

What Is Required to Uproot Oppression?

*Strategic Problems of the
South African Resistance*

The problem of how to uproot oppression effectively with minimal casualties and maximum long-range benefits to the liberated people still remains without an adequate solution. The people of South Africa have long awaited its resolution. Although this chapter is an edited synopsis of four articles published in 1963, with only a few changes and additions, its major points are, in 1980 - seventeen years later - still as relevant as when they were written, despite certain very limited new signs of Government flexibility.

In whatever way the South African conflict may be finally resolved, many people throughout the world will continue for many years to face the general problem of how to uproot oppression. It is hoped that- this chapter will raise questions and suggest possible

directions for consideration by people who are still seeking more adequate answers to the question of what is required to end oppression.

* * *

The situation in South Africa is now a desperate one. The Government, backed by the "opposition" United Party, * has for years increased its dictatorship over the predominantly non-European population. Every means of change has been dammed up. The flood waters are rapidly rising. For South Africa there is no way out which does not involve severe suffering and bloodshed. If nothing is done the situation will grow worse, and the constant suffering of the people and violence of the Government will increase, contributing finally to a terrifying explosion. Whether nonviolent or violent means of resistance are used, great suffering will be incurred by the non-European people. Anyone who opposes action on the grounds that it will lead to suffering is profoundly ignorant of the situation. The problem is how to act effectively to change that situation, and whether the suffering will help to achieve a free, humane society.

This chapter is an attempt to contribute to an understanding of that problem, and thereby shed some light on its solution. My aim, therefore, is not to "judge" or "condemn" or "instruct" but to contribute a few thoughts to the general quest for a solution. The problem of South Africa is one for all humanity. We all have much to learn from the South African experience.

In seeking a course of action we must accept the fact that no matter what is done, there will be a hard core of Afrikaners who will never agree voluntarily to the abolition of apartheid. One must also accept that many European South Africans are so committed to their position of power and wealth that they will continue to react to every challenge, by whatever means, with increased rigidity. One must, therefore, expect that they will respond by vigorous repression, and that the abolition of apartheid and European domination will come only after a protracted struggle.

*The United Party collapsed in 1977 as the result of internal dissension. Two new parties were created: the New Republic Party and the South African Party. Other former United Party members joined the Progressive Reform Party, which was renamed the Progressive Federal Party, now the second largest party in the country.

Simple moralizing about how to deal with this problem will not suffice. A course of action is required. In addition to specific methods of action in particular situations, attention must be given to the tactics to operate in particular phases of the struggle, and to the overall strategy to guide the course of the struggle.

A consideration of some of the problems of an overall strategy should include three areas:

1. How to achieve the maximum strength and involvement in the struggle by the non-Europeans, mainly the Africans. *
2. How to split some of the Europeans from support for the Afrikaner Nationalists and European domination, and move them toward action in support of the non-Europeans.
3. How to bring the maximum international pressures to bear on the South African Government toward change compatible with the self-determination of the South African people as a whole and their future development.

There are two main techniques of struggle which could be applied by the non-Europeans of South Africa: some form of revolutionary violence, or large-scale noncooperation and defiance without violence - that is, nonviolent action. The violence would probably follow the general model of the Algerian struggle, a type of terrorist guerrilla warfare. An exact model for the nonviolent alternative does not exist, although there are experiences and thought both within and without South Africa on which to draw.

RECONSIDERING THE EFFICACY OF VIOLENCE

The pendulum has swung heavily in favor of violence. "On all sides now there is a fatalistic acceptance of the inevitability of vio-

*Despite the time-honored practice of referring to persons of European descent as "white" and of African descent as "black," I have resisted this. These terms are themselves a product of a racist society, and make it inevitable that we see not the actual color variations with infinite gradations - which make dichotomous racism extremely difficult - but instead two clear separate groups. That makes racism, and its practices of prejudice, discrimination, slavery, segregation, and apartheid thinkable, and therefore possible. The view of reality behind our words often has grave consequences when it results from false preconceptions, distorts reality, and is a precursor of disastrous practices.

The term "non-Europeans" was used by the Unity Movement to refer to Africans, Cape Colored people, Indians, and other Asians.

lence," wrote Colin Legum in *The Observer*. "The long period of support for [African National] Congress's methods of nonviolent struggle (as embodied in Chief Luthuli) is past. All talk now is about the tactics of violence, no longer about its relevance."¹ Bitterness, frustration, and helplessness build up to the point where a violent explosion becomes almost inevitable. The past failure of nonviolent action to achieve major victories leads to its rejection. The Government attempt to prevent all forms of protest leads to the understandable feeling that one must strike back.

Despite widespread lip service, the world's response to the non-Europeans' pleas for economic boycott and political, diplomatic, and cultural ostracism of the Afrikaner Government has been pitifully small, so that non-Europeans naturally become disillusioned with the potential of such means. Despite some gestures, the world's nonviolence movement has been unable to offer any major assistance, whether in the form of spearheading the international boycott or by providing helpful information and analyses of problems of resistance, or consultants (where wanted) to contribute to the consideration of serious strategic and tactical problems in an effective nonviolent struggle.

Although they have obviously been inadequate, significant and sacrificial efforts to apply nonviolent struggle have been made by the non-Europeans. No one would deny that if a peaceful way out of the situation were believed possible, they would choose it.

Nevertheless, the doctrinal approach of salvation by violence has gained such a following that fair consideration of alternative courses of action may not be given unless the adequacy of violence is challenged on strategic grounds, and unless certain qualities of nonviolent action are examined. This consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of violent and nonviolent action is often difficult because of impatience with intellectual analysis of revolutionary problems and because of justified distaste for the vague generalizing and moralizing which has often been poured out by exponents of nonviolent means.

There are important reasons for not accepting the inevitability of the resistance movement's relying upon violence to achieve victory. It is not sufficient to have an emotional release of hatred in acts of violence, any more than it is enough to have a growth of self-respect in the person defying the government in nonviolent action. Consider-

ation must also be given to the way in which the proposed course of action will contribute to the success of the movement.

Recognition of the difficulties and dangers of a future struggle by nonviolent resistance, and of the inadequacy of the past nonviolent movement, is not in itself an argument in favor of adopting violence. It is also necessary to consider the difficulties and dangers of a future struggle both by guerrilla warfare and terrorism and also by possible new types of nonviolent struggle. If a responsible consideration of the alternatives is to be made it must include a comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of each technique of struggle, and a consideration of whether the disadvantages of each can be overcome or are counterbalanced by other factors. There is little evidence that this is taking place. Colin Legum wrote that "the loss of faith in the efficacy of the old methods does not always go with a realistic assessment of the chances that violence might prove to be equally unsuccessful."²

So many difficulties and dangers are involved in the choice of struggle by violence in South Africa that a reconsideration of its efficacy is now merited alongside an exploration of whether a struggle by nonviolent means can be developed which is more effective than that of the past. While military superiority does not guarantee victory ----, especially in guerrilla warfare - it is important to note that the South African Government possesses vast military superiority over anything that the non-European South Africans could hope to muster, barring extensive and highly dangerous international intervention.

Indeed it is in many ways an advantage to the South African Government for the non-Europeans to resort to violence. This provides the excuse for extremely harsh repression which could produce still further demoralization among the Africans, Cape Colored people, Indians, and other Asians. It has been suggested that in at least one instance the government may already have deliberately provoked violence by the use of agents provocateurs at the end of the 1952 Defiance Campaign of civil disobedience. The riots between 18 October and 9 November 1952 - while the campaign was at its peak - resulted in the deaths of six Europeans and thirty-three Africans. This greatly helped the Europeans to identify the nonviolent campaign with the violent African Mau Mau movement in Kenya - and thus counter the tendency of some Europeans to sympathize with it.

The riots also helped crush the spirit of resistance among the non-Europeans. In October 1952, for example, 2,354 volunteers defied apartheid laws, while in November and December combined, only 280 did so. This violence was not the only factor involved in the collapse of the movement. (Fear of increased severity of sentences was important, as were, it is suggested by some, internal activities of Communists within the movement.) Yet, said Leo Kuper in his study of this campaign, "Clearly the riots played a decisive role." They also "provided the opportunity for the government to take over the initiative and to assume far-reaching powers with some measure of justification."³

The killing of African demonstrators at Sharpeville on 21 March 1960 is often cited as a justification for abandoning nonviolent action. This view is, however, based upon a lack of understanding of the dynamics of nonviolent action. (It is not widely remembered that the shootings at Sharpeville began after some Africans broke nonviolent discipline, throwing stones at the police, and that this was preceded by a riot at Cato Manor not long before, which may have made the police more jumpy, and may have increased their brutality at Sharpeville.) It was, however, precisely because the killings were perceived as committed against peaceful unarmed demonstrators that there was aroused in South Africa and throughout the world such deep feeling and vigorous protests. Had the same number of Africans been killed in police firings against an undisciplined mob invading a European residential area to commit arson and murder there would have been no such reaction. Compare, for example, the attention and protests aroused over the deaths of less than a hundred Africans at Sharpeville with the indifference to the deaths of any particular hundred Algerians in the Algerian struggle.

The murders at Sharpeville revealed, to those who had not yet realized it, the real nature of the South African Government and its policies. Immediately following this there was very considerable international support for the boycott programs. In Norway, flags all over the country were flown at half-mast after Sharpeville. This was symbolic of its impact - an impact that would have been sharply reduced if the South African Government could have shown that those shot were terrorists rather than courageous nonviolent demonstrators. Witness, for example, the comparatively small reaction to the executions of the Poqo terrorists.

COSTS AND EFFECTS OF NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE

There are some very naive conceptions about the nature of nonviolent resistance prevalent among both its advocates and opponents. It is not true that if opponents of a regime struggle nonviolently the oppressive regime will be nonviolent too, and quietly acquiesce. It is not true that by being nonviolent one avoids suffering and sacrifices. It is not true that if the opponent reacts with brutal, violent repression, the struggle has been lost and the movement defeated. It is not true that the nonviolent way is an easy way.

Quite the contrary. One must expect that if the non-Europeans resist by nonviolent but militant means, there will be suffering and deaths. This is in part a consequence of the very violence of the social and political system which is being attacked. And violent repression is in part a tribute to the power of nonviolent action and a recognition of the threat it poses to the continued existence of that system.

At the time when the opponent intensifies his repression, the resisters must demonstrate great courage and not only continue but also increase their resistance. This has not always taken place in South Africa. This willingness to persist despite repression produces political jiu-jitsu. That is, the government's supposed greater power is made ineffective and turned to its own disadvantage. The repression of nonviolent people tends to alienate sympathy and support for the government - among those who might join the resistance, the government's usual supporters, and throughout the world - as the regime is seen as dependent upon, and willing to use, naked, brutal violence against nonviolent human beings. This may lead to increased numbers of people becoming determined to resist such a system. It may also lead to divisions within the government's own camp. Given a sufficient growth of numbers, the massiveness of the defiance by courageous resisters may, in an advanced stage, be so vast as to immobilize even the agencies of repression.

The cost of change may thus be a terrible one, but no worse than that incurred by violence. The indications are that although in a nonviolent resistance movement there is severe suffering, this is far less than in a violent resistance movement. In proportion to the numbers involved there were far fewer deaths in the nonviolent struggle in India than there were in the Mau Mau campaign in Kenya - both struggles waged against British rule. The information we

have about the series of strikes in Russian prison camps, occurring primarily in 1953, indicates that where the strikes were conducted largely nonviolently, the number of casualties was much lower than where a great deal of violence occurred. Similarly, among the Indian campaigns themselves, those in which there was little or no violence were accompanied by fewer injuries or deaths than those campaigns in which there was substantial violence. In the Indian struggle for independence as a whole, probably not more than eight thousand died directly or indirectly as a result of shootings and other injuries inflicted in the course of the struggle over a long period. The immense number of casualties in Algeria - estimated as high as one million in a population not exceeding ten million - a fraction that of India - is quite alarming. This is not explained by accusing the French of being by nature more savage than the English.

The cost of a violent revolt is likely to be much higher than that of a nonviolent revolt. Impatience with the expected slowness of change by nonviolent action (based only on South African experience) ought not to blind one to the length of time that a violent struggle would take. Defeats and stalemates also occur when violent means are used, and sometimes nonviolent means work rapidly. Both violent and nonviolent techniques of struggle require sacrifice and time in which to operate. In certain circumstances one technique may appear to be somewhat quicker than the other. But, even then, other important factors must be considered, such as the likely number of casualties and the kind of society which will result from the struggle.

The South African struggle is a movement to cast off tyranny and achieve freedom. It is, therefore, very important whether the technique of struggle used is likely to do this, or whether, at best, it is likely to remove one dominating minority and replace it by another. Violent struggles tend to be followed by the concentration of power in the hands of those who control the effective means of violence - usually the army and the police. The population then disarmed and knowing no other means of struggle, is relatively helpless in the face of rulers with such means of violent repression.

The simple destruction of one form of tyranny does not in itself bring freedom. That would require the diffusion - not the further concentration - of power. The simple destruction of European domination in South Africa without diffusing power among the people and their organizations and institutions will mean that at least

as much power will be concentrated in the hands of the new government as is now the case. Probably it would be more, as there are constant pressures for centralization in newly liberated countries. This is serious, for we know from experience that the leaders of a resistance movement often do not remain rulers after victory, and that a single party or even a single man often becomes dominant. Even if this does not develop immediately in its extreme forms, the very concentration of power even in the hands of the most restrained and benevolent ruler makes it possible, if a coup d'etat takes place, for a usurping despot to impose an especially thorough and complete form of tyranny.

In contrast, nonviolent struggle tends to diffuse power through the population as a whole. The course of the struggle itself depends on voluntary widespread popular support and participation. After a successful conclusion to the struggle, the concentration of military power in the hands of the commanders (which could be used to bolster a new dictatorship) does not occur, and the population is trained in effective means of struggle by which it can maintain and extend its freedom against new usurpers. These considerations are highly important if one is really concerned with achieving freedom, and not simply with replacing one tyrannical system with another. The disastrous consequences of violence for political ends should prod us to seek other, nonviolent, solutions to even the most difficult problems.

INADEQUATE NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE

These criticisms of violence by no means imply that the nonviolent movement in South Africa has been adequate. First, there has not been enough of it. That is, inaction, nonresistance, and an absence of violence are by no means to be equated with nonviolent action.

The Indian minority in South Africa, using nonviolent action under Mohandas K. Gandhi's leadership between 1906 and 1914, achieved great improvements in their situation. However, nonviolent action was not again used in South Africa on a comparable scale against segregation and discrimination until 1946, again by the Indians to gain relief from the "Ghetto Act." Since then there have been

several African bus boycotts (some successful), the 1952 Defiance Campaign (in which over 8,500 non-Europeans were imprisoned for civil disobedience of apartheid laws), the Pan-Africanists' defiance of the pass laws in 1960 which culminated in Sharpeville, and attempts to organize widespread strikes (which were apparently more successful than the Government admitted at the time - for example, the three day general strike in 1961). There have been other similar actions. But it is clear that nonviolent action has been sporadic, and there have been long periods of inaction. This has often been for very understandable and necessary reasons. But where these periods of inaction have been necessary, that necessity has been produced by the weakness of the resistance movement and the non-European population. (Imagine an army which only fought scattered skirmishes after intervals of weeks or months in a war, or major campaigns only after intervals of months or years!)

Inaction, however, even in such situations as South Africa, sometimes tends not to strengthen but to weaken the subordinates still further. The belief that advances will be made as long as there is simple abstention from violence is false. If a resistance movement in situations such as South Africa only undertakes nonviolent action sporadically, it will not achieve significant results unless the subordinates are considerably strengthened and their organization grows in the "silent" periods.

Nor can a nonviolent struggle be successful if the participants and the population are unwilling to pay the price of resistance. This is something which is very similar in the case of a violent struggle. If in a war of the old type the infantry collapses under heavy enemy fire, that side cannot win. The fault in such a situation is not with war itself, but with the ability of the troops to wage war. Similarly, in nonviolent struggle, when the opponent applies repression and increases that repression, to have a chance of victory the nonviolent actionists must have the strength to persist and court the greater penalties for their defiance. If they lack sufficient strength to do so, the fault is not in the technique but in the actionists themselves.

Thus in 1952, when the Government instituted severe punishments for civil disobedience, it was a grave tactical error not to increase the defiance. Nor should the Pan-Africanists have been taken by surprise in 1960 when in response to their defiance the Government declared an emergency. Withdrawal at such a point

the Government to regain the upper hand and for an atmosphere of fear and conformity to become predominant among the once again. Yet another weakness existed in past nonviolent movements. One of the clever means which the Government has frequently adopted for dealing with nonviolent action has been to remove the non-European leaders from the political struggle without making them martyrs and sources of inspiration by imprisonment. For example, a person may be "named" and "liquidated" the Suppression of Communism Act and thereby be prohibited from maintaining or taking out membership in specific political organizations, exercising leadership of them, or attending political gatherings. National leaders were sometimes tried under that Act, found guilty, sentenced to several years' imprisonment, to be suspended provided they did not again commit an offense under that Act. Under the Riotous Assemblies and Criminal Law Amendment Act a person can be exiled to an area far from his or her home, work, and activities. The alternative for the non-European leaders has been years of imprisonment. This alternative is personally severe, but so also can be the political consequences of accepting withdrawal from political activities and even exile.

One of the objective results of the leaders' choice of accepting these limitations, instead of refusing to comply and going to prison, has been to set an example harmful to future resistance. The ordinary opponent of apartheid is not likely to risk a greater punishment than the leaders are seen to be suffering. Yet willingness to undergo imprisonment and other suffering is a primary requirement of change. It is significant that Robert Sobukwe, who founded the Pan-Africanist Congress, chose to be among the first to go to prison for civil disobedience.⁴ Albert Luthuli, on the other hand, implied in his autobiography that he intended to conform to the ban until it expired in May 1964 (though it was doubtful under the circumstances that he would then be allowed to resume political activity).⁵ The Government thus achieved the advantages which come from imprisoning the non-European leaders without incurring any disadvantages.

All of these and other influences have tended to reduce the militancy and activity of the nonviolent resistance movement. Yet in such a situation if there is no vigorous nonviolent resistance and defiance, no sufficiently strong movement to be a source of real hope

(if not of major immediate victories), then it is virtually certain that in desperation a shift to violence will take place.

THE MAIN TASK: STRENGTHEN THE OPPRESSED

The South African Government - like every government no matter how democratic or how tyrannical - is dependent for its continued existence upon the willingness of its subjects to continue to cooperate with it and submit to it. This cooperation and submission may take various forms, such as helping to run the economic system, serving as government employees, and simple obedience of the laws and orders of the regime.

This consent may at times be "free" - based upon support for the regime or passive submission to it. At other times, it may be "forced" - that is, acquiescence may be procured because the people are afraid of the imprisonment or other sanctions which may be imposed upon them if they refuse to cooperate. But even "forced consent" reflects the choice that it is better to submit and avoid the penalties than to defy and incur the suffering. In either case the continued existence of any regime is the result, not simply of the wishes and determination of those persons and groups directly controlling the State machinery, but primarily of the submission and cooperation of the people as a whole. The cost of defiance may vary. In some situations, as South Africa, it may be terrifyingly high. The people's ability to withdraw their consent may also vary, depending upon their determination, strength, and willingness to pay the price for change.

The problem of altering the existing Government or of achieving a revolution is, therefore, not simply one of attacking the existing rulers and their immediate agents. The primary responsibility, both for continuing the present system and for producing change, thus falls on the majority of the population, without whose submission and cooperation the system - after a bloody attempt to force a resumption of cooperation - would collapse. The achievement of change in South Africa thus depends upon increasing the strength of the non-Europeans, predominantly the Africans.

Change can thus be achieved even if the present rulers are never convinced that it is desirable. *The main task is to strengthen the*

Their determination to abolish the system must be increased. The organizational strength and ability to act corporately and spontaneously must be improved. Their willingness to persist in defiance despite repression must be strengthened.

The condition of real liberty or tyranny in any political society is thus largely a reflection of the past and present strength or weakness of the people as a whole. If the people are now weak and fearful, unable or unwilling to pay the price of suffering for the withdrawal of their consent, then no real and lasting freedom can be achieved. Real freedom is not something which is given, but rather something which is earned and taken, and which can therefore be defended and extended even in the face of new attacks.

Therefore, those - including important non-European leaders - who now look to liberation of South Africa by solely external intervention are attempting to by-pass the most important single revolutionary problem and to achieve a short cut to freedom when there is none. Even if the present Afrikaner Nationalist Government is abolished by external intervention, and European domination is thereby ended, that will not necessarily bring an end to oppression in South Africa. If in the process the people as a whole are not strengthened and their own ability to win and defend their freedom is not increased, if no effective diffusion of power among them occurs, if no increase takes place in their ability to control their rulers themselves, then the succeeding Government - no matter what its color - will be at least as tyrannical as that which it replaced. Having depended on external aid to end one system, the people would then still lack the ability to achieve real freedom.

Terrorist and guerrilla movements often recognize to a considerable degree the importance of the withdrawal of cooperation and consent from the government. This helps to explain why so often the terror is directed not against the "enemy" as one might expect, but primarily against one's own people, to force them into resistance. (There are signs that this is already beginning in South Africa.) It is thus an attempt to force people to be free, an attempt to achieve the impossible. Even if politically successful in destroying the existing Government, the kind of society and the kind of liberation which is thereby produced is of highly questionable worth.

Evidence exists that nonviolent action can significantly assist in increasing the strength of oppressed people. Mohandas K. Gandhi

always argued that the primary aim of the nonviolent struggles he led in India was not to attack the British, who were an important but secondary factor in the situation, but to strengthen the determination, independence, and ability to resist of the Indians. They were the most important factor.

This was demonstrated in South Africa in 1952 in the Defiance Campaign, during which membership of the African National Congress jumped from 7,000 to 100,000. The number of members is not the only criterion for increased strength, but this is one indication of the contribution of nonviolent action to increased capacity to resist, and increased organizational strength. Similarly, in India the Indian National Congress was transformed under Gandhi's program from a tiny group passing yearly resolutions into a mass fighting organization capable of shaking the mighty British Empire.

Among the factors which could help strengthen the capacity of people to resist are:

- increased self-respect;
- strengthening of their institutions and capacity to act in solidarity;
- dissemination of knowledge on the use of nonviolent struggle, and how to organize for group action;
- awareness of what others have done elsewhere in difficult situations;
- the example of some people among themselves resisting the tyranny - which may inspire others and be contagious;
- an imaginative accepted leadership to spark the situation;
- a new idea (or a new insight into an old idea) which may suddenly give people a new confidence, especially if it relates something they can do to help solve the problem;
- unplanned actions, breaking the spell of conformity and moving others to action also; and
- participation in nonviolent action on a small scale: this may itself contribute to increased confidence in one's capacity to change the situation, especially if limited objectives can be won.

Often - though not always - as people begin to act, the qualities of courage, willingness to serve others, and concern about the social and political evils around them grow within themselves. Further, their example often helps others to gain these qualities. This,

along with other results of nonviolent action, helps to improve that society's capacity for freedom.

It has been argued, for example by Patrick Duncan, that because the South African Government has made all conventional political efforts by non-Europeans to produce change illegal and has forbidden the use of nonviolent action to alter apartheid, violence is now justified. It is, however, very superficial reasoning to conclude that because nonviolent action has been made illegal, violence should now be used. Violent resistance is equally unlawful, and this argument does not address in practical terms the need for effectiveness.

Increasing government repression now makes it much more difficult to organize nonviolent resistance - especially openly @than it was in 1952. But it is no easier to organize violent resistance. It is true that nonviolent resistance is usually most effectively organized openly. However, in a violent movement, agents and informers make secrecy less than totally effective. Also, while we should keep in mind the dangers involved, nonviolent resistance has been effectively organized secretly while practiced openly - as with much of the Norwegian resistance under the Nazi occupation. Furthermore, not all nonviolent resistance need be organized in advance to be effective. At times, highly effective resistance has been quite spontaneous. At other times, actions planned and initiated by a very small number of people may strike a responsive chord, and their example may be followed by large numbers of people.

FACTORS IN A STRATEGY FOR CHANGE

It is extremely difficult now to work out wise strategy and tactics for the struggle in South Africa, yet very important that serious efforts be made to do this. Only thus can a serious alternative to terrorism and guerrilla warfare and to military invasion gain a serious hearing. Unfortunately, we do not have all the knowledge we should have for developing wise strategy, one reason being the lack of interest in, and resources for, the kind of research and analysis which could have expanded our knowledge.

At least five major tasks need to receive careful consideration in working out that strategy:

1. Examine the present condition of South Africa, signs of

rigidity and flexibility, strengths and weaknesses, and in particular the condition and potentialities of various groups which may hinder or aid resistance, especially:

- (a) the Government;
- (b) the European opposition and potential opposition to the Government;
- (c) the non-European activists and organizations;
- (d) the potential non-European resistance; and
- (e) the remainder of the population.

2. Study the technique of nonviolent action, its power theory, methods, dynamics, requirements for success, and possible relevant experience elsewhere.

3. Reduce present weaknesses among the non-Europeans which would increase their ability to cast off oppression. In particular, this includes such questions as:

- (a) how to increase self-esteem;
- (b) how to cast off fear and increase willingness to persist in resistance despite repression;
- (c) how to increase knowledge and ability to resist most effectively;
- (d) how to gain confidence in their ability to change the situation (as by winning small local victories, as has already been done in the earlier bus boycotts); and
- (e) how to select the specific issues (especially limited economic ones) for immediate changes.

4. Separate sections of the European South African population from support for the Government, including especially liberals, religious groups, the English minority, and the industrialists. It is significant that the 1952 Defiance Campaign was effective in this direction, leading to the establishment of both the Liberal Party and the Congress of Democrats, and leading also to limited religious opposition.

5. Stimulate the maximum international assistance and make the most effective possible use of it. There are several concrete ways in which international assistance could be given to an internal nonviolent resistance movement. These suggestions are simply illustrative:

- (a) communicate news, encouragement, resistance plans, etc. to the people of South Africa by, for example, a radio station based outside South Africa, newspapers and other literature printed out-

side South Africa for distribution within the country;

- (b) improve effectiveness of publicity and educational campaigns directed toward the rest of the world about conditions in South Africa and the resistance movement there;

(c) provide selected literature on the characteristics, requirements, and options in nonviolent struggle and additional means of training people in the use of that technique;

(d) apply more effective economic pressures against South Africa, such as a much more serious boycott and embargo movement than has been practiced hitherto (recommended by the United Nations General Assembly as long ago as November 1962);

(e) exert more effective diplomatic and cultural pressures, such as the breaking of diplomatic relations (also recommended by the UN General Assembly) and refusal of cultural cooperation, except where this involves the breakdown of apartheid practices;

(f) cut off all supplies of military weapons, replacement parts, and ammunition to South Africa (also recommended by the UN General Assembly) and of supplies which could be used for their manufacture within South Africa;

(g) withdraw all foreign investments except where the industries are willing to pay reasonable wages to non-Europeans and to abandon apartheid practices; and

(h) apply throughout the world various types of nonviolent action, as well as conventional means, to achieve these objectives.

Naturally, the major role of people outside South Africa must be in advocating and participating in such international action. International action and internal action are, however, interdependent, and certain types of action within South Africa are more likely to stimulate international assistance than are other types of action or inaction.

These measures could be of great assistance in (1) strengthening the morale, determination, and capacity of the non-Europeans to resist; (2) weakening the morale, determination, and capacity of the Government to continue the present course; and (3) weakening the willingness of the European population in general to support the present Government and apartheid.

The alternative to this general course of action is doubtless some form of war, probably involving either a long terrorist campaign and guerrilla struggle on the Algerian model or major international mil-

itary intervention by a United Nations army, an all-African military alliance, or more direct Russian or Chinese military assistance. All of these are highly dangerous, especially where the East-West power struggle could become involved and where the conflict could degenerate into nuclear war.

At this late stage the odds are not great that the struggle will shift to a more effective application of nonviolent resistance internally, with powerful external aid. If it does not happen, however, it will be because of insufficient daring, understanding, strength, and initiative - not because, if intelligent¹ and courageously applied, nonviolent action could not have been effective. If that does not happen, the tragedy of South Africa in the future may make the tragedy of South Africa in the past and present appear insignificant. There is still hope, however, and the opportunity. If these are seized, the world may be given a lesson in how to deal with tyranny and simultaneously to establish genuine and lasting freedom.

NOTES

1. **The Observer** (London), 5 May 1963.

2. Ibid.

3. Leo Kuper, **Passive Resistance in South Africa** (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1957, and London: Jonathan Cape, 1956), p. 145.

4. **Robert Sobukwe (1924-1978)** became Secretary-General of the African National Congress youth league while attending Fort Hare University. He broke with the ANC in 1958 and formed the Pan-Africanist Congress, intended to conduct more militant nonviolent struggle against apartheid without the Communist influence he felt in the ANC. Under his leadership, the PAC organized mass nonviolent demonstrations and civil disobedience in 1959 and 1960 against the pass laws. He was convinced that violent resistance was suicidal and militant nonviolent struggle was the effective alternative.

Sobukwe was arrested on 21 March 1960 on charges of incitement. He was sentenced to three years' imprisonment, detained a further six years, then released in mid-1969 and sent to Kimberly. He died there on 27 February 1978 after a long illness.

He was regarded as a gentle, humble, intellectually brilliant man, one of the great African nationalists. Sobukwe was wrongly accused of being a racist. He urged Africans to stand on their own feet, and look forward to a South Africa in which people of different colors could live in equality.

5. **Albert Luthuli (1898?-1967)** was elected Chief of the Unvoti Mission Reserve in 1936, after serving as Secretary and President of the African Teachers' Association. In 1952, at the time of the Defiance Campaign against segregation laws, he was

President-General of the African National Congress. When he refused that year to resign from the ANC the Government stripped him of his chieftainship.

Luthuli was among the 155 arrested in 1956 for opposition to apartheid, but after the long Treason Trial was released. Under the Suppression of Communism Act he was restricted to an area around his home near Stanger, about thirty miles north of Durban. In March 1960, after the Pan-Africanists had initiated defiance of the pass laws, Luthuli burned his pass in Praetoria and urged all Africans to do so also. The South African Government allowed him to travel to Oslo, Norway in 1961 to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, but Luthuli was prohibited from leaving the country after that. Under his banishment, he was prohibited from making speeches and attending public meetings. His statements were banned from publication in South Africa. His autobiography, **Let My People Go**, was banned in that country.