 1981 did not even list these as one of the groups that respondents could choose. Although very prolific publicists, Trotskyites surely form a very small minority in the black community.

The same applies to the AZAPO/National Forum Alliance. According to Orkin's survey, only 1% of the respondents favoured AZAPO and its youth movement AZASM. In addition the National Forum claims allegiance of an unspecified number of mostly anonymous affiliated organizations, yet has not really emerged as a national movement if compared with the UDF. Its socialist programme is extremely intellectualist and it has no proven grassroots support. If anything, evidence such as the 1981 Argus group survey reveal a bias amongst AZAPO supporters against full scale nationalization strategies.

As far as overtly socialist tendencies in the UDF conglomerate are

concerned, these have so far been restricted to mostly White intellectual publicists. There are no indications of a significant UDF move to amend the Freedom Charter to make provision for more explicit socialist ideals. The same holds true for the ANC. Recent meetings between businessmen and the ANC revealed an absence of intransigence on economic policy, while a rising star such as Thabo Mbeki recently quite emphatically distanced the ANC from the label "socialist". Even Joe Slovo, while still holding on to the ideal of eventual full socialism, has, in a recent interview, been much more pragmatic than we are sometimes led to believe the SACP is. Asked about future economic strategies, he said: "I believe that one of the cliches we must avoid about a future South Africa is the one that is so easily thrown about by the far Left in our conditions, of the immediate leap forward into an egalitarian socialist millennium as the immediate consequence of the destruction of the racist state. We are going to face the most enormous economic complexities in South Africa, which will require a really delicate balance to be achieved between a number of imperatives. Among those imperatives is the need to begin to change the relations of production while continuing to supply the people with their daily needs and ensuring that the economy does not fall into chaos".²⁷⁾

d) I have indicated that prominent trade union leaders and their advisors are openly advocating a socialist future.

Extrapolating from what we have learnt about general black perceptions, it may be surmised that shopfloor sentiment may be less radical than those of the leadership-elite. Some indications in this regard are supplied by the HSRC survey already quoted. According to this survey 73% of the black respondents, mostly workers, regarded the bargaining for better wages and working conditions as the primary aim of trade unions, with only 9,5% dissenting; 47,9% discounted politics as a legitimate concern for trade unions, while 30,3% did see a political role for trade unions. There seems therefore, to be at least a marginal gap between the members and their leaders about the radicalization of the trade union movement.

e) One area of definite concern, though, is the commitment to socialism amongst the Black youth, and especially schoolchildren. Although no hard evidence on any side is available, no counter-factuals can be advanced to modify the earlier conclusion that socialist rhetoric is very much part of the call for "people's education".

There is, thus, enough verifiable evidence to indicate that, apart from schoolchildren, the commitment to full scale socialism may not be so prevalent in South Africa's black community as was summarily concluded in the previous section of this article.

Indeed it can be argued that black's vision of a future economic system is subjected to the same kind of "dual consciousness" their general political visions are. As Theodor Hanf has

pointed out, "empirical studies of black South African attitudes have revealed significant contradictions. In 1977 a majority felt they were unhappy. A slightly larger majority felt that they would be very happy ten years later" (that is now — recent surveys have indicated a slightly less, yet still predominantly optimistic view of the future).

Hanf continues: "Since 1977 black anger and rage have increased dramatically (and) . . . the prestige of black protest movements, especially that of the ANC has grown considerably. Such findings may be interpreted as revolutionary expectations. But other findings are incompatible with these. A broad majority of blacks expect their leaders to practice moderation and patience". (Many) "are opposed to disinvestment, and are prepared to share power with the whites under some future dispensation".²⁹⁾ Although almost a quarter of the black population by 1986 has come to accept violence as a viable means to effect change, and up to 40% support the ANC and Mandela, the majority still believes in peaceful changes. (In Orkin's survey only 40% of ANC supporters condoned armed struggle.)

This duality seems to apply in the case of economic ideals as well. While calls for a redistribution of wealth is predominant — even in moderate circles such as NAFCOC and Inkatha, full scale socialism still seems to be a generally less favoured model than a kind of mixed economy with an increased level

of social responsibility. As can be deduced from Table 2 there is a strong sentiment amongst blacks for a state role in the provision of housing, medical services and unemployment benefits. Yet, significantly large numbers of respondents did not favour the exclusive state option, and for very good reasons. On the question of state owned housing, eg., 1% of all respondents preferred private freehold.

Perceptions, however, do change with time. At present the lingering economic recession, high inflation, rampant unemployment, rising political expectations, and tremendous propagandistic pressures may swing black perceptions drastically in favour of socialist ideals. Utopias tend to thrive in adverse economic conditions. If our present economic system cannot adequately address black aspirations, no one can blame them for being mesmerized by alternatives. Pure

unmitigated socialism may well be a dying breed in the first world and even behind the iron and bamboo curtains. It still has, however, enormous growth potential in South Africa if present trends are not addressed and turned around.

3. Some Thoughts on Corporate Strategy

Without being pedantic, I would like to suggest in this last section some ways and means to ensure black allegiance to an economic system which values private entrepreneurship.

Since Project Free Enterprise's first report, excellent work has been done by management to increase the awareness of black employees about the advantages and dynamics of the market system. My first point, though, is that these educational projects should be conducted with great sensitivity towards the traditional and historically

TABLE 2

HSRC SURVEY — 1985: THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE

	Agree	Disagree
State should supply medical services	43,9%	46,4%
State should own and provide all the housing in a country	61,1%	26,2%
Government has a responsibility to help support families, eg in the form of cheap or free housing	62,1%	26,2%
State should provide financial support for unemployed	60,0%	30,2%
The more services government has to provide, the higher taxes get	52,3%	32,5%
If the government needs more money for the development of eg black housing and education, taxes of the higher income group should be increased	43,0%	41,6%
The state should fix a minimum wage	54,9%	35,2%

developed resistance of blacks towards an anarchial society in which they regard themselves as the losers. Instead of starkly contrasting and exclusive choices, black employees and management should rather be subjected to programmes which stress the compatibility of welfare practices with entrepreneurial skills and market forces coupled with programmes of black advancement. Before this can be done, though, top management and shareholders themselves must be convinced of the merits of an integrated, problem-orientated, mixed economy. Wolfgang Thomas' idea of a "social market economy" recently published in *SOUTH AFRICA INTERNATIONAL* (October 1986), seems to be a fruitful model in terms of meeting both the aspirations of black employees and white entrepreneurial concerns about growth and productivity potential.

Secondly, management will have to accept that a huge part of their problem is a political one. As Joe Slovo correctly pointed out, the more blacks become convinced that sham political reform do not address their immediate social and economic needs, the more they will be prone to accept radical restructuring of the political and economic system as the only alternative. I have much appreciation for the determined way in which some business leaders have recently tackled the government on the issue of reform. Cynical employees may, however, justifiably ask where all these voices were before 1984, and even more

important, what has happened to business pressure since the state of emergency has made "business as usual" possible again.

Surveys indicate that black employees expect much more political pressure on the government from their employers. It may just be that greater political credibility of the business ethic among black employees.

I think the business sector should be actively involved in one of our most problem areas, i.e. the alienation of the black youth. As we have seen, socialist ideas today have a fertile breeding ground amongst this highly politicized section of our population. We also have to recall that the black youth has a proven capability of disrupting vital sectors of the economy, and that the "young comrades" of today are the potential managers whom our economy will so desperately need ten to fifteen years hence.

One possible bold move in this regard may be that the business world become involved in the funding and execution of alternative curricula, respectively "people's education". Given the fact that socio-economic issues will anyway feature prominently in these programmes, the business community can just as well try to play a moderating role if its programme facilitates an open and balanced discussion on the merits and shortcomings of various models.

It is not too late to contemplate an Education Foundation, structured along the lines of the Urban Foundation. Credibility may be an initial problem.

but if conducted on a big enough scale, and endorsed by enough of the black leaders, this may be overcome. Another major stumbling block may be the bureaucratic intransigence of the Department of Education and Training (DET). Fortunately both the Minister and his deputy have not written off people's education as such. Given the assurance that the proposed programme may have a moderating effect on the long run, it may get their blessing, although it will be unwise to involve a government department directly.

Finally, every manager and employer will have to realise that his or her daily actions probably play the biggest role in determining the attitude of black employees towards the economic system.

Respected surveys convincingly show that daily experiences of discrimination, sub-standard wages and disregard for social security and housing needs are the most immediate concept formation influences on black employees. It is absolutely inexcusable when companies, in this late stage, still gamble with South Africa's future in this irresponsible way. I am well aware that there may be good

and moral reasons why minimum wage levels will be counter-productive in terms of employment maximisation. Yet management practices can only be sound if they adequately address the need of our black community for decent living conditions. If these are not provided by the private sector, the considerable black pressure for state welfare schemes will only further increase from their already high level (See Table 2). As a recent much to be recommended look on black advancement in the South African economy indicates²⁹⁾, business in general can still drastically improve on its track record in this regard.

It is useless, if this task is tackled sporadically and individually. What we need is a collective responsibility by all business leaders in this regard, as well as a self-policing system which can ensure that company Z does not wreck all the good work done by companies A to Y. Has the time for an indigenous Sullivan Code, of fair employment practices, hammered out and supervised by all the major employer movements in South Africa, not arrived?

Fallacies of South African Disinvestment

Michael Johns

*Assistant Editor, Policy Review
The Heritage Foundation*

The current campaign being waged against the Republic of South Africa and the leadership of President P W Botha has many of the earmarks of a well thought-out and orchestrated propaganda effort devised to undermine yet another American ally in yet another strategic region of the world. By now the frightening scenario should be familiar to even the most callow policy analysts.

First, the Western left finds or creates an issue in an allied nation under which it can rally its forces. Traditionally, these issues have been somewhat similar. Under Cuban President Fulgencio Batista, the issue was corruption. Under the Shah of Iran, it was human rights violations. And under Nicaraguan President Anastasio Somoza Debayle, it was a combination of both.

Next, they enlist popular support by unleashing their radical Philistines and sending them into the streets to demand that under the euphemism of "compassion", we must disinvest with the ally in question, place an arms embargo on them, and sever diplomatic and cultural ties immediately.

The result, of course, is always the same. The Western ally, faced with growing outside pressure and a perceived lack of internal support, is violently overthrown by a militant regime hostile to the West, allied with the Soviet Union, and far more corrupt, barbaric, and totalitarian than any previous leadership could have hoped to have been. The American actions, far from being "compassionate", end up facilitating the ascendancy of Leninism and expansionist-orientated dictatorship, increased human rights violations, and serving a serious blow to the geopolitical state of the West.

It is relatively easy, though, to view the current demonstrators, calling for economic sanctions and disinvestment in South Africa, as benevolent human beings earnestly concerned about the evils of that country's racial policies. In an effort to bring apartheid to an end, they argue, the West should place sanctions on South Africa, launch boycotts and embargoes, ostracize South African athletes, musicians, and artists, eliminate all cultural ties, and support the South African opposition. On the

surface, this seems to be a rather reasonable agenda set forth to put an end to the heinous evils of apartheid which we all abhor. Aside from prescribing the wrong medicine for the disease of apartheid, there is only one problem with these activists: they reek with the stench of pure hypocrisy.

After all, aren't these the same liberal activists who respond to continued communist brutality and aggression — which, relative to South African apartheid, is far less pragmatic, far more overwhelming and brutal, and whose expansionist doctrine presents a significant threat to the free world's very survival — by proposing **increased** cultural and scientific relationships, more extensive trade agreements, academic exchanges, and "less anti-communist rhetoric and more common understanding".

Indeed, in a world dominated by totalitarianism, one wonders why these people seem only concerned with violations — big or small — committed by our allies.

One would like to ask the disinvestment crowd where they were as the Communist dictatorship of Angola was running hundreds of black resisters through large circular saws lengthwise? Where were they as Soviet repression of Russian Jews intensified and thousands were thrown into gulags for not renouncing their faith? Where

were they as Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge were massacring over a third of the Cambodian population and forcing nearly all the rest into slave labour camps? Why weren't these protesters leading demonstrations outside the Soviet embassies and consulates after that government ruthlessly shot down a Korean passenger plane killing all of the 269 civilians aboard? Where are the cries on behalf of the people of Afghanistan, one million of whom have been massacred at the hands of an invading Soviet army? Why are these gadflies seemingly unconcerned with the horrid persecution of blacks in Communist Mozambique and Zimbabwe?

Why haven't they lead disinvestment campaigns against the brutal Communist dictatorship of Angola, where multinational American oil companies are upholding the regime against the will of the people and providing the necessary funds for the government to support the presence of over 45,000 Cuban, East German, and North Korean troops installed to suppress democratic uprisings in that country? Why not disinvestment with Red China whose government policy of infanticide is more than well documented?

The answer to these many questions is a simple one: The South African disinvestment campaign is not really

interested in opposing human rights violations or even furthering the economic, social, and political prosperity of blacks in South Africa. The leaders of this movement are only interested in turning public opinion on American allies and providing the necessary setting for their eventual overthrow.

Ironically, disinvestment would only further penalize South African blacks, many of whom fled economic and political persecution in totalitarian African nations for haven in South Africa, and make the dissolution of apartheid even more difficult. Instead, the West should attempt to remodel its South African policy by recognising that it is through color-blind employment practices of US companies and continued economic growth, that we can strike the biggest blow to the evil system of apartheid.

Indeed, universities and other stockholding institutions, if they truly want to "do something" about apartheid, should increase their portfolios with equity in business which are playing such a constructive role in South Africa. Likewise, US multinational firms should make an effort to increase their operations, net output, and number of South African employees in the country.

In the long run, these action will result in increased economic power for

South African blacks, and hence, an increase in the possibility for social and political reform. Capitalism, when unleashed from government restraints, is a moral force which can and is putting an end to apartheid. The reason for this is rather basic: Capitalism and apartheid are simply incompatible. Capitalism is based on the concept of freedom of movement, reasonable freedom of government intervention, and the ability to enter and exit from the market place freely. Apartheid contradicts these concepts. In essence, either apartheid or capitalism will eventually triumph in South Africa. America would do well to encourage the latter. By discouraging capitalism, through disinvestment and embargoes, we stand only to strengthen the forces of apartheid and authoritarianism.

Furthermore, while disinvestment may be favoured by liberals and black organisations in the West, polls reveal that South African blacks stand almost united against it. A recent poll by South Africa's respected polling analyst, Lawrence Schlemmer, reveals that more than 75 percent of South African blacks oppose disinvestment as a means of bringing about an end to apartheid. This should not come as any surprise. The presence of foreign firms has improved the economic and social status of South African blacks to the point that their status exceeds that of almost any other

nation on the entire African continent.

The future of South Africa is very much undetermined and American policy toward her, no doubt, will play a key role in that future. History shows that American withdrawal from our allies, either economically or diplomatically, serves only to open the door to brutal Communist expansionism. In South Africa, the Soviet-backed African National Congress is already poised to exploit any opportunity for violent advancement. Their triumph would be

the worst possible scenario for South African blacks resulting in economic despair, similar to other black dictatorship on the African continent, increased human rights violations, and a permanent suspension of all civil liberties. Furthermore, it would be an enormous blow to the West and the democratic cause.

Before it is too late, America would be wise to consider the many fallacies and dangers of disinvestment and devise an alternative to abolishing apartheid without abolishing the Republic itself.