

world. In the frenzied insecurity of his fear of women, man has remade society after his own pattern of confusion and strife and has created a world in which woman is the outsider. He has rewritten history with the conscious purpose of ignoring, belittling, and ridiculing the great women of the past, just as modern historians and journalists seek to ignore, belittle, and ridicule the achievements of modern women. He has devalued woman to an object of his basest physical desires and has remade God in his own image—"a God that does not love women." Worst of all, he has attempted to transform woman herself into a brainless simulacrum, a robot who has come to acquiesce meekly in the belief in her own inferiority.⁷

The Middle World is our primary concern. The stigmatisation and inferiorisation of women is the time-bomb laid by history and usage at the foundations of the American structure of power. The two evils are inseparable complements. By making women congenital outsiders in their own society, the twin evils force the women either to reject the values of the society which attacks and punishes them for being the particular children of their parents or lack the total commitment to these values which would release all the creative forces locked in the female personality and give them constructive purpose. Giving constructive purpose to these forces is one of a society's or a civilisation's guarantees of stability.

The stigmatisation and inferiorisation have transformed the American democracy into a prison of the mind in which the genius and human potential of the women are distorted in ways which give her an abiding sense of grievance. This frustration of life's purpose for her ultimately gives her a vested interest in the destruction of the values which are given one meaning on the male side and another on the female.

The woman is placed in an impossible position here. On one plane she is expected to produce children and to teach them, during their most formative years, that the values which define American nationhood are the finest that the United States could have been built upon. Her children grow up seeing how this nationhood punishes her for being a woman. If this damages her credibility, it gives the children a cynical view of the American system of values.

The stigmatisation and inferiorisation of women complicate America's race problem. The two evils have their roots in the ideal of fulfillment which Graeco-Romano-Hebraic civilisation translates into action. God, whom Christianity regards as the creator of all things, is a male; so is his son, Jesus Christ, who is said to be the saviour of the human race. In the Roman Catholic Church the Pope and the hierarchy are all men.

In the Christian tradition maleness is associated with virtue, strength and innocence while woman is regarded as the fount and incarnation of all vice, all weakness and all cunning.

In *Canon Law and the Battle of the Sexes*,⁸ Rosemary R. Ruether has the following to say about the position of the woman as defined by Canon Law:

The law of the Church is designed to elevate one group at the expense of another: women are sacrificed as human beings to elevate priests to the status of sanctified beings. The law was written over the centuries by men for men, and by men who regarded sex (which is still today very hard to come by without women) as quite undesirable. In that men wrote for men, and then for celibates, women were written out of the organization of the Church and out of the sanctuary. As far as the spirit of canon law is concerned, the Church seems to assume that it can do very well without women.

The inferiorisation of woman has been justified by Church Fathers and other scholars down the centuries. Writing in the collection of essays to which reference has been made above, Bernard P. Prusak quotes Clement of Alexandria as making these comments on the beard as evidence of supremacy (p. 103):

His beard, then, is the badge of a man and shows him unmistakably to be a man. It is older than Eve and is the symbol of the stronger nature. By God's decree, hairiness is one of man's conspicuous qualities, and, at that, hairiness distributed over his whole body. Whatever smoothness or softness there was in him God took from him when he fashioned the delicate Eve from his side to be the receptacle of his seed, his helpmate both in procreation and in the management of the home.

When Clement recognised the beard as evidence of supremacy, he was defining categories to justify male supremacy. Christian civilisation has been built on this type of supremacy. Largely as a result, the woman continues to be punished, in the Land of the Free, for being the particular child of her parents, even though White. On the Black side of the colour line, the person of colour is punished for being the child of his or her particular parents.

In either case the bias for categorisation punishes the "outsider" for having qualities which he or she cannot change. At this level, race ceases to be the determinant of behaviour; attitudes to the person come to the fore as translations into action of a particular view of the human being—of a given evaluation of the person.

This evaluation is so closely bound to Christianity that many American women rebel only silently against their inferiorisation. They have to be silent in order to survive. The silent rebellion is one of those factors which

makes the United States a nation whose conscience is at war with itself; the Americans cannot be a free people if the American woman continues to be punished for being the particular child of her parents.

The students' revolt was not over when I arrived in the United States in 1969. I travelled extensively over America, speaking to different groups, largely on college and university campuses. Two aspects of the revolt attracted my attention. I discovered that the angriest students tended to be the girls. So much violence had been done to the person, dignity and honour of the woman, that the girls were determined to pull down the establishment in the bid to realise that freedom they had been promised by the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution. They were outraged by the circumstance that in their society, freedom had one meaning on the side of the male and a different one on the side of the female.

The second aspect I noted was that the women and young men in revolt did not have an alternative philosophy with which to confront what they regarded as the establishment. Most of them clamoured for relevance; for the humanization of the American experience. Like the establishment which they opposed, however, they defined relevance and humanization in terms which would move them in a circle back to where they had begun to revolt. To an outsider from Africa, this was the basic weakness in the students' revolt.

To an African again, the weakness arose from the fact that the rebellious students did not challenge the pessimistic and devaluative assessment of the person developed by the Greeks, Romans and Hebrews and could not, for this reason, confront the boreal evaluation of the human being with an effective alternative.

While the rhetoric of the revolt emphasised "ideology" and many even spoke of a revolution, what happened in the absence of clarity on the meaning the young gave to the person was that the advocates of change concentrated on the purely operational aspects of their relations with the establishment; they fought the institutions, rules and other usages developed by the establishment to translate the Graeco-Romano-Hebraic view of the person into action.

There is no doubt in my mind that at the level of attacking institutions, the students' revolt scored some notable victories. The exposures of the Watergate Scandal, the public outcry against it which forced President Nixon to resign and the election of President Carter on his Human Rights and Clean Administration planks were gains.

The Blacks who revolted at this time were as handicapped as the White students were at the ideological level. While they set out to change American society, in the absence of a clearly stated philosophy by which to define the person, the revolting Blacks could do no more than attack the operational aspects of race discrimination and succeed in effecting changes in the functioning of a given set of institutions.

The civil rights laws which Congress passed were significant gains for the Black side. But these gains affected the functioning of institutions; they did nothing to the philosophy behind these institutions. The concessions were to a large extent a valve for letting off the accumulated steam which could explode and crack the foundations of American nationhood.

As long as the person was defined in terms which clashed with the nature and demands of the "Citty," America seemed fated to drift from one crisis to another until women on the White side and men and women on the Black were defined in terms which would be valid in the conditions created by the "Citty," described by John Winthrop in 1630.

That after two hundred years of American nationhood, the United States has a vigorous Equal Rights Amendment movement and that this Amendment has not yet passed sets the spotlight on the chasm between the ideal and the real; on the fact that in the Land of the Free, citizenship, liberty, equality and happiness have one meaning on the side of the White males and another when it comes to Black people and White women.

Black Americans and White women were punished for qualities they could not change; they were given the status of outsiders. This happened, not because the White males were wicked, but because of the bias for categorisation which had its roots in the Graeco-Romano-Hebraic evaluation of the person; in pessimistic and devaluative attitudes to the person.

The pessimism and the devaluation created difficulties in relations between man and woman on the White side and between Black and White. As shall be shown later, they also complicated some of America's relations with peoples of colour in the Third World generally and, in particular, with Africans. The complications incapacitated the United States for giving effective leadership in moving events toward a political solution to Southern Africa's race problem; they limited America's ability to understand the African or the thinking behind the changing dispositions of power in Southern Africa.

The dangers of the incapacitation were thrown into sharper focus by the American economy's need for some of Southern Africa's metals.

History was showing that the Whites were fighting a war they had already lost in the subcontinent; before many years were out, the United States would be dealing with the Black majority. For these dealings to produce the results the United States would desire, America would need to move away from devaluative definitions of the human being, toward universally valid assessments.

The Westerners, however, are not the only Caucasians committed to the devaluative view of the human being. Like them, the Soviet Bloc is part of the Graeco-Romano-Hebraic civilisational family. The pessimism about the person emerges in Soviet attitudes to African

Nationalism and in the American-Soviet consensus on guarantees for minority rights.

As shall be shown later, the Soviet Union continues to see African problems from Eastern European perspectives. These have little relevance in African conditions. To apply these arbitrarily, as the communists in South Africa used to do, creates problems for all.

The Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA) which was formed in 1921 and went underground after the apartheid regime came to power in 1948, has always had close ties with Moscow. Its critics argued that Moscow did the thinking for the CPSA. This thinking, like the approaches of the slave-owners of the Cape, the colonialists, the Christian missionaries, the advocates of apartheid and the capitalists, was founded on Graeco-Romano-Hebraic assessments of the person.

The Party always feared that its Caucasian perspectives would be diluted by Sudic perspectives. Moscow was always on guard against the dilution. The precautions the Soviet Union took in the 1920s to preserve the purity of Marxist doctrines were described by Eddie Roux, who was for many years a leading member of the CPSA, in his book, *Time Longer Than Rope*:⁹

The Communist Party by now numbered among its members many Africans whose political knowledge and understanding was small. It began to seem that the Party might be swamped by members who had little or no knowledge of Marxist principles and theory. The suggestion came from Moscow that the Party should remain a small and select body of trained revolutionaries working through a larger mass body. In this way, the communists would be enabled to preserve the purity of their doctrine while at the same time, through the larger organisation, giving a clear lead to the masses on all questions.

The Soviet Union's distrust of African traditions was reflected in the CPSA's hostility to African Nationalism, whose leaders the CPSA attacked and denounced as the Black bourgeoisie. The CPSA spared no opportunity to split the political organisations established by African Nationalists. The first of these attempts was made in 1928, after the return of J. T. Gumede, then president of the African National Congress, from a visit to Europe which included a tour of parts of the Soviet Union. This came after communist attempts to split the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union (ICU) two years earlier. Clements Kadalie was forced to expel the communists from the ICU in the bid to preserve the unity of his organisation.

The ANC was always the prime target of the communists because of its being nationally recognised as the custodian of the 1912 Bloemfontein *Ideal of Nationhood*. The next serious attack on African Nationalism

reached its peak in the middle of the 1950s when the communists set out to stampede the ANC into rejecting the Bloemfontein Ideal of Nationhood.

The document which set out to do this was the Freedom Charter, which was made public in Kliptown, near Johannesburg, on June 26, 1955. The Charter did not say a word about the Bloemfontein Ideal. The silence was eloquent; it implied that there was no Ideal of Nationhood to which the Africans were committed. The Charter justified the definition of nationhood which served best the ends of the CPSA.

For purposes of the present discussion, the most important aspect of the Charter came under the heading: "Guarantees for Minority Rights." The Charter argued for the entrenchment of "national rights."

Dr. Henry Kissinger, when he was United States Secretary of State, flew to Africa in 1976 on what he called a "mission of commitment." In his policy speech, delivered in Lusaka, he announced America's commitment to the establishment of majority rule in Southern Africa and coupled the commitment with the expectation of "Guarantees for Minority Rights."

Not to be outdone by the surrogates of Moscow who had written the Freedom Charter nor by the Republican Administration which sent Kissinger on his "mission of commitment," President Carter dropped this bombshell in his now famous Notre Dame policy speech:

Finally, let me say that we are committed to a peaceful resolution of the crisis in Southern Africa. The time has come for the principle of majority rule to be the basis for political order, recognizing that in a democratic system the *rights of the minority* must also be protected. (Emphasis added).

This declaration, which *The New York Times* published on May 23, 1977, was remarkable in two ways. On one hand the President seemed indifferent to the fact that the minority rights he wanted protected were the very issue on which Black and White were quarreling; they were the bone of contention which had moved Black and White to the Soweto Rebellion; they were the cause for which Africans had been willing to sacrifice hundreds of lives.

On the other hand, the emphasis on guarantees for minority rights established a point of convergence for Democratic, Republican and Soviet views on the cause of the race quarrel in Southern Africa.

The consensus was not accidental; it had its roots in the common American and Soviet commitment to the evaluation of the person developed by the Greeks, the Romans and the Hebrews. The convergence of American and Soviet views on minority rights issued from the Caucasian perspective which the evaluation produced. At the ideological level, the United States and the Soviet Union were poles apart, but when

it came to civilisational patterns, they drank from the same inspirational fountain; they had identical, or, it should be warned, co-ordinable attitudes to the material possessions acquired by the White minority in Southern Africa. The Graeco-Romano-Hebraic perspective forced Washington and Moscow to regard the Whites in Southern Africa as a possible bridge which could guarantee access to the subcontinent's resources.

The Soviet Union was prepared to stab African Nationalism in the back to ensure that the surrogates of Moscow were the dominant factor when White domination was overthrown. The Democrats and the Republicans in the United States offered political power as the bribe which would make it possible for the Africans to agree to guarantee minority rights.

An articulate group of Afrikaners, mainly in the ranks of the intellectuals, promptly grasped the significance of the convergence of American and Soviet views on this plane and made public demands for a recasting of Afrikaner attitudes to the communist states. There was even talk of the formation of a South African-Soviet Union cartel to control the disposal of gold and uranium in world markets.

The demands for changed attitudes to communist countries were not the sort of babble heard in drinking parties. That some members of the government took them seriously emerged from debates in the South African parliament. The international edition of the *Johannesburg Star* (April 16, 1977) reported that Dr. P. van B. Viljoen, the apartheid member of parliament for the Newcastle constituency in Natal, had spoken during the resumed debate on the 1977 budget and had:

warned the West that it could no longer take South Africa for granted, and if it came to a matter of survival the Republic would turn to communist and socialist countries of the Eastern bloc to raise capital.... [He added that] it was time South Africa became less dependent on the West for raising capital... South Africa could not go on ignoring the hostility of certain Western countries after all South Africa had done for the less fortunate people in South Africa... the time had come to ...establish economic links with certain communist countries... so that South Africa could rid itself of its dependence on the West and the vulnerability that went with dependence.

There certainly was more anger than realism in Dr. Viljoen's threats. The Afrikaner's control of South Africa is not absolute. While political power is for the present firmly in Afrikaner hands, the Africans supply the labour which sustains the economy while English finance is the lifeblood which keeps the economy going. An African-English alliance, made up by peoples both of whom have been dispossessed in different ways, could make it impossible for the Afrikaner to take South Africa to the communist side of the fence when it comes to foreign investments.

English dominance in the economy could create problems which the apartheid regime has limited power to control. The response of big business to the continuing Black revolt shows what is possible. Alarmed by the government's inability to suppress the 1976 revolt on one side and the refusal to introduce meaningful change in racial policies on the other, big business has, in at least the last three years, moved steadily to the left of the government. At present, it is about the only part of the capitalist world to stand to the left of the government on a fundamental issue of national policy.

This has placed South Africa in the unique position where the dispossessed, who have a vested interest in change, find themselves virtually in alliance with big business against the government. Government intransigence could, by radicalising the dispossessed, transform them into revolutionaries. It would be interesting to see the Soviet Union in alliance with the apartheid regime against revolutionaries who would be backed not only by Free Africa but also by China.

Whether or not the advantages of a gold and uranium cartel would outweigh the obloquy the Soviet Union would draw on itself for bailing apartheid out of its economic troubles is a matter that can be decided only by the Soviet Union. For their part, the men who control big business would have little reason for allowing the government to be economic allies with communism.

A South Africa whose government was anti-West while African labour and big business were pro-West would be an obvious candidate for destabilisation by any interested party.

Let us leave this tantalising subject at this point because our main concern is the role the boreal attitude to the person plays in situations where Black and White perspectives collide. The attitudes conducive to conflict are not peculiar to the Caucasians; they are not peculiar even to capitalistic societies. That people have been victims of race discrimination is no guarantee that they will not punish other human beings for being the children of their particular parents. Let us have a look at the incidence of race discrimination outside South Africa and the United States.

Europe's incursions into Africa brought into being the Middle World, gave it its medial perspectives and set in motion the evolving interaction between the punitive racism on the White side and the evolving reaction on the Black side. Let us, for this reason, look at race discrimination in Europe.

In the South African setting, most Afrikaners justify race discrimination on the score that it is a guarantee of White survival; that this type of guarantee is rendered necessary by the fact that the Whites are a minority in South Africa.

If this argument were valid, there would be no race discrimination in Europe, where the Whites are in the majority and have their roots; where no outsider can threaten these roots. The Intelligence Report of the *Parade Magazine* inserted in *The Washington Post*, August 14, 1977, published this item:

ADVICE TO ARABS: Don't do your wash in the hotel swimming pool and hang it up to dry in front of the hotel windows. Don't forget to pay when you go shopping. And remember, wait your turn in line.

These helpful hints, meant for Arab tourists coming to Great Britain, are contained in a booklet published in Arabic by the London Tourist Bureau.

The purpose of the guide, it says, is to protect the visitors from mistakes and embarrassment—it is not intended to be patronizing or condescending.

Tourists from Near-Eastern oil countries have been flocking to England. They spent more than \$260 million last year in London alone.

The London Tourist Bureau might have had the best of intentions in mind. But in situations where the races have quarrelled or where colour prejudice is known to exist in one form or another, it does nothing to explain that patronizing or condescending is not intended, because, in Arab eyes, the patronizing issues from the context provided by the existence of race discrimination in Britain, by the attitude of people like Enoch Powell and his followers, by the existence of the National Front and by incidents like what happened in Bradford in 1971. Writing in *The Washington Post* October 16, 1971, Alfred Friendly reported:

In the small hours of Thursday morning, in the North England industrial city of Bradford, someone poured kerosene through the letter slot of an Asian immigrant family's row house, and added a match. By the time the father, a wool-comber on night shift in a textile plant, reached his charred door, his three youngest children, aged 8, 11 and 15, were dead and his wife was—and remains—in critical condition....

The fire was only the latest in a series of 13 instances of deliberate arson against nonwhite immigrant homes in Bradford....

Eight West Indians were horribly burned when a Molotov cocktail was thrown into their club in South London early this year. There have been several incidents in East London where gasoline-steeped rags have been set alight and stuffed through windows and letter slots....

The unhappy fact is that there is a great deal more racism in the United Kingdom than the British care to admit.

This was in 1971. Seven years later racism had become a political problem which, in the view of some commentators, threatened to give the British Labour Party one or two nasty headaches. Writing in *The Washington Post* of January 30, 1978, Geoffrey Hodgson reported as follows:

British politics have always been moderate and civilized, as befitting a nation with old democratic traditions. But within recent years, we have been witnessing the rise here of an extremist right-wing movement, avowedly racist in outlook, that is now threatening to cut into the support of the ruling Labour Party.

The movement calls itself the National Front, and it appears to be gaining ground in the decaying inner-city neighborhoods of London, Birmingham and Manchester as well as in such northern mill towns as Blackburn and Bradford, where sympathy for the Labour Party has been strong.

The Front has been encouraging the antagonism of white workers in these areas against Asian, African and West Indian immigrants, many of whom perform unskilled jobs that the British themselves are loth to handle. There are some two million of these immigrants in Britain's population of 56 million.

What worries the Labour Party leaders is the possibility that the National Front may win seats in Parliament if a general election is held this year.

The nascent racism in Britain obviously has some of its origins in the country's sick economy. This economy, which was for centuries supported by slavery or the resources of the colonies, does not seem able to recover from the ailments which have afflicted it since the end of World War II.

The nascent racism is not likely to help the British workers solve their problems; it is not likely even to provide more and better jobs for them in the long run. Take, for example, the case of Swaziland. In south-west Swaziland, the British have established one of the world's largest man-made forests at Bunya. Wood pulp from these is exported to Britain where it is processed into paper. The processing requires supportive industries which give additional jobs to British workers.

By falling back to racism, the National Front creates a climate of thinking which could provoke an African reaction; which could make it difficult and in some cases impossible for African countries in Swaziland's position to subsidise British workers in the way they do. The present generation of Free African leaders is moderate and is likely to

tolerate for some time to come the humiliation of the African race by British workers who support the National Front. But these leaders are not immortal. One day, a generation of Africans will arise which will punish the National Front for its racial policies.

By hoping to drive the non-Caucasians out of Britain, the workers who support the Front might hope to secure jobs for the British today. In the long run, however, they are digging economic graves for their own children.

It would be wrong to recognise the British as the only color-conscious nation in Europe. On February 20, 1972, *The Washington Post* published a London *Observer* report by Sue Mastermann to this effect:

Growing prejudice in the Netherlands against coloured and foreign immigrant workers, has led to a Dutch government clampdown on the admission of foreign labour.

At the time, Holland had a population of about 13 million and about 125,000 foreign labourers made up of Turks, North Africans and people from the poorer Mediterranean countries. In Rotterdam, where the Dutch rioted for a week against foreigners in August, 1972, one out of every 15 people was an outsider. The influx of coloured people into Holland set in motion moves to dump them in the Netherlands' bantustans in the Caribbean—Surinam and the Antilles. As in South Africa, the idea was to give these territories "a greater degree of autonomy with independence in view."

In West Germany, Black American defenders of the Republic continually wrote home complaining of race discrimination; many were refused accommodation. As in Japan after the last world war, the children of Black American soldiers and German girls were often treated like the vermin of the earth in the land of their mothers.

The propaganda of socialist countries creates the impression that race discrimination is an evil peculiar to capitalist societies.

The death of Edmund Asare Addo in Moscow in 1964 set the spotlight on racism in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Addo was a Ghanaian student of medicine. One morning, he was found dead on a street. The Russian authorities said he had died of natural causes or intoxication. The African students insisted that he had been murdered for reasons connected with race.

Free Africa agreed with the students. Writing in the *Accra Evening News* on December 20, 1964, Rambler, who was not noted for discovering evil in the Soviet system, had this to say, according to a bulletin published by the government of Swaziland at the time:

Details of circumstances leading to the death of that Ghanaian student in the capital of the Soviet Union make grim reading. No wonder

African students in Moscow who disagreed with the official version of the medical student's death had to use such strong tell-tale placards for their demonstration march on the Kremlin.

Whether Asare Addo died from natural causes, from intoxication, or from cold, the hullabaloo being made in sectors of the capitalist press and radio in some Western countries should teach our socialist friends the need for extending the principle of co-existence beyond the frontiers of ideological verbosity or theoretical altruism.

It is true one swallow does not make a summer but the very fact that such a thing could happen even in the Soviet Union emphasises the point that the cradle of socialism in the modern world is not itself free from the barbarities of race hatred and discrimination.

Other Free African papers took a stronger line. *Jeune Afrique* (Tunis) commented acidly on December 23:

In spite of all the (communist) party's propaganda, there certainly remain in Russia as in all Eastern Europe deep impressions of racism. This feeling often shows itself and black students put up with it even less easily because it is absolutely contrary to the principles which the Soviets teach them in interminable courses of political instruction. This time, in Moscow, fairly and squarely, they rebelled....

The most serious result of this incident in Moscow is that it throws into relief the contradictions between the Soviet Union's desire to teach the young people of the uncommitted countries and the "welcoming set-up" they can offer....

From Dakar, *Afrique Nouvelle* fired verbal shrapnel in all directions on December 27 and January 2, 1965.

What does seem important is that the African students should have demonstrated about a Ghanaian in the name of the whole of Africa. The Russians must therefore have found themselves confronted by a delicate problem. Besides, this was a lesson in freedom which they gave to the Soviets, but equally to the African Powers who want to indoctrinate their students.

In its commentary on the death of Addo the African press found it strange that racism could occur in a socialist country. There was nothing really new in the irony. In *The Red Prussian*, author Leopold Schwarzchild says that after the quarrel with Bakunin, Marx and Engels formulated a "new iron law." This is his description of it:

The will of history had endowed certain nations with the gift of spreading the gospel of progress throughout the world; to other nations this gift had been denied.

Applying this law to international relations, Engels wrote thus in a letter to Marx, dated May 23, 1851:

...there is absolutely no more reason for Poland to exist.... [Germany, he continued, should take] from the Western part of Poland anything that can be taken, to let the Germans occupy their fortresses under the pretext of "protection", use the people for cannon fodder and devour their country.

The founding saints of communism carried their hatred of outsiders to the plane of personal relations with some of their colleagues. Lassalle was a prosperous lawyer of Jewish extraction who did his best at times to assist the communist cause in Germany and often stood by Marx. In a letter to Marx, dated March 7, 1856, Engels described Lassalle in these colourful terms:

A typical Jew from the Slavic border, always ready to exploit everyone for his private ends...concealing with all kinds of hair oil and make-up, the fact that he is a greasy Jew from Breslau.

Subsequently, Lassalle wrote a book on Heraclitus and volunteered to send a copy to Marx. The father of communism had this to say about it in a letter to Engels, dated December 22, 1857:

We shall soon see for ourselves and even if it is a gift horse, we'll look it straight in the mouth...on the express condition, of course, that it doesn't smell of garlic.

After Lassalle had been to London, where Marx quarrelled with him, he ceased to be a Jew; he became a "Jewish nigger" whose genealogy Marx described in extravagantly lurid terms in a letter to Engels, dated July 30, 1862:

...it is perfectly obvious from the shape of his head and the way his hair grows that he is descended from the Negroes who joined Moses on the Journey out of Egypt, unless perhaps his mother or his grandmother had relations with a nigger.

When the interpreters do not prescribe destiny for the Africans, they ignore the fundamentals of conflict and focus attention on the operational aspects of the quarrel between Black and White.

The advocates of apartheid ignore the destiny the Africans chose for themselves on January 8, 1912, and insist that the Black people must seek fulfillment for themselves in the vassalage the South African government peddles as independence in unviable mini-states.

For years now, South Africa's White liberals have been clamouring for the abolition of what they call petty apartheid: the differential wage, residential segregation, influx control, Bantu education and related vehicles for entrenching White domination. The underlying assumption was that the Africans accepted integration in a socio-economic set-up based on Caucasian attitudes to the person, when the Africans rejected this type of integration on January 8, 1912.

Professor I. I. Potekhin, who was director of the African Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union, had much to say about what was good for the African. In one of his essays¹⁰ he wrote:

The existence of the world socialist system creates highly important prerequisites for the non-capitalist development of the African peoples. The decisive prerequisite, however, is the condition of African society itself.... The Republic of South Africa, for example, is a capitalist country, with the peculiar feature, however, that capitalist enterprises in industry and agriculture belong to the European minority. The first task here is to make a people's democratic revolution as a result of which the system of racial discrimination will be abolished and the African population will receive political rights equal to those of the European minority. After the victory of the people's democratic revolution there will open up the possibility of building a socialist society, but South Africa is no longer in a position to by-pass the stage of capitalist development, since capitalism already exists here. In South Africa, therefore, it is not a question of non-capitalist development but of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

From prescribing destiny for the Africans (the majority) Professor Potekhin proceeds to berate those Africans who talk of African Socialism:

A completely erroneous counterposing of scientific socialist theory to "African Socialism" has gained wide currency among African Socialists: scientific socialism is not suitable for African reality; we shall build our own African Socialism, is what they say....

Some advocates of "African Socialism" imagine socialist society as a society of equal petty producers.... Everyone will manage his own farm or business independently of others and will exchange the products of his work; if someone suffers misfortune, the rest will help him.

This type of society, however, is simply impossible with the present state of technology....

A legitimate question arises: Why are people who sincerely wish to build a socialist society and abolish the exploitation of man by man unwilling to accept the scientific theory of socialism, tested in practice, and instead engage in a search for some other kind of socialist society?

A comparison of apartheid with Marxist positions on prescribing destiny for the African and condemning what they regard as ideological heathenism is not the place to answer Professor Potekhin's question. It can, however, be said in passing that "the scientific theory of socialism, tested in practice" is not acceptable mainly because it does violence to the African definition of the person, while the testing in practice took place in conditions which do not exist in Africa. It does not, in other words, address itself to vital African needs or to determinative realities in the Black experience. It does not, for example, recognise the African's right to define himself in his own terms. What need is there for him to do this when Jesus Christ, John Locke, and Karl Marx have done this for him?

As far as Professor Potekhin is concerned, the Bloemfontein Ideal of Nationhood, which will be discussed in a later chapter, does not exist; the "common controlling idea" on the basis of which the various African language groups united themselves into a new nation in 1912 is not valid and the "new and unique civilization" this nation set out to build has no relevance. The things that exist and are valid and relevant are the "people's democratic revolution," a "socialist society" and receiving (from the Whites) "political rights equal to those of the European minority."

In all these examples we see the boreal attitude to the person translated into action in ways which punish the African for being the child of his particular parents. The Christians did this and the advocates of apartheid and the Marxists continue to do it today not because they are White, but because they all are committed to a civilisation built on a philosophy which defines the person in devaluative terms.

The will to impose White perspectives sets out to ensure that whole peoples define themselves in Caucasian terms. Leopold Senghor spoke at the inauguration of the Senegalese Economic and Social Council in Dakar in March, 1964. Some of his remarks were as follows:

Nothing can replace capital, technical training, work and honesty. The mistake, Karl Marx and his followers made was that they neglected agriculture and stock farming in favour of industry, and the peasants in favour of the artisans. This mistake explains the lack of economic balance in the socialist countries....

Moscow's *Izvestia* (June 6, 1964) replied with this significant retort:

Nationalism has become the principal danger of the socialist commonwealth.

In all the above, we see a clash of attitudes to the person. In this collision, some Whites use racism as a vehicle by which to perpetuate the dominance of their civilisation. It does not matter much who or where these are, they all have a deeply vested interest in the security of their civilisation and the attitude to the person on which it is built.

The point to note in any serious attempt to understand the "race" problem is that the African has his own attitude to the person; that he is as vitally interested in its survival as the White man is in his and that if the White man cannot come to terms with this fact, South Africa is heading for a bloody collision, by the side of which the war in Rhodesia will seem like a backyard brawl.

Being involved in this collision is not our destiny. Concerned people on both sides of the colour line have the duty to launch a dialogue of minds or civilisations to reconcile conflicting perspectives. Most Whites—in the West and Socialist countries—are psychologically not equipped to accept the validity of truths discovered down the ages by the African. These Whites are part of the problem.

That people have been victims of race discrimination does little to prevent them from punishing others for being the children of their particular parents. Solomon Grayzel, a Jewish historian, tells us what happened to the Jewish community of Cochin, India, after the arrival of "white" Jews from Europe:¹¹

In matters of religion and culture the old settlement of Jews in India benefited from the arrival of the European Jews.... Socially, however, the new settlement brought a problem which has afflicted Cochin Jewry to this day. The newer arrivals insisted on keeping aloof from the others. Their reasons were the ignorance of the Hindu Jews and the supposed racial impurity indicated by their colour... The Spanish Jews argued that they could not permit their own racial purity to be sullied by intermarriage or even by social contact with such "inferior" stock.

All the groups were equally orthodox, observing the same rites, although the "whites" and the older "blacks" worshipped in synagogues of their own.... Economically the "white" Jews were not necessarily better off than the "blacks."

No matter how tragic a people's experience of punishment for being members of a particular racial or ethnic group in Graeco-Romano-Hebraic cultures might be, the suffering does not seem to destroy their bias against outsiders. Today, about a generation after the tragic experience of the Jews at the hands of the Nazis, the ashkenazi or Western

Jews in Israel subtly, though illegally, keep a distance between themselves and their Sephardic brethren. The attitude behind the punishment of the Sephardic Jews was stated by General Moshe Dayan, the renowned Israeli soldier and political leader, in South Africa when he visited that country in 1974.

In what the *Johannesburg Star* (International edition, September 7, 1974) described as an "impassioned speech" Dayan "took a side-swipe at what he called 'Oriental Jews.'" He told the South African Jews, who are classed as White in that country, that one of the problems facing Israel was that three out of every five immigrants were Orientals. Appealing to the "white" Jews to return to their "homeland" he said:

What we have to try to do now, is to be very, very attentive to try to help more newcomers from the Western countries.

For years, the peoples of the Third World regarded the Scandinavians in general and the Swedes in particular as the only Europeans whose attitudes were not poisoned by the evil of race prejudice. The Swedes themselves loved and were proud of this reputation. In July, 1977 the police in Goteborg, Sweden's second largest city, began an investigation¹² into five restaurants and discotheques that were shown to have refused to admit Blacks from Africa and the United States while opening their doors for White patrons.

United States Ambassador to the United Nations Andrew Young once called the Swedes "terrible racists" and had added that they had an ideology which made them very humanitarian, but when the crunch came, the Swedes treated the Black people in the way the Whites in Queens, New York, treated them.

The relevant point which emerges from what has been written up to now on race discrimination as used by the Whites to punish peoples of African descent is that the punishment transcends ethnic, religious and ideological loyalties in the Caucasian group itself. As the long history of anti-semitism and Nazism in Europe show, Whites are not above punishing each other for being the children of ethnically different parents.

This suggests that we should look beyond biology for the basic cause of race discrimination. Attitudes to the person seem to be the main cause of the evil.

As already stated, the human baby is born with a brain and not a mind. His environment—that is, his family, society, culture and location—gives him the perspectives from which he sees reality, experience and the person; it gives him his beliefs, attitudes, customs and other usages; it gives him his mind and identity. Race conflict arises when the total of

attitudes we call the White mind collides with the mind of the African; when the Caucasian evaluation of the person clashes with its opposite on the Black side; when the Sudaic perspective clashes with the Caucasian perspective.

The problem at which the present discussion is directed emerges in clearer outlines at this point. Contact with the Caucasians has thrown Africa into a crisis of values which moves Black and White in cycles of conflict to final disaster. This emerges from the history of Caucasian civilisation in the last 3,000 years or so.

The devaluative attitude to the human being combined with the bias for categorisation to move ancient Greece and Rome to final disaster; they drove the Holy Roman, Spanish and Portuguese empires to oblivion in much the same way that they led the British, French, Dutch, Belgian and Italian empires to ruin. The attitude and the bias plunged the world into two global wars in the lifetime of a single generation. If indications are any guide, the pessimistic definition of the person and its inner logic—which is the bias for categorisation—are driving the United States and the Soviet Union to the point where they will land the human race in World War III.

The initiatives asserted by the United States (and the West) on one hand and, on the other, by the Soviet Union and its satellites, have a special significance for Africa. If and when the two eventually take up arms against each other, they will fight their fiercest battles in Africa, whose mineral and other forms of wealth each great power seeks to grab for itself and its allies.

The "scientific approach" by which the Marxists set so much store, is as incapable of devising a formula for the resolution of conflict in Southern Africa as capitalism's greed is. In situations of contact and conflict between Black and White in Southern Africa, the West and the Soviet Bloc behave in related ways because of the attitude to the person to which they are committed.

In this setting we, the people of Africa, find ourselves caught in the drift toward disaster of an ideal of fulfillment which belongs to the childhood days of the human race.

For all of us, whether we are in Southern Africa, in Free Africa or in the diaspora the definition of the person in pessimistic and devaluative terms raises a fundamental question to which all the peoples of African descent need to give a fundamental answer.

The view that the individual is a creature and not an integral and inseparable part of the living force which unifies the cosmic order limits the person's freedom to discover more satisfying dimensions of being human and prevents him from realising both the promise of being human and the glory of being a self-defining value.

This frustration of life's purpose for the human being gives to the cash value of the person the dimensions of a criterion by which to assess human worth; the person ceases to be human—he becomes a unit of

production and a cipher in the books of those who determine his destiny, manage his life, do the thinking for him and extort maximum advantage from his productive potential.

The person is born to live, work and die in the inhuman conditions created by those who prescribe destiny for their fellowmen. The Church comes along with countless mysteries to incapacitate the people for effective revolts against the devaluation of the person. The state establishes a whole structure of power to force the person to see fulfillment for himself in apologising for being human or, if the person is a White woman in the West, to apologise for being the particular child of her parents.

At the end of the person's life, he dies with a pile of credit cards which indicates the extent to which he mortgaged his life to those who were "smart" enough to transform ideology, dogma and gross national products into prisons of the mind in which he was not allowed to realise the promise of being human.

If he is an African, the fundamental question he asks at the end of his life is:

"What did I do with my life? Why did I not realise the promise of being human? Where did I go wrong?"

The next chapter gives answers to his fundamental questions.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I

1. H.J. Rose: *Religion in Greece and Rome*, Harper and Row, New York, 1959, P 94.
2. In *World Culture And The Black Experience*, University Of Washington Press, Seattle, 1974, P 8.
3. Rose, *Religion in Greece and Rome*, P 94.
4. Quoted by Hans-Joachim Schoeps in *The Religions Of Mankind*, Doubleday and Co., New York, 1968, P 231.
5. *Hermeneutical Philosophy, Myth and African Thought*, an essay in *Philosophy in the African Context*, compiled by D.S. Georgiades and I.G. Delvare, from papers read at a seminar on the theme: *Philosophy in the African Context*. The Seminar was held in the Witwatersrand University (Johannesburg) in July 1975.
6. J.H.P. Serfontein: *Die Verkramppte Aanslag*; Human and Rousseau, Pretoria, 1970, P 41. Rough translation: out-and-out Afrikaner hegemony, Afrikaans as the official language, with the end in view, briefly and clearly, of "complete political nationalisation and eventual Afrikanerisation of our English-speaking countrymen."
7. Elizabeth Gould Davis: *The First Sex*; Penguin Books Inc., Baltimore, 1973, Pp 17-18.
8. An essay in *Religion And Sexism*, ed., Rosemary Radford Ruether, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1974, P 270.
9. Wisconsin University Press, Madison, 1964, P 226.
10. *On African Socialism: A Soviet View*, in *African Socialism*; eds., William H. Friedland and Carl G. Rosberg, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1975; Pp 102, 106, 107.
11. *A History Of The Jews*; New American Library, New York; 1968, Pp 636, 637.
12. *The Washington Post*, July 21, 1977.



Black leaders meet with Vorster, January 1975.



Sharpeville Massacre, March 21, 1960.

II. An Attitude Toward The Person Which Has No Place In Africa

One of the important points raised in the last chapter was that in the view of the African revolutionary in Rhodesia—as in Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa—the quarrel between Black and White is a war of minds; that it is a crisis of values and a collision between conflicting attitudes to the person.

The central issue in this war, in so far as the Black South African is concerned, is whether or not the White race has the right to prescribe destiny for the Black race. The attitude to the person reflected in the papal bulls listed in the last chapter authorised the Europeans, who led Christendom at the time, to prescribe destiny for the predominantly non-Caucasian “pagans.” The Whites in South Africa translate this attitude into action when they arrogate to themselves the right to own 87 percent of the African’s land.

Professor Potekhin gives expression to the same quality of mind when he asks: “Why are people who sincerely wish to build a socialist society and abolish the exploitation of man by man unwilling to accept the scientific theory of socialism, tested in practice, and instead engage in a search for some other kind of socialist society?”

The answer is that Africans do not recognise the White man’s right to prescribe destiny for them and reject the White man’s attitude to the person.

The rejection is not confined to South Africa or to the people involved in the fight against apartheid; it can be seen in major segments of the Black World. From March 25 to April 1, 1959, Black writers and artists met in conference in Rome to “preserve the unitary vision of cosmic reality which characterises the wisdom of traditional Africa.” The conference’s Commission on Philosophy moved this resolution:

1. That for the African philosopher, philosophy can never consist in reducing the African reality to Western systems;
2. That the African philosopher must base his inquiries upon the fundamental certainty that the Western philosophic approach is not the only possible one; and therefore,
3. Urges that the African philosopher should learn from the traditions, tales, myths and proverbs of his people, so as to draw from them the laws of a true African wisdom complementary to the other forms of human wisdom and to bring out the specific categories of African thought.

There were Marxist writers in the conference. They moved a motion which included the following:

1. The cultural references in Marx's thought are nearly all drawn from Western experience.
2. The economic situation of the Western proletariat cannot be strictly identified with that of the underdeveloped people.
3. A doctrine is all the more universal so far as, on the one hand, it takes into account all experience, historic, economic, etc., and the diversity of the cultural genius of peoples, and on the other hand, its application is controlled by a really representative authority.

We invite African Marxists to develop their doctrine on the basis of the real history, aspirations and economic situation of their peoples and to build and found it on the authority of their own culture.¹

Strange as it might sound, the sentiments of the Marxists were echoed by the All-Africa Church Conference which met in Kenya in August, 1975. The Conference reiterated its determination to work for the development of a theology with "a universal dimension" which would reflect:

the situation in which the people of Africa live, their critical social, political and economic circumstances, their spirituality and cultural setting.... Theology should always be rooted in the heart, soul and soil of the people, coming in the language, idiom and thought-forms of the people....²

Between the Rome and Kenya conferences an important development had taken place in Ghana. The All-African Students Union had met in conference at the University of Science and Technology in Kumasi in July 1972 and had passed a resolution which included:

We urge all Africans to rely on their own concerted efforts and resources to promote the overall development and total liberation of the continent.... In the great struggle for African freedom and advancement, we urge all African countries to adopt the philosophy of Africanism which serves the material, intellectual and spiritual interests of Africa and does not in any way serve the interests of either the Eastern or Western powers....

In this regard, we appeal to African countries to undertake a vigorous cultural revolution in which all citizens shall be compelled to have only African names, streets, public places and institutions named after things and people of African origin and also to liberate their education system from the shackles of bankrupt intellectual imperialism in Europe and America and gear it towards the needs and aspirations of the continent.³

The loud and clear message which comes out of the pronouncements made by the Black writers and artists, the Church in Africa and the students of Africa is that the people of Africa do not want anybody to prescribe destiny for them; that this applies as much to the West as to the Soviet Bloc, and the advocates of White supremacy in Southern Africa; that the destiny the Africans want for themselves is the creation of a world in which no person will be punished for being the child of his particular parents or for being the particular child of her parents; the establishment of a society in which the person will be equipped, enabled and seen to realise the promise of being human. This ideal is capable of attainment only in a society based on a positive and mature evaluation of the human being.

The All-Africa Church Conference's search for "a universal dimension" means that the leaders of African Christianity have reached the point where they realise that Christianity does not have this dimension. Otherwise why should they look around for something that is already in the religion they uphold?

The Conference's search is important because it sets the focus on the mutual exclusiveness of the Sudeic and Christian evaluations of the person. The African Church says in effect that if the two are not incompatible, the chasm between them is so wide it can be bridged only by "a universal dimension."

Here the African Church makes a fundamental criticism of Christianity's view of the human being. But the leaders of this Church are not alone in rejecting the element of what Nigeria's President Olusegun Obasanjo once described as teleguidance.

A ferment is afoot in the Sudeic world; its aim is to rediscover the vital element that gave symmetry and durability to the Sudeic experience throughout the ages, because the theologies and ideologies based on the

Graeco-Romano-Hebraic view of the human being create catastrophic disharmonies in the Sudio personality.

The day is coming when Sudio philosophers will realise that things went wrong in the Sudio experience when the Africans began to ignore their evaluation of the person.

Aimee Cesaire, the Black poet from Martinique, is a respected Black World thinker. After the 1956 Khrushchev exposures of Stalin's crimes against humanity, Cesaire decided to leave the French Communist Party. The letter of resignation he wrote and which is read widely in the Black World, had this to say:

I could easily express my feelings towards both the French Communist Party and a Communist International as it has been shaped by the patronage of the Soviet Union ... the list of dissensions and grievances would be long....[They included] pigheaded obstinateness in error, perseverance in lies, the fantastic pretence of never once having been wrong... the bankruptcy of an ideal and pathetic of a whole generation's failure.

Cesaire then turned to racism in the party and tore it to pieces in these terms:

...in the light of events (and having appreciated the existence of a shameless anti-semitism whose manifestations have occurred and, it appears, still are occurring in countries that call themselves socialist) I have acquired the conviction that our ways and destinies, and those of communism, such as it is put in practice, are not purely and simply identical; that they cannot be purely and simply identified.

One fact, crucial in so far as I am concerned, is this: that we coloured men, in this specific moment of historical evolution, have consciously grasped...the notion of our peculiar uniqueness, the notion of just who we are and what, and that we are ready, on every plane and in every department, to assume the responsibilities which proceed from this coming into consciousness...of our problems which aren't to be reduced to subordinate forms of any other problem...of our history, laced with terrible misfortunes which belong to no other history [and] the peculiarity of our culture.

Cesaire proceeded from this to reject the claim that the French Communist Party had "duties towards colonial peoples in terms of a tutorship." He saw no point in campaigns to create Black solidarity

with the French proletariat and, *via* communism, with all the world's

proletariats. I don't make light of these solidarities.... But I don't want to see them blown up into metaphysics. There are no allies by divine right...if communism pillages our most vivifying friendships, wastes the bond that weds us to other West Indian islands, the tie that makes us Africa's child, then I say that communism has served us ill in having us swap a living brotherhood for what looks to have the features of the coldest of all chill abstractions.⁴

Cesaire lays great stress on the "peculiarity of our culture." What makes it unique (for purposes of the present discussion) is its evaluation of the person; its attitude to the human being and its recognition of the person as a self-defining value.

Dr. Davidson Nicol, the Sierra Leone scholar, stresses the uniqueness in his poem, *The Continent That Lies Within Us*.⁵ He writes:

Go up country, so they say,
To see the real Africa;
For whoever you may be,
That is where you come from....

We have looked across a vast continent and
Dared to call it ours. You are not a country,
Africa, you are a concept which we all
Fashion in our minds, each to each, to
Hide our separate years, to dream our separate dreams.
Only those within you who know their circumscribed
Plot, and till it well with steady plough
Can from that harvest then look up
To the vast blue inside of the enamelled bowl of sky,
Which covers you and say, "This is my Africa," meaning
"I am content and I am happy. I am fulfilled, within,
Without and roundabout. I have gained the little
Longings of my hands, my heart, my skin and the soul
That follows in my shadow."
I know now that is what you are, Africa,
Happiness, contentment and fulfilment,
And a small bird singing on a mango tree.

Dr. Nicol describes Africa as "a concept" and not merely a geographic entity. But Africa derives her nature not only from geography, but also from her people. When we talk of Africa and her identity, we refer to her and her children. This identity is unique and "peculiar" because it regards Africa as a concept or value, precisely in the way that it recognises each one of her children as a self-defining value.

Like other Sudic children of Africa, the Zulu-speaking Africans of South Africa developed, down the ages, a whole body of *izaga* (aphorisms) in which they defined the person, themselves and their environment. These wise sayings contain Zulu interpretations of the teachings of the Sudic philosophy. Of the person, they say: *Umntu ngumuntu* (literally: The person is human). To be human is to be able to say what and who you are and to be able to say why you are here and where you are going; it is to be able to define yourself. Ancient Zulu philosophers taught that the person was unique in that he defined himself; in that he knew the worth of the value that he was.

Dr. Nichol draws attention to another aspect of the "peculiarity of our culture": the protean character of the philosophy by which we define the person. He says Africa is a concept which we "fashion in our minds, each to each, to hide our separate years, to dream our separate dreams." Each fashioning of the concept is legitimate, valid and important because each value is the unchanging equal of every other value.

The ideal on which Sudic civilisation has been built recognises, first, the right of the person to discover more satisfying dimensions of being human and, second, the simultaneous legitimacy, validity and importance of the different ways in which different peoples in different environments define themselves.

The definition of the person on which Graeco-Romano-Hebraic civilisation was developed attaches maximum importance to convictions which have no room for tolerance. Christianity, like Marxism, demands the whole person; so does apartheid. This is diametrically opposed to the principle of simultaneous legitimacy and validity.

Another aspect of racism and race discrimination emerges at this point. To punish the African for being the child of his particular parents, the Caucasians do not always put up notices at entrances to their buildings saying: "dogs and niggers not admitted"; they arrogate to themselves the right to "know" what is good for the persons of African descent and to impose their perceptions on the Black people. Their philosophy does not recognise the simultaneous legitimacy of their and the African experiences.

The Caucasian Christians decided by themselves that their religion was good for the peoples of Africa and crossed the seas to impose it in different parts of the continent. The South African government says segregation and retribalisation are good for the Africans and proceeds from this to impose Ethnic Grouping and the vassalage in unviable mini-states it peddles as independence. At this level, the Soviet Union does not behave differently. It reserves for itself the right to prescribe destiny for the Africans, whom, like the Christian missionaries of the West, it regards as heathens—that is ideological heathens.

Ideological deheathenisation in Southern Africa assumes forms which are different from those in the Northern Hemisphere. In North America, as in

Western and Eastern Europe, White scholars, journalists, authors and other opinion-formers are producing large numbers of books and articles in which they "interpret" or "speak for" or "explain" the African to the outside world without informing themselves on the factor which determines thought and action in the Black community: the Sudic attitude to the person.

Ignoring this fundamental of conflict gives to the "interpretations" and "explanations" the character of intellectual apartheid and forces those Whites who concern themselves with developments in Africa to distort African perceptions even where they have the best will in the world.

The distortions must be seen in context. The representative African witnesses whom we have called to testify on how they feel about imposed ideals of fulfillment are unanimous in saying that borrowed theological and ideological self-definitions create catastrophic disharmonies in the Sudic personality. The All-Africa Church Conference is looking around for "a universal dimension" which Christianity does not have. Black Marxist authors and artists demand an interpretation of Marxism which will be valid in African conditions. The Black South Africans are confronting the Whites with an alternative to apartheid.

The difficulties which Christianity is having do not mean that Africa should necessarily reject this religion if she does not want to. After all, Christianity was built on Judaic inspirations which were affected by the ancient Egyptian experience over a period of about four hundred years. Christianity is indebted to Egypt's Osiris, Isis and Horus cults for its concept of the Holy Family and for many other traditions the Jews brought out of Egypt with them.

What Judaism and Christianity did was to destroy the Sudic Ideal's mature definition of the person and to build themselves on given traditions borrowed from Egypt. This is the mistake Graeco-Romano-Hebraic civilisation made; it is this error which the African Church needs to correct.

Something else emerges from the pronouncements. The inner logic of the African attitude to the person moves the thoughts of the Marxists, the churchmen and the students toward convergence when it comes to Africa's destiny; toward what one might call an Evolving Consensus on the destiny of the Sudic peoples.

This point is of the greatest importance when we consider the crisis in South Africa on one plane and, on another, the dangers to which this crisis is leading the rest of Africa. If not diffused, the crisis will get out of control, reduce South Africa to ashes, start fires which will destroy Free Africa and eventually drag in the United States or the Soviets or both. At that point, the world will be galloping to a global war.

Substance is given to this prospect by the fact that the inner logic of Caucasian civilisation, which is the bias for categorisation, leads peoples through cycles of conflict to final disaster.

The inner logic of the Sudic or Sub-Saharan or Buntu attitude to the person which we shall, for lack of a better word, call the bias for agmination moves events toward congruency, as shall be shown throughout the present discussion.

The quarrel between Black and White might thus be defined as a collision between the inner logic of the Sudic attitude to the human being and the inner logic of the Caucasian assessment of the individual; between the bias for agmination and the bias for categorisation.

The present chapter outlines the philosophy which the Africans translate into experience. The philosophy will be presented as a four-sided entity: it will be argued that the African teaching is a protean evaluation of the human being which flowered into Egyptian civilisation on one hand and, on the other, created clusters all over Africa which together make up African civilisation. In this civilisation, each community defined itself in terms dictated by its environment. An outline of the Zulu self-definition will be given as an example. It will be shown that the Zulu self-definition was a total of nomarchic self-definitions because all these described the person in specific terms in a specific environment.

The model nomarchic self-definition made by my section of the Ngubane family was stated to me by my father when I reached puberty.

The intention in presenting the philosophy which gives meaning to the person and the specifics of this meaning—as described in my father's passing of the *Law* on to me—is not only to provide the context in which to see the quality of nationhood produced by the African ideal of fulfillment; it is also to focus attention on the fundamental weakness in the All-Africa Church Conference's search for a *universal dimension*.

The African Church will not find this dimension unless it faces squarely the fundamental conflict between the African or Sub-Saharan or Sudic attitude to the person, and the Graeco-Romano-Hebraic assessment of the human being on which Christianity is based.

Apartheid is not an aberration; it issues naturally from the logic of the definition of the person as a creature born in sin. It is part of a long and firmly established tradition which produced the Inquisition, gave rise to slavery, colonialism, racism, Nazism and communism. These evils issued naturally from the bias for categorisation.

The African Church needs to face squarely the fact that its search for a *universal dimension* ultimately responds to the fact that the Christian definition of the person has no place in African society; that Christianity can have valid meaning only if it defines the person in terms which establish the adequacy of the person, enlarge the human personality and enable each woman, man and child to fully realise the glory of being a self-defining value and the promise of being human.

If the African Church trembles at the prospect of freeing itself from the prison of the mind which the Graeco-Romano-Hebraic evaluation has become, African Christianity will commit the blunders which have forced the Africans to look for a *universal dimension*; that will make Christianity as irrelevant as colonialism.

A few explanations need to be made in order to place the outline in context. We shall be making frequent use of the word Sudic, to describe the Sub-Saharan experience. The outline will first trace the origins of this word and proceed to define the person. The texts used in the first instance will be taken from the writings of ancient Egypt for two reasons: Egyptian attitudes to the person are well documented while the Egyptian evaluation of the person is similar to the philosophy which inspires the major cultures of Black Africa today.

The Egyptian view of the human being is characterised by a concern with the person and a predilection for developing attitudes and creating institutions designed on the one hand to enable him to discover more satisfying dimensions of being human, and on the other, to realise the glory of being a self-defining value. The concern and the predilection characterise Black cultures.

The Egyptian definitions of the person will be followed by their opposite in the Zulu experience and by a review of how the Zulus translated the Sudic attitude to the human being into political action in the last five hundred years of Zulu history.

The choice of the Zulu experience is dictated by one simple reason: it is the only one which the present author knows and understands. I was born into it; it made me what I am. I believe that it is as integral a part of the larger Sudic experience as any we have in South Africa. Tracing the application of the Sudic evaluation of the person in the last five centuries will draw in sharper outlines the inner logic of the Sudic attitude to the human being in South Africa; it will show how the Africans reacted to conquest and what they eventually did to restore to themselves their land and their freedom.

The word *Sudic* comes from *su*, a variant of *Nu*, which is the rootword for *person* in most Sub-Saharan African languages. In terms of origin, the rootword is related to *Nu*, the ancient Egyptian word for primordial substance. The ancients believed that all phenomena emerged from *Nu*. The person, they believed, evolved from primordial substance through a creator-god. The person was "created" so that he should "appear in glory" on earth.

In the migrations up and down the continent, the differently placed Africans developed variants of *nu* and gave it the following forms: [-*du*, -*nho*, -*ni*, -*no*, -*ntfu*, -*ntu*, -*nwo*, -*nwu*, -*so*, -*su*, -*tho*, -*thu*] and -*tu*. This consensus on *nu* produced the following nouns for person among peoples in widely different parts of Africa: