

Glossary of Select Course-related Terms

Introduction

Guys: Before you go through this glossary a few preliminary points I want you to note carefully: First, not all the terms in this glossary may be relevant to this particular course. (See announcements on the class home page and/or the class proceedings schedule in the syllabus packet to determine which terms you must know for the purposes of tests/exams.) Second, as I have stated in class before (and as common sense would suggest), anything written by me that I assign you should be considered as an extension of my class lectures. Third, concerns the purpose of producing this glossary for you. I have not produced this document simply to provide you with helpful definitions of the key terms we have (or will) come across in this course; there is a bigger purpose—in other words, there is a subtext to this glossary, and it is this: Too many students graduate from this school with a very poor understanding of the difference between *knowledge* and *information*. The two are not the same, even though in daily parlance the two words are often used interchangeably. Information is what we get, for example, when we do research. It is usually in the form of facts, observations, and the like. After the information has been gathered it must be processed (analyzed) so as to transform it into knowledge: the body of analyzed information that allows us to understand whatever it is that the research was about. To give you an example from *your* world: to know the different parts of a car engine and what their functions are is to possess *information* about that engine. However, that is not knowledge; knowledge of a car engine is when you can *explain* the physical principles behind the operation of the engine. It is knowledge of these principles that allowed the invention of the engine. (So, do you know the principles behind the operation of the internal combustion engine?... I thought so.) Remember, the saying is “*knowledge is power*” (and not information is power). Now, in order to transform information into knowledge you have to have access to tools of analysis (which usually takes the form of theories, concepts, and the like). The purpose of this glossary, then, is to also introduce you to some of the key concepts and theories that are behind the material that we have covered (or will cover) in this course. Let me also add here, by the way, that not all knowledge is neutral. Most knowledge is also biased, depending upon who is producing it—though that does not automatically mean that such knowledge is incorrect or useless. For example: conservatives tend to be suspicious about knowledge produced by liberals (and vice versa); similarly, radicals are suspicious of knowledge produced by both conservatives *and* liberals. In my classes, knowledge is always biased toward the view that mutual harmony in society rests on democracy (not in its narrow sense, but in its wider sense as defined below). It is democracy that separates us from barbarity and chaos. Fourth, consider this document as my gift to you as part of my mission to try and do good in this world—why else do teachers become teachers? Please keep a dictionary handy when going through this document—you may need it. Now on to the glossary. By the way, words highlighted within a definition is an indication that the same words are also defined elsewhere in this glossary. Enjoy! (Do not forget to read the footnotes.)

Glossary

9/11: The shorthand name given to a terrorist event in United States that took place on September 11, 2001.

Accumulation: The limitless acquisition of wealth on the basis of expanded reproduction of capital through the mechanism of surplus appropriation within the sphere of production in capitalist societies.

Agency: A concept that denotes the ability to shape one’s destiny—but within limits imposed by history and circumstance—as a constitutive characteristic of a thinking being. Agency may operate at a group level as well (as in the idea of “historical agency.”) Note that social change, from our perspective, is considered to be an outcome of a dialectic in the agency/**structure** binary.

African Americans: See **U.S. African Americans**.

Afrikaans: The language of Afrikaners, also sometimes called Cape Dutch, that grew out of a combination of the Netherlandic language (Dutch) and the languages of the indigenous Africans living in the Cape region (mainly the Khoisan peoples), and African and Asian slaves and indentured labor. It had diverged sufficiently from Dutch by about the middle of the 18th century to become a distinct language in itself. To the African people, Afrikaans in time came to be associated with apartheid oppression, therefore they preferred to learn English instead. (The common use of English among Africans, as opposed to Afrikaans, was also, however, facilitated historically by English-speaking missionaries—the Afrikaners did not believe that black people had a soul to convert.) When in 1976 the Apartheid government mandated that the medium of instruction in black high schools no longer be English, but Afrikaans, it provoked a massive rebellion on the part of the kids, who by this time had also come under the influence of the South African version of the U.S. Black Power movement, known as the *Black Consciousness Movement*, led by Stephen Biko (who himself would be arrested and tortured to death by the South African police in 1977) that came to be known as the Soweto rebellion in which hundreds, mostly school children, were killed by the police and many hundreds more imprisoned and tortured. South Africa was never the same again following the rebellion; it would be the beginning of the end of Apartheid and white minority rule. (Very often, in modern history, students have been at the forefront of bring major change to society.)

Afrikaner: An ethnic category comprising descendants of Boers—the original European colonial settlers (mainly Dutch, French and Germans), who arrived at the Cape beginning in 1652 under the initial leadership of one, Jan Van Riebeeck, at the behest of his employers, the Dutch East India Company, to set up a shipping station for their ships enroute to and from the East. They would later migrate out of the Cape region shortly after the British arrived to rule the Cape (in 1806) to form the autonomous states of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. (Incidentally, This term, as a self-conscious appellation, was already beginning to come into vogue by the beginning of the 1700s as the Afrikaners sought to distinguish themselves from the VOC officials and servants.) Along the way they would engage in frequent warfare with the African peoples they encountered. (Compare, the settlement of the West in the U.S. by

European colonial settlers.) This migration (taking place roughly from mid-1830s to mid-1840s), prompted by dissatisfaction with British liberal policies, especially with their decision to free the slaves and abolish slavery in the Cape, came to be known as the Great Trek, has great symbolic significance in Afrikaner history. Afrikaners are also sometimes referred to as the Boers (Dutch word for peasant farmer). Note: The conflict with the British that led to the Great Trek would never completely abate; it would eventually develop into a full-scale war between them (1899-1902) known as the Anglo-Boer War or the South African War. During that war most of the U.S. public was on the side of the Boers, but the U.S. Administration and its allies took the side of the British. The Boers were defeated, but they would later emerge victorious through the ballot-box in 1948, by which time the British, through the 1909 South Africa Act, had facilitated the formation the following year of the now self-governing Union of South Africa (formed out of the original colonial settler states of Cape Colony, Natal, Transvaal, and Orange Free State). The constitution of this new country largely excluded the majority of the population, the Africans and other black peoples, from any form of political participation. It was as if they did not exist. Until 1994, when for the first time in its history South Africa would hold a nation-wide multi-racial national elections leading to the election of the majority black peoples to power (under the leadership of the ANC and Nelson Mandela), South Africa would remain a white minority ruled country.

Americans: In my classes this nationality refers to all the peoples who reside in the continents of North and South America. Reference to Americans who live in the United States is by the designation *U.S. Americans*.¹

ANC: Acronym for African National Congress, an African nationalist organization and political party, which originally began its life in 1912 as the South African Native National Congress with the initially limited objective of fighting for the retention of a modicum of voting rights that some sections of colored people (people of mixed racial descent) and Africans enjoyed in Cape Province. The organization changed its name to the African National Congress in 1923, by which time it had begun to expand its objectives to include resistance to racist segregation, so that by the 1940s and the early 1950s it was in the forefront of resisting Apartheid through moderate non-violent strategies. The more famous of these was the Campaign of Defiance against Unjust Laws of 1952 (organized jointly by the ANC with the South African Indian Congress and others) that included a public transportation boycott. (Compare, the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955 led by Martin Luther King, Jr.) In 1959, a small splinter group of ultra-nationalists broke away from the ANC to form the Pan African Congress (PAC) and it is as an indirect result of this event that Mandela, Sisulu, Kathrada and others would be given life imprisonment and be banished to a prison on the Robben Island. To explain: the PAC organized massive demonstrations against laws prohibiting freedom of movement for Africans (known as the “pass laws”) in 1960, and one of these demonstrations (involving peaceful unarmed demonstrators) in a black township called Sharpeville became a police massacre in which scores were shot to death as they fled from the police. The Sharpeville Massacre, in turn, provoked the ANC, now an underground illegal organization following its banning in 1960, to form a unit the following year called *Umkhonto We Sizwe* (“Spear of the Nation”) to commence armed resistance, mainly through sabotage activities, against apartheid given that as the Apartheid state increasingly tightened its grip on South African society, non-violent resistance was not only no longer possible, but it was a suicidal strategy, as demonstrated by the Sharpeville Massacre. In 1962, its leader Nelson Mandela (and other colleagues) were arrested and sentenced to five years in prison for their anti-apartheid activities. Those who had escaped arrest, such as Oliver Tambo, escaped from South Africa altogether to reconstitute the ANC in exile (with the assistance of countries such as the Soviet Union through the agency of ANC’s ally, the Communist Party of South Africa, itself also a banned organization (1950) and in exile, as well as the host countries, such as Zambia and Tanzania). Following the 1976 Soweto Rebellion, which provoked a massive emigration of the young to neighboring countries where the ANC had over the years developed bases, led to the reemergence of the ANC as the preeminent anti-apartheid organization, inside and outside South Africa.

Apartheid: I am sure most of you have come across this word before, and certainly we have used it in this class. However, it has a very specific meaning and history behind it even though it is usually used today generically to refer to racist segregation of a society. This is an Afrikaans word meaning “apartness” that came to signify the juridically-based, racially defined neofascist socio-political order (that had its roots in the colonial era at a time when the European settler struggle to dispossess aboriginal Africans of both their land and labor, in the context of the globally determined emerging capitalist order, overrode all else) in which the concept of “whiteness” was foundational, and fashioned by the Afrikaner segment of the white polity following its accession to power in 1948 when their party, the National Party, won the all-white national elections. It is important to point out that apartheid was both a racist ideology (white versus black), and an ethnically defined ideology in which the Afrikaners sought to gain ascendancy over the English segment of the white polity for both economic and cultural reasons. The specific guiding principles of the agenda of this new apartheid government are summarized best in a sentence or two by Kallaway (2002: 13): “They were keen to promote the interests of Afrikaner politics against English domination of economic, social and cultural life, against big business and its control by ‘alien forces of Anglo-Jewish capitalism,’ and against ‘black encroachment’ on ‘white interests.’ They were for the promotion of Afrikaner business and culture and the ‘salvation of ‘poor whites.’” In other words, and it is important to stress this, apartheid was at once an economic project and a political project—the two were intimately and dialectically related—that sought to promote Afrikaner supremacy in the first instance and white supremacy in the second. Apartheid was never meant to wish black people away, on the contrary it needed black people, but only as sources of cheap labor (and to this end it meant dominating and controlling them on the basis of that classic “separate-but-equal” ruse first perfected in the United States following the Supreme Court decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson* 163 U.S. 537 [1896]). Ergo, to say that apartheid was a modernized form of serfdom is not to engage in cheap theatrical polemics, but to describe it as it really was designed (and came) to be. Building on existing racist legislation (such as the 1907 *Education Act No. 25*, and the 1913 *Natives Land Act*) and centuries old customary Jim Crow practices, various National Party-led governments systematically erected and perfected a highly oppressive,

1. In 1820, the Mexican rabble-rousing cleric Servando Teresa de Mier, during a visit to Washington, D. C. wryly indicated this problem of nomenclature: “Since the Europeans believe that there is no other America than the one their nation possesses, an erroneous nomenclature has formed in each nation.” He explained:

The English call their islands in the Caribbean Archipelago, our Indies or the West Indies; and for the English there is no other North America than the United States. All Spanish North America is to them South America, even though the largest part of the region is in the north. The people of the United States follow that usage and they are offended when we, in order to distinguish them, call them Anglo Americans. They wish to be the only Americans or North Americans even though neither name is totally appropriate. Americans of the United States is too long; in the end, they will have to be content with the name guasintones, from their capital Washington,... just as they call us Mexicans, from the name of our capital. (From Rodriguez O [2000: 131])

On this subject, see also the article by Hanchard (1990).

neofascist, racially segregated, super-exploitative, sociopolitical economic order that came to be called apartheid.² Initially, the system would rest on a base of three socially constructed races: Africans, Coloreds, and whites; but later, a fourth would be added: Indians (Afro-Asians). A little later, the system would be modified to fragment the African majority into its smaller ethnic components fictively rooted geographically in separate rural labor reservations (which would be first called Bantustans and later dignified with the label “homelands”) carved out of the measly 13% of land that had been allocated to Africans by the 1913 *Native Land Act* and its subsequent modification. (In other words, apartheid was also a form of colonialism—internal colonialism.) Of the numerous pieces of legislation that underpinned the system, among the more salient were: the 1949 *Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act*; the 1950 *Population Registration Act*; the 1950 *Group Areas Act*; the 1950 *Suppression of Communism Act*; the 1953 *Reservation of Separate Amenities Act*; the various internal security acts that not only proscribed any form of opposition to the apartheid system, but permitted imprisonment without trial; the various pass laws that severely curtailed the freedom of movement of Africans by requiring them to carry a pass at all times; and the 1959 *Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act*, which created the pseudo-sovereign internal African states just mentioned. (Note: the *Suppression of Communism Act* defined communism so broadly as to include any nationalist or antiapartheid activities by any one, communist or not.) It is also important to point out that the rise and longevity of apartheid as an ideology were also due, to a significant extent, to the fact that the ideology while seemingly at odds with the needs of capital, in reality suited the capitalist order quite well—that is until the accumulated weight of contradictions it spawned would grow to become a serious liability by the 1980s—in that it served to “purchase” the loyalty of white labor (with its electoral power to legitimate capitalist enterprise) in the inherent class struggle between labor and capital by facilitating the subjectification of objective class interests of labor at both levels: at the racial level of the white polity as a whole (through the concept of whiteness), and at the specific ethnic level of Afrikanerdom (through the concept of “Afrikanerism,” for want of a better word). At the same time, needless to say, it facilitated the super exploitation of land and labor that belonged to others, namely the aboriginal African majority. To those familiar with U.S. history, it would not be farfetched to draw parallels (leaving aside the obvious reversal of the black/white population ratios) with the Jim Crow era of the U.S. South in which Jim Crow was aimed at securing political/economic domination over both, in the first instance, blacks, and in the second instance, white northerners.³

Appropriation: This is a fancy word for stealing and then claiming that it has always belonged to you. Conquerors tend to appropriate everything: property (such as land), culture (such as language and music), and even knowledge and ideas. Some examples of appropriation: Euro-Americans appropriating African-American music; Europeans appropriating Native American lands; Europeans appropriating Islamic knowledge and culture during the latter half of the Middle Ages. **See also Culture.**

Art: This is a very difficult concept to define because of the inherent subjectivity involved—be it from the perspective of the individual or society as a whole—in identifying something as a “work of art.” Consider: among Western thinkers who have grappled with this problem range all the way from Plato to Aristotle to Edmund Burke to Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel to Leon Trotsky. In fact, it may be legitimate to argue that it is impossible to come up with a single definition of what constitutes a work of art that would encompass every form of artwork that people in a given culture have so considered it. (One person's art may be another person's junk; in one culture a painting of a nude can be a work of art while in another it can be viewed as pornography.) One solution to the problem is to define art on the basis of “genres” from the perspective of a given culture. Hence, the definition of what constitutes art would differ depending upon whether we are considering a painting or literature or a dance performance or a piece of music or a film or a culinary creation, and so on, in the context of, say, Western culture in contrast to, say, African culture. That said, however, I would suggest that at least eight key characteristics can be identified as intrinsic to all works of art: First, from the point of view of the artist, works of art involve (a) human creativity (where the artist marches to the beat of his/her own drummer); (b) a motivating impulse of good (in contrast to evil); (c) talent; (d) passion; and (e) motivation that is independent of the pursuit of monetary reward for its own sake. Second, from the perspective of audience appreciation, works of art (f) involve an aesthetic experience (delightful, in some way, to one or more of the senses); (g) elicit contemplative cognition; and (h) they stand the test of time. (Note, however, that these last three characteristics may also be relevant from the perspective of the artist—but not always.) In terms of cinema, which is our main concern here, I will seek refuge in a definition that distinguishes between art versus commercial entertainment along the lines best captured by Youngblood (1979:754) while discussing this very subject: “By perpetuating a destructive habit of unthinking response to formulas, by forcing us to rely ever more frequently on memory, the commercial entertainer encourages an unthinking response to daily life, inhibiting self-awareness.... He/she offers nothing we haven't already conceived, nothing we don't already expect. Art explains; entertainment exploits. Art is freedom from the conditions of memory; entertainment is conditional on a present that is conditioned by the past. Entertainment gives us what we want; art gives us what we don't know what we want. To confront a work of art is to confront one self—but aspects of oneself previously unrecognized.”⁴ From this perspective, then, a film is a cinematic work of art when all its constitutive elements (the screenplay, the acting, the cinematography, the editing, the film score, the production design, the sound design, costumery, and so on) work in concert to render the film, at once: intelligently entertaining, powerfully thought-provoking, emotionally challenging, and intellectually enriching. Yet, the fact that the predominant characteristic of most Hollywood films is their obsessive quest for entertainment value—of the lowest common denominator at that—above all else (violence and debauchery being their signatures) speaks to the corrupting influence of corporate capitalism in its obsessive and obscene pursuit of profits.

Banning: The proscription of organizations—and, check this out, persons. Now you may ask, how can a person be “banned”? What this meant in practice was that banned persons were virtually under house arrest during specified hours, restricted to a particular locale, they had to report to the local police regularly at specified times, were isolated from family, friends and the media, and so on. (It was illegal, for example, for the media to talk to or quote a banned person. Another severe restriction was not being allowed to be in the company of more than one

2. Recall that some of the architects of this order were open admirers of Nazi Germany!

3. See also Derrida and Kamuf (1985, 1986) for an insightful take on the word apartheid. It is also worth pointing out here that as in the case of Jim Crow U.S. South, apartheid came to have a highly corrupting influence throughout society, sparing no one. As Lyman (2002: 9) has so well put it:

Racial discrimination, when institutionalized, indeed made part of the national ethic, brings out the worst in all people. It attracts the most brutal into positions of authority and gives them an outlet for their brutality; it demeans the victims and forces them into servility to survive; it breeds anger, fear, and timidity on all sides, making efforts at reform tepid and violent by turns. In sum, it corrupts the entire society, oppressor and victim, liberal and conservative. So it was with apartheid.

4. Youngblood, Gene. “Art, Entertainment, Entropy.” In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, edited by Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen, pp. 754-760. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1979.

person at a time.) Remember, apartheid South Africa was a neo-fascist state. (Fascism refers to an ideology first practiced in Nazi Germany and Benito Mussolini's Italy that combined jingoism, militarism, authoritarianism, racism and capitalism.) It was a *neo*-fascist state because it still allowed some democracy for a portion of the population: the white population. For the rest, the black population, however, it was racist domination and exploitation, involving at the margins of the system an endemic pattern of murders of political opponents inside and outside prison, assassinations of opponents in foreign countries, military incursions into neighboring countries, the imprisonment without trial and torture of thousands upon thousands of anti-apartheid activists (including children as young as seven!), unprovoked shooting of demonstrators, and so on. All this has been documented in a multivolume report issued by a commission of inquiry set up in 1995 by the then newly elected President Mandela under the leadership of Bishop Desmond Tutu called the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission*.

BBC: British Broadcasting Corporation

BCE: Before the Common Era (**C.E.**)—equivalent to the period that historians used to refer to as B.C.

Blacks: An ethnic category that refers to all peoples who can trace their ancestry to peoples of Africa, Asia and the Americas living in the period before the Age of European Voyages of Exploitation. Whites, using a similar line of reasoning, are those peoples who can trace their ancestry to peoples of the European peninsula before the Age of European Voyages of Exploitation. In the U.S. context, blacks generally refers to **U.S. African Americans**, and whites refers to U.S. Euro-Americans.

Boer: Descendants of the first European settlers to arrive in South Africa (roughly during the period 1652 to 1707) who were predominantly Belgian, Dutch, German and **Huguenot**, and whose first language is **Afrikaans**. The word Boer in Dutch means farmer or husbandman. Note, that today the word has acquired a generally derogatory connotation and Afrikaners prefer not to be called by this term.

Boipatong Massacre: Boipatong is a township south of Johannesburg in the Vaal Triangle. Inkatha supporters attacked (on June 17, 1992) a squatter camp inhabited by, presumably, ANC supporters, killing more than 40 people, including many women and children. An independent investigation at that time revealed that the attackers had had the support of the police. The ANC accused the government of F. W. De Klerk of using the police and the army to engage in terrorist activities against ANC supporters, with the connivance of groups such as Inkatha. More recently, however (November 2000 ruling of the Amnesty Committee of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission), it has been suggested that Inkatha supporters had acted on their own and that the police were not involved.

Borders: See **Culture**

Botha, P. W. (Pieter Willem): A law student who did not finish his degree, Botha's passionate love of politics ensured that this particular personal failure would be a minor handicap, if at all. Botha was born on January 12, 1916 in what was then the Orange Free State. Politically active even as a teenager, he would be elected to Parliament in 1948 as a candidate for the National Party when this right-wing (even in terms of white South African politics) Afrikaner party would sweep the whites-only elections, banishing the white liberal parties into political wilderness forever. After almost 20 years of active participation, beginning in 1961, as a government minister in various posts (public works, defense, etc.) he would assume the prime ministership in 1978 upon the resignation of B. J. Vorster. The timing could hardly have been auspicious, for the storm clouds that would herald the twilight of apartheid South Africa were already gathering fast (recall the Soweto rebellion two years prior, and the collapse of white-minority rule in the neighboring countries of Mozambique and Angola three years prior, and in Rhodesia two years later). It is unlikely that he or any one else would have foreseen that he too, despite his stubborn efforts to maintain an iron-grip on the apartheid ship of state—as the fury of the African people, led by the young, at enduring more than 300 years of unmitigated white racist oppression exploded beyond all control—would be made to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor: he would end his office in ignominy by being forced to resign, on grounds of incompetence, by his own cabinet in 1989.

Bourgeoisie: A term that refers to the wealthy class that emerges as a result of capitalist industrialization: the modern capitalist “nobility.” The term is used interchangeably with other terms, such as, capitalist class. Note that this class also includes the minions of corporate capital who sit at the top of corporate hierarchies. In capitalist societies political and economic interests are always fragmented; they are never unitary because of the divergent objectives of the different groups imposed on them by the dictates of the capitalist economic system. In general, though not always, on almost all major societal issues the objective interests of the bourgeoisie and the petite bourgeoisie are diametrically different from those of the working class (**proletariat**) and the **peasantry**. (See also **petite bourgeoisie**.)

Cape: A geographic term that in the South African context has had various geographic designations depending upon historical context: hence it can refer to the settlement that was established at Table Bay by Jan van Riebeeck on behalf of the VOC that eventually grew to become today's modern Cape Town; or it can refer to the Cape of Good Hope (a promontory at the southern end of Cape Peninsula); or it can refer to Cape Colony (and later Cape Province), one of the administrative territories (of which Cape Town was its capital) that was the first European colony of the four colonies that eventually coalesced to become modern South Africa.

Cape Town: The legislative capital of South Africa, and administrative capital of Western Cape Province, that was founded by the first Dutch settlers (led by Jan van Riebeeck) in 1652. A geographic landmark that the city is famous for is, of course, Table Mountain. The city is located in the Cape peninsula north of Cape of Good Hope. By the way, the administrative capital of South Africa is Pretoria. All the three prisons Mandela was in are in or near Cape Town.

Capital: This term is used in two senses in my classes, depending upon the context of its usage. One sense is the more common understanding of capital as referring to one of the three key factors of production in a capitalist society, financial resources—the commodity whose function is to marry the other two factors: land (or its equivalent) and labor. The other sense in which the term is used is as a generic term for capitalists considered as a class.

Capitalism: This term refers to an economic system that first emerged in Western Europe around the fifteenth century following the collapse of feudalism.⁵ This is not to suggest that prior to this period there were no capitalists. In fact capitalists were present as far back as the ancient civilizations of Babylonia in the form of merchants. The difference however is that in these civilizations capitalism was not a universal economic system in which all members of society were participants—either as workers/peasants or as capitalist entrepreneurs. For capitalism to exist as a universal economic system it is not enough that only some members be involved in profit-making activities whereas the rest are involved in other forms of production systems, such as the feudal system or subsistence system. The entire society must become involved in which there is not only simple profit-making via trade but also profit-making via what may be termed as “expanded reproduction of capital.” That is the continuous process of investment and re-investment of profits (capital) in order to continuously expand its magnitude. In such a

⁵ The factors that were responsible for this transition to a new economic system is a matter of intense debate—see for example Dobb et al. (1976) and Brenner (1977).

system everything has a potential to become a commodity that can be bought and sold, including labor-power (provided by workers) and capital (provided by banks). Therefore, capitalism signifies an economic system in which three types of markets interact: the labor market, the capital market, and the exchange market (the selling and buying of goods) with the sole purpose of generating profits for those who own the means of production: the capitalists. Such a system is only possible under conditions where a group of people in society, workers, are completely at the mercy of another group, capitalists, for their livelihood; for it is only under such conditions that capitalists can obtain labor-power, without which nothing of value can ever be produced. In other words, capitalism by definition implies the emergence of two principal classes: the capitalist class which has a complete monopoly over the means of production (be it land, factories, and so on) and the working class which has no access to the means of production, and therefore must sell their labor-power to the capitalist class in order to survive.⁶ In defining capitalism, there are three points that deserve emphasis: (a) The drive to make profits as a result of competition (see above) not only fuels the innovation process in production techniques as new ways are always being sought to reduce costs as well as improve quality of products (which in turn require greater profits to pay for the research and innovation), but also force capitalists to seek out new markets and sources of cheap raw materials beyond the borders of the country in which they are located, giving rise to transnational firms. One implication of this fact is that it is in the interest of transnationals to ensure that no region of the world is closed to them—in case they may need to extend their activities there (to invest, to sell goods, to develop raw materials sources, and so on). The push to open up the Antarctic region to capitalist activities is symptomatic of this inherent need by capitalists to extend their range of actual and potential activities to all corners of the globe; regardless of the disastrous environmental consequences that may ensue, not only for the Antarctic region but the planet itself. Since socialist economic systems do not permit private capitalist activity countries that acquire socialist economic systems are by definition enemies of transnationals. It is this issue that lay at the heart of what used to be called the cold war; the United States and its allies had an innate fear of the Soviet Union assisting PQD nations in instituting socialist economic systems. But how does one explain the fact that even a supposedly socialist country such as China now has transnationals operating within its borders? The simple answer is that it no longer has a socialist economic system. Its economy is a mixed economic system comprising partially state-owned and partially (or wholly) privately-owned capitalist enterprises. In fact, with the phasing out of centralized economic planning—an important characteristic of socialist economies—the economy that has emerged is essentially one of a fusion of state and private capitalism. (State capitalism is a system where

⁶ But how does this division arise when at some point in history all had access to the principal means of production: land? The answer is force and violence; not, as the capitalists tend to assert, talent, ability, or intelligence. To take the examples of the United States and South Africa: the mechanism by which a group of people were rendered workers and another capitalists was force and violence. Through force and violence the early European settlers stole the land from the native inhabitants and divided it up among themselves. Later, once all the land had been taken, newcomers had to buy the land from the original settlers—setting in motion the usual capitalist processes of using land for agricultural, or mining, or residential or other uses to generate profits that would later be invested in factories and other commercial enterprises. In this way there arose two principal classes in both countries: capitalists and workers. Similarly in Western Europe, through force and violence the serfs lost the right to farm their land to the nobility during the process of the transition from feudalism to capitalism and became as a result agrarian and industrial workers while the nobility became the capitalist group. The roots of capitalist classes therefore are to be found in history where invariably money tainted with the blood of others (e.g., serfs, native inhabitants, slaves, and so on) formed the basis of their genesis. The most recent example of a capitalist class in formation is, of course, in present-day Eastern Europe, China (and South Africa as well, in the case of the emerging compradorial black capitalist class). Those bureaucrats who had managed to accumulate privileges and contacts while they were in office are finding it much easier to convert these privileges into sources of support for their entrepreneurial activity. The arrival of capitalism in Eastern Europe has given a second life to the high-level Communist bureaucrats (ironically, the very group responsible for bankrupting the economies of Eastern Europe when they were in charge). But how does one explain the fact that today there are examples of people who have become rich through, seemingly, their own talent and ability? The answer is that to be sure some at the individual level do become rich and join the ranks of the capitalist class through their own efforts (perhaps they win a lottery and invest the proceeds, or they have unusual entertainment talent—acting, singing, sports and so on—that allows them access to large sums of money that they then invest in businesses). However, a close scrutiny of the background of the rest of the so-called self-made people will reveal that they had advantages and “breaks” associated with coming from a capitalist class background (e.g., education, the right skin color, the right gender, adequate nutrition that did not stunt their brain development while growing up, right connections through their parents and/or other relatives, and so on), or in the case of the former Communist countries of Eastern Europe associated with coming from a high-level Communist bureaucratic background. It will, therefore, come as a shock to many to realize that in all modern capitalist countries of the West, the majority of the working class and the capitalist class can trace their roots going as far back as thousands of years in history when the first divisions began to take place in society (with the emergence of settled agriculture) between those who produced products via their own labor (the ruled), and those who consumed what others produced (the rulers or the nobility). In other words, regardless of the various transformations of economic systems, class divisions have remained remarkably constant in terms of who the occupants of these divisions have been. Today’s working class in OD countries has a long, long history of being exploited that predates capitalism. Therefore, the idea that people achieve wealth, status and power via their own personal efforts, embodied in the so-called “mobility dream,” that is so widespread in many capitalist societies is in reality a myth. (See Li 1988 for more on this idea and its fallacies.) People do not choose to become poor, homeless and unemployed; structural conditions of the capitalist system ensures that a significant segment of society that has been historically discriminated against, through the use of force and violence, remains within the class of workers and the unemployed. Moreover, a simple thought experiment will drive home the point that other factors besides talent, ability and the capacity for hard work are involved when seeking membership to the capitalist class: supposing that all within the United States or South Africa, regardless of race, gender or any other biological attribute, suddenly became equal in terms of these three factors, would they all become rich and members of the capitalist class overnight? The answer obviously is in the negative. The fact is that the enjoyment of wealth, power and status by a minority group of people, whether in a single country or in the world, is dependent upon the denial of these to the rest of the population in a context of scarce resources that cannot permit all to have gourmet three-course meals, chauffeur-driven expensive luxury cars, unlimited supply of spending money, luxury mansions with tennis courts and swimming pools, vacations in exotic places, servants, expensive cloths, all kinds of sophisticated electronic gadgetry, and so on. The system that today permits this massive inequality without making it appear unfair and unjust to both the capitalist class and the underprivileged is the capitalist system. The idea, propagated via the concept of the “mobility dream,” that all have an equal chance to enjoy such a life-style, but only if they work hard and use their talent and ability, is a myth that helps to justify the existence of a system that conceals the inherent inequalities it engenders via the impersonal operation of market forces where those with initial advantages (derived from the past) remain the constant winners. The irony in all this, of course, is that among the staunchest believers of the mythology of the mobility dream are the very victims of the capitalist system: the workers, the unemployed and the poor.

the owner of the capitalist enterprise is not a private individual or a group of private individuals but the state.) It is for this reason that the cold war is now dead. (b) The political system that accompanies capitalism can be of any kind—so long as it does not interfere with the capitalist processes of making profits. Hence a monarchical form of government, a ruthless military dictatorship, a fascist government, a racist government, a parliamentary democratic government, a multiparty presidential government, a benign civilian dictatorship, etc. can all be at home with capitalist economic systems. Democracy therefore is not intrinsic to capitalism, just as political tyranny is not intrinsic to socialist economic systems—except in the case of the Leninist-Stalinist versions (sadly the only ones that have been in existence hitherto). (c) In order to fully comprehend the sources of social change in capitalist societies one must study the political behavior of the two principal groups in these societies: the capitalist class and the working class; that is, the two groups that are mutually antagonistic toward each other as a result of the specific relationship each has to the production process (exploiter and exploited).⁷ In the case of South Africa until recently, class division

⁷ But there are many people in capitalist societies that are neither capitalists nor workers; does this mean they are irrelevant? Not at all; except that their political behavior can be best understood by determining how far from or how close to in the production process (or bureaucratic hierarchy) they are to either of the two principal groups. To take an example: in a government bureaucracy the political behavior of those at the top will diverge considerably from those at the bottom; those at the top will most likely have a commonality of interests with the capitalist class whereas those at the bottom with the working class. There is one other related matter of clarification: you will find in the literature a very adamant view that the analysis of the social structures of capitalist societies (like this one) does not need to consider the matter of “race” (or “gender” for that matter) because it is in reality an ideological epiphenomenon. It is “class” that must be the only focus of attention. At one level this view is correct as this thought experiment should quickly reveal: if tomorrow this entire society became racially homogenous would structural inequality disappear? The answer of course is no. Class would still remain as the determinant of the social structure. To make things clearer, I am briefly laying out below the basic elements of the theoretical narrative that explains the relationship between class and race. However, before I proceed let me first draw your attention to the issue of “specificity”: what follows is not concerned with a “generic” capitalist society, rather it deals specifically with the United States; that is a society that is not only capitalist but also a *constitutional democracy* with a history in which race has not only been a permanent subtext, but at times the text itself. (Recall that the colonization project was also at one and the same time a “racist” project.) Given this fact, the theoretical task is to coherently weave together three things: race, class, and law to arrive at a cogent understanding of the nature of U.S. society.

Capitalism and class

We live in a capitalist society, which means like ALL capitalist societies there is a hierarchic division of society by class (meaning rich at the top and poor at the bottom)

↓

Democracy

We also live in a society that supposedly champions *procedural* democracy (e.g. bill of rights) and *corporeal* democracy (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness).

↓

Problem

How can the capitalist class (today dominated by corporations and their minions) retain its hegemony in this capitalist democracy?

↓

Solution

Artificially construct new racial categories of “white” versus “black” by obliterating international ethnic (cultural/linguistic) differences through law. Then convince the majority (the white working class) to believe in the property value of “whiteness” (meaning the belief—often subconscious—that the mere possession of white skin color entitles one to more than the other person) Note: even whites who believe they are not racist will often succumb to the ideology of whiteness.

↓

Class consciousness

Obliteration of class consciousness (awareness of one's class position and interests) through subjectification of these interests (e.g. one's skin color becomes more important than such matters as jobs, health, education, etc. when voting) by subscription to racist beliefs (e.g. racist stereotypes) and racist practices (discrimination).

↓

Specific Functions of Racism

Racism acquires specific social functions: (1) scapegoating of minorities; (2) exploitation of minorities; (3) fragmentation of the working classes (divide and rule)

↓

Class warfare

Consequences: class warfare perpetrated on the working classes

↓

Law

Effect of this warfare: a perpetual assault on procedural democracy, which includes harnessing law in this effort.

↓

Quality of life

Effect of this warfare: a perpetual assault on the quality of life by subverting corporeal democracy

↓

Income gap

Symptomatic of this assault on the quality of life is the ever widening income gap between the capitalist class and the working classes NOT attributable to the logic of capitalism (meritocracy)—e.g. through manipulation of taxes

↓

Alienation

Creates frustration, disillusionment, and alienation among the working classes—including the white working class

was also by and large a racial division; consequently the politics of race was of greater significance than the politics of class. This circumstance is now changing, however, as a black capitalist class emerges and the white working class loses its former apartheid-determined privileges.⁸

Capitalist Democracy: See **Democracy**

CE: Common Era—equivalent to the period that historians used to refer to as A. D. (See also **BCE**)

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency (a U.S. government entity that began its life as a spy agency but which today undertakes all kinds of clandestine activities abroad, beyond spying).

Civil Society: This term has probably as many definitions as the number of persons willing to define it; for our purposes this one will have to do: the collectivity of all voluntary institutions in a society that are constituted from outside the arenas of the family, the state, and the market place. In a democracy, civil society is its basic foundation (to put it bluntly: no civil society, no democracy). There is a dialectical relationship between civil society and democracy where one nourishes the other.⁹

Civilization: See **political consciousness**

Climate Change: see **Global Warming**

Colonialism. The process of forcibly imposing on other peoples *territorial* hegemony (in contrast to the *nonterritorial* hegemony of **imperialism** and **neocolonialism**) by the colonizing power. The actual practice of colonialism is termed *colonization*. By its very nature, colonialism carries with it the imperative of the abrogation of the rights of the colonized as subsumed by the **Natural Law of Prior Claim**; and therefore colonization is always a two-stage process: conquest followed by the imposition of structures of hegemony (which range from forces of direct coercion to forces of economic subordination to forces of ideological manipulation [such as education and other aspects of culture]), by the colonizers. This entire process should not, it is important to stress, be regarded as an entirely one-way street in which the colonized lie supine as victims; on the contrary, even in defeat on the battlefield they do not abandon other forms of resistance elsewhere in the economy, polity and society generally—thereby exhibiting historical agency, as one would expect of thinking beings. Further, in my classes, colonialism refers specifically to that of the modern era (see **imperialism** for an explanation of the distinction). At the same time, unless indicated otherwise, colonialism in my classes refers to that variant of it that we may term **settler colonialism**. Note that “colonialism” is another one of those highly debated concepts (like imperialism)—see the discussion by Ostler (2004), for example, in his introduction, paying particular attention to his footnotes (as well as the sources indicated for **imperialism**).

Colored: An ethnic category in Southern Africa (a very rough equivalent to “mulatto” in the Americas) comprising persons *either* of mixed descent who emerged after the arrival of Europeans in that region—e.g., a person with a European father and a Xhosa mother, or an Asian slave father and a Khoisan mother, or a European father and an Asian slave mother, or a Colored father and a European mother, and so on—or persons of Khoisan or slave ancestry who took on the working-class version of the dominant white culture (including language) of their day, namely Afrikaner culture. Their predominant language is **Afrikaans**. An important subgroup among them were the Khoikhoi/Afrikaner descendants who were initially called the “Baastards,” or “Basters” but who later renamed themselves the *Griqua*. (Fleeing racist discrimination at the Cape to go on to impose their own brand of racism on the aboriginal Africans, they, for a time, had even managed to carve out their own territories: Griqualand East [in 1861, under the leadership of Adam Kok III], and Griqualand West [settled beginning in the late eighteenth century]. Both territories were eventually annexed by the British, the former in 1879, and the latter in 1871 when it was under the leadership of Nicholaas Waterboer.) Note that in the U.S. context this term was once reserved for **U.S. African Americans**.

Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986: This Act is referenced in the film, but not by name but by its principal provision: the imposition of economic sanctions by the United States on South Africa. It was signed into law by none other than Ronald Reagan (who had long resisted doing exactly this). Recall that earlier in the film Botha mentions Reagan (and Margaret Thatcher) as friends of South Africa. The Act was the work of Congress, prodded by the anti-apartheid activities of African Americans and others throughout the U.S. in the 1980s. The economic sanctions that were imposed on South Africa were limited and were more of a symbolic significance than anything else, except for an extension the following year (via the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987) of an important provision of the Act that rescinded the exemption from double-taxation enjoyed by U.S. transnationals operating in South Africa. It increased the cost of doing business in South Africa—thereby accelerating the loss of foreign investment for that country. From the perspective of the Apartheid government, the Act was a serious psychological blow (and we can sense it in the film).

Conjuncture of Fortuitously Propitious Historical Factors: A concept that seeks to explain major social transformations—of the order that can change societies permanently—by positing that they are as much a product of chance and circumstance as directed human endeavors (in the shape of “social movements,” broadly understood).¹⁰ In other words, such transformations are always an outcome of a fortuitous relationship between agency and “historical structures” (the latter being understood, in this instance, as major historical factors, be they natural

↓

Back to square one (the cycle begins again through subjectification of objective interests)

As a consequence they seek refuge in racism (whiteness) which permits scapegoating (psychic satisfaction) and slightly bigger crumbs from the table of the capitalist class—e.g. first hired, last fired.

⁸ While my classes are usually replete with criticisms of the capitalist system this should not be taken to imply that there is a surreptitious plea for the wholesale abandonment of the system; however desirable that may be, reality (both conceptually and politically) precludes that.

⁹ An introductory text worth looking at that explores this concept in its various manifestations is the anthology edited by Glasius, Lewis, and Seckinelgin (2004).

¹⁰ This is a very important concept because it helps to debunk the myth propagated by the powerful, the conquerors that their power is rooted in their own genetic makeup (that is that they are a naturally superior people born to rule, dominate exploit, etc. others). Whereas the truth is that this power and domination is an outcome of being in the right place at the right time, so to speak. In other words, no group of human beings (by whatever means you categorize them: race, class, gender, etc.) have a monopoly over intelligence and creativity. If they did have such a monopoly then how come they or their empire and civilizations are no longer with us today. (The passage into the dustbin of history numerous civilizations and empires—e.g. the Egyptian Civilization, the Greek Civilization, Roman Empire, the Chinese Civilization, the Byzantium Empire, the Islamic Empire, the Aztec Civilization, The British Empire, the Soviet Empire, and so on—attests to this point) Civilizations or empires are not preordained, whether by nature or God. Today the dominant civilization is the Western Civilization, but will it last forever? History tells us that the answer is no, but only time will tell.

or human, that originate outside the dictates of the agency in question and therefore are bereft of intentionality, that is, in terms of the transformations).¹¹

Conservatism: This is an ideology, obviously, that conservatives espouse; however, please note that there is a distinction between political conservatism, and cultural (or social) conservatism—it is quite possible for a person adhere to one, but not the other—and our concern here is with the former. So, what then is political conservatism? Very briefly it is an ideology that advocates the preservation of the existing or a bygone political, social, and economic order. In other words it is an ideology that justifies maintenance of the status quo or its overthrow in favor of a past order (status quo ante) *from the perspective of dominant power relations* in society (in other words, it is an ideology that justifies an arrangement where those who are on top remain on top and those who are at the bottom remain at the bottom—from this perspective conservatism is inherently opposed to **corporeal democracy** even while it may champion **procedural democracy**). Historically, conservatism in the Western world arose in opposition to the revolutionary political, economic and social changes wrought first by the French Revolution and later by the Industrial Revolution. For example, Edmund Burke, one of the prominent conservatives of the 18th century England, and whose thoughts would influence conservative political theory in the 19th century, believed in the preservation of the power of the monarchy and the landed gentry (the upper class); retention of a close relationship between the State and the Church; and the limitation of voting rights to a select few in society. Political conservatism in the twenty first century has tended to emphasize *laissez faire* (meaning to “leave alone” in French) economics, where there is no State intervention in the economy (except in circumstances explicitly requiring the protection of the interests of capitalists), and virulent opposition to the development of a welfare State. Political Conservatives, therefore, believe in absolute minimal government—except where capitalist interests are threatened (for example, conservatives do not object to the use of State power to smash trade unions—especially in situations of conflict between capitalists and workers). Since conservatism harks back to a past social order it follows that present day conservatives, such as those in the U.S., are opposed to many of the advances that have been made in the area of human and civil rights since the end of the second World War, including rights for blacks, women and even children. They are also opposed to efforts by the federal government to regulate industries in order to protect consumers directly (e.g., from fraud, unsafe products, false advertising, etc.) and indirectly (e.g., from environmental pollution), and of course are vehemently opposed to any programs designed to help the poor. On the basis of their pronouncements and on the basis of the foregoing it can be safely asserted that in general (there will always be exceptions of course) conservatives—depending upon the degree of intensity of adherence to their ideology—tend to display the following attributes: racism; sexism; favoritism toward the wealthy; intolerance toward alternative viewpoints, ideologies and lifestyle; patriarchal tendencies; unquestioning obedience to law—even if unjust; disdain for programs, projects and ideas aimed at protecting the environment because they believe environmental protection costs capitalists money (and since they have money they do not have to worry about their own health: e.g., if you can drink imported mineral water why worry about water pollution); disdain for the poor and the handicapped (the former because they are considered lazy and the latter because they are considered a burden on society); and jingoism accompanied by much belligerency (since the wealthy tend to profit from war and usually their children are able to avoid military service). In the U.S. in general, but not always, conservatives tend to be Republican Party members and/or usually vote for Republican candidates, and in general they are wealthy or come from wealthy backgrounds. However, large sections of the ignorantsia may also, from time to time, claim allegiance to this party. It is necessary to stress that not all conservatives will share all of these attributes; though all will share most of them. In a nutshell then conservatives are people who believe in a political and social order that would protect to the maximum possible privileges that they have garnered over the long course of human history at the expense of other human beings. (For an excellent account of the genesis of the conservative ideology see Moore [1966]). The sad truth is that after one has cut through the thick jungle of pseudointellectualism, one is confronted with the incontrovertible fact that in every field of human endeavor (from the arts to the sciences), conservatism has stood as a reactionary bulwark against all human progress. That said, one can still champion a serious study of conservatism much in the same way one would study, say, fascism.

Contradictions: unintended and usually unforeseen oppositional outcomes in a social system that threaten its survival—unless they are resolved by fundamentally transforming it—and which are rooted within the operational parameters of the system. It may be noted that contradictions first usually come to light *as contradictions* through scholarly analysis whereas they are incorrectly manifest to the architects of the system as merely disruptive symptoms (e.g. crises) of “imbalances” in the system which can be dealt with by simply fine-tuning the system (e.g. reforms—rather than fundamentally transforming it).

Corporeal democracy: See **Democracy**

Culture: Refers to the different cumulative adaptive responses of human societies to their different physical (natural) environment that is the product, in the first instance, of a dialectic between agency and structure. It is not race but culture that makes us “different” (but what that means, of course, is that contrary to what racists claim, culture is a *learned* phenomenon, and not a biological artifact.) Two points to note here about cultures: First, as I have explained many times, cultures are almost never entirely self-generated; they always include cross-cultural fertilizations through both deliberate and fortuitous border-crossings. And when it comes to “civilizations” (which are simply complex cultures) there is absolutely (repeat absolutely) no way that a civilization can arise without cross-cultural infusions or border-crossings (implication: no human diversity, no civilization). In other words, the idea of a “Western” civilization, to give one example, is not only a bogus idea, but it is also a racist idea! (Think about this: if we went far back in time when human societies were still forming, it is quite possible that we would find evidence of humans borrowing elements from animal “cultures”—e.g. cultures of apes—as they developed their own human

¹¹ Those who study history, especially comparative history, are burdened by the constant and sobering reminder that no matter how intelligently purposeful human beings may consider themselves, at the end of the day—that is, in the last instance—social transformations are as much a product of chance and circumstance as directed human endeavors (in the shape of ‘social movements’—broadly understood). To put the matter differently: any teleological order that may appear to exist in the history of social transformations is in reality a figment of the historian’s imagination. History is, ultimately, a selective chronicle of a series of conjunctures of fortuitously ‘propitious’ factors where the role of human agency, while not entirely absent (hence the qualifier: ultimately), is, more often than not, far from pivotal to the social transformation in question. Stephen K. Sanderson, in his book *Social Transformations: A General Theory of Historical Development* (Blackwell, 1995), makes this point with even greater clarity:

[I]ndividuals acting in their own interests create social structures and systems that are the sum total and product of these socially oriented individual actions. These social structures and systems are frequently constituted in ways that individuals never intended, and thus individually purposive human action leads to many unintended consequences. Social evolution is driven by purposive or intended human actions, but it is to a large extent not itself a purposive or intended phenomenon.” (p. 13)

cultures [now, how about them apples!]). Second, the fuzzy zone that marks off one culture from another can be termed as a cultural border or boundary. In a truly democratic society that encompasses many cultures among the objectives of democracy in such a society includes the twin-goals of *acceptance* (not just tolerance) of cultural borders and the simultaneous facilitation of border-crossings as essential to democracy, progress, and the quality of life. Two further points, but about border-crossings: where communities involved insist on maintaining strict boundaries in enforced hegemonic opposition to border-crossings then one should view it as symptomatic of racism/ ethnicism and the like. Second, where there are deliberate border-crossings, even in the face of opposition, it does not always signify respect and acceptance of the culture of the **Other**. The same can also hold true for fortuitous border-crossings (arising for instance out of one or more of such avenues as conquest or colonization or trade and commerce). In such instances, that is border-crossings in the absence of respect and acceptance of other peoples' cultures, we can call these border-crossings as "appropriation" (sometimes also referred to as "going native," especially in the context of **settler colonialism**). Note, however, that appropriation is further characterized by a refusal to acknowledge the appropriation (in this sense appropriation is really theft). A good example from history is the appropriation of the contributions of the Egyptian civilization to the development of the Greek civilization by the West and effected by Western historians in the service of the racist project of denying the contribution of black people to the development of Western civilization. A contemporary example of appropriations and which you should be able to relate to easily is the appropriation of black music (such as hip-hop) by young whites. When young white kids listen to hip-hop music they are not necessarily engaged in a "democratic" border-crossing, but may instead be engaging in **exoticism** and/or using this music as a means of rebelling against their parents (but while at the same time sharing with their parents a racist view of black people in general¹²).

Curse of Ham: See **Hamitic Theory**

Democracy: Democracy, in its true sense, has two related halves: the *procedural* and the *corporeal* (or substantive, meaning the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) where the former is the means to the latter. In a *capitalist democracy* the tendency is to emphasize the procedural at the expense of the corporeal, for obvious reasons. However, one without the other simply reduces democracy to a well-meaning but empty slogan. The first half refers to the institutional processes of voting, elections, term-limits, legislative representation, and so on. This narrowly defined understanding of democracy can be labeled as procedural democracy. Democracy, however, also has a broader substantive meaning (second half), as captured, for example, by the preamble to the U.S. Declaration of Independence. To quote the key paragraph: "WE hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all [Persons] are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." (Of course, even as one turns to that document, one cannot help but imagine how great that document could have really been if only its architects had at the same time not refused to consider other peoples, such as the enslaved African Americans and the Aboriginal Americans, worthy of these same rights; instead they even went on to label the latter as "merciless Indian Savages," and made them the source of one more grievance among the many listed by the document against the British Crown.) It is important, guys, to note that both kinds of democracy are essential for a society to function as a democratic society because both procedural democracy and substantive democracy are dialectically intertwined—one without the other renders both a sham. Of course, as implied here, the very idea of democracy in a capitalist society is problematic. The issue is not only one of the inherent contradictions of capitalist production where the nature of exploitation is rarely if ever transparent, but even within the confines of a narrower definition, in the context of capitalist societies, of what corporeal democracy implies (one that leaves the basic parameters of the capitalist order unchallenged) the relatively more simpler and accessible matter of making the apparatus of procedural democracy (elections, legislation, etc.) responsive to the agenda of the objective interests of the mass of the citizenry—one associated with a decent quality of life for all commensurate with the economic resources of the country, of which such markers as reasonable access to jobs, adequate remuneration, affordable and meaningful health insurance, quality education, safe neighborhoods, and so on, are axiomatic—is constantly (and often flagrantly) subjected to subversion by capital and its allies. In my classes, I also talk about *personal* democracy, by which I mean interpersonal relations among individuals in a society that are governed by the principle of equality of opportunity for respect, acceptance, and non-discrimination, regardless of age, class, color, ethnicity, gender, and other similar social structural markers.

De Klerk, F. W. (Frederick Willem): Another law student, but who, like Mandela, did finish his law degree and go on to establish his own successful law firm, would enter national politics in 1972 when as a National Party candidate he won a seat in parliament. Born on March 18, 1936, in Johannesburg, De Klerk's family background was saturated with politics (his father Jan, for instance, had been the head of the Transvaal National Party, and a minister in the 1954-58 government of J. G. Strydom). Given this pedigree and his own legal and political talents, he would be selected by Botha for a place in his cabinet—he would serve in various posts for the next ten years, beginning in 1979. In the same year that he connived with his fellow cabinet colleagues to force the resignation of Botha from the presidency, De Klerk had won the election for the leader of the National Party. He would formally become president upon the mandate of Parliament on September 14 (in which year, guys?). By the time he became president, secret talks with Mandela had already been underway, and his release a foregone conclusion, except for the actual date. It would come the following year, accompanied by the release of other important political prisoners, and a few days later (February 20, 1990), the unbanning of all political parties—including the Communist Party of South Africa on the left, and the neo-Nazi parties (like Terreblanche's AWB) on the right. Between 1991 and 1994 when the first multi-racial national elections were held in which the ANC won with a landslide, De Klerk's government undertook a series of negotiations with the ANC for a new political order based on universal suffrage against a backdrop of considerable internecine violence among black people involving, among others, ANC and Inkatha supporters. Sadly, and to the horror of many inside and outside South Africa, it proved to be the required catalyst to speed up the negotiations and break the various impasses that arose. Following ANC's electoral victory in 1994, De Klerk for a short time served as the second deputy president in the government of national unity that Mandela established. In 1997, De Klerk retired from active politics. From the film we can sense that De Klerk was essentially a backroom wheeler and dealer, and a pragmatist rather than an ideologue (unlike his wife Marike). What we are not shown in the film, however, is the real power behind the throne in De Klerk's rapid move toward dismantling apartheid, the Afrikaner-Broederbond—a South African secret society of male members of the Afrikaner establishment (whose membership is by invitation only and secret) founded in 1918 in the wake of the defeat of the Afrikaners in the Boer War, for the purpose of countering the power of the English-speaking white establishment. Guys: a question to ponder: why did De Klerk deserve to share with Mandela the 1993 Nobel Prize for Peace? Or did he?

¹² An extreme example of such behavior is when a neo-Nazi Skinhead listens to rap music. (See Yousman, Bill. "Blackophilia and Blackophobia: White Youth, the Consumption of Rap Music, and White Supremacy." *Communication Theory* 13 (no. 4): 366-91.)

De Klerk, Marike: Unlike her husband, De Klerk's spouse did not share her husband's view, by the time he took over the presidency of South Africa, that the "writing on the wall" was clear: the days of white minority rule would soon be over. The De Klerks divorced in 1998 after a 39-year marriage, allowing De Klerk to marry Elita Georgiadis (a love-interest of some four years standing). Marike died in early December 2001; she was brutally murdered in her apartment in Cape Town (motive of the murderer not surmisable). South Africa remains a violent country to this day; in the year that she died some 21,000 people were murdered.

Development: This term refers to economic development in my classes. Although development implies some form of economic growth, it must be distinguished from it because the latter is a phenomenon of a much narrower compass. Development should be defined (in addition to the matter of personal security and the protection of basic human and civil rights), as economically and ecologically *sustainable* economic growth that leads to a convergence between the rich and the poor by means of a qualitatively authentic ascendancy in the standard of living of the *masses* such as to guarantee them a *basic minimum* in seven key areas: nutrition, health, housing, sanitation, environment, employment, and education.

Dialectic: This is a concept often associated with philosophy, but it is not that philosophical meaning of the word that is of direct relevance here. Rather, its use in this course is more generic in the sense that it denotes the process where two seemingly unrelated factors impinge on one another *cyclically* such as to permanently render the fate of each, to be in the hands of the other. For example: factor A impacts factor B in such a way as to alter factor B, and thereby enhance its capacity to influence factor A, which in turn is altered, enhancing its capacity to continue influencing factor B. Factor B then is further altered, enhancing its capacity to continue impinging on factor A—and so the cycle continues.

Erasure: See **Textual erasure**.

Essentialism: Among its various uses, essentialism is an important weapon in the ideological arsenal of the racist, sexist, and so on. Considered from this perspective, this concept refers to the fallacy that there are certain basket of characteristics—often taking the form of malignant stereotypes—that constitute the "essence" of whatever group (marked by either race, gender, cultural difference, etc.) that is the target of essentialism and it is something that is biologically-rooted and therefore unchangeable. The common belief in this society that women are not good at math and science, that Jews are good with money, that Asians are robotically hardworking, that blacks are obsessed with sex, are all examples of essentialist beliefs.

Euro-Americans. See **Blacks**.

Euro-South Africans. People of European ancestry, but excluding the Colored peoples—generally used interchangeably with "Europeans" in my classes in terms of the South African context. (See also **Coloreds**.)

Exoticism: When you marry **Otherness** with your own fantasies about the Other then you emerge with exoticism. In the context of Western civilization, exoticism has meant projecting on to the culturally different peoples of the entire planet outside Europe, depending upon time and place, such Western-derived fantasies as "uninhibited sexuality," "innocence," "simplicity," and so on. While in the final analysis exoticism performs the same function as Otherness, it often *masquerades* as acceptance of difference, that is "multiculturalism." For instance, the Thai sex industry, which has its roots in the Vietnam War when U.S. soldiers visited Thailand for so called "R & R" (rest and recreation) and which rests primarily on Western middle-aged male clientele sexually exploiting poor rural Thai girls (and boys), is a perfect example of Western exoticism at work today. Another example, is the portrayal of Africa in films and documentaries as a continent full of wonderfully exotic wild animals—but minus human beings who would spoil the scenery—for the titillation of the Western "couch-potato" adventure seeker. To give yet another example, but one closer to you guys, is the seeming penchant for hip-hop culture among white suburban youth who even as they indulge in this culture, especially its music, continue to view black people from the perspective of Otherness. (Remember: imitation does not mean acceptance.) Question: to what extent was the election of a black president for the first time in the history of this country a function of exoticism?

Fascism: A political ideology that first arose in Nazi Germany, and Benito Mussolini's Italy that combined jingoism, militarism, authoritarianism, virulent ethnicism/racism, and capitalism into one ideological package.

Frontline States: Name acquired by a loose grouping of independent countries in Southern Africa who shared the legitimate view that they were in the "frontline" of the struggle against apartheid South Africa. They met regularly to exchange notes and coordinate policy; their membership included Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

G8: Short for *Group of Eight* which refers to the exclusive but informal club of the world's major economies (namely, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, and United States) located in the global North and who meet annually to discuss, plan, coordinate matters of mutual concern. From the perspective of the film, the G8 has relevance in that at their meeting held in July of 2005 at Gleneagles (a luxury hotel) in Scotland they agreed to forgive the foreign debts owed by 18 of the world's most heavily indebted poor countries, all located in Africa.

Goldberg, Dennis: An engineer by profession, he was born in Cape Town in 1933. He was a leading member of the Congress of Democrats (a white organization allied to the ANC). Goldberg was not taken to Robben Island with his codefendants since he was considered white; instead, he was taken to Pretoria Central Prison where white political prisoners were incarcerated. He served 22 years of his sentence before he was released.

Global North: another name for Western countries, that is, the rich (and it stands in contrast to *Global South*, which is roughly the rest of the world, that is, the poor). These terms are of course very broad generalizations but they have their purpose when discussing matters of wealth and power on a world scale.

Global South: see **Global North**.

Global Warming: At the simplest level, global warming may be viewed as the *greenhouse effect* gone awry. The greenhouse effect is the process by which the sun's energy warms the planet by heating the earth as it passes through the atmosphere while the atmosphere acts like a heat blanket (thermal radiation) preventing catastrophic heat loss into space from the heated earth. The best example of the greenhouse effect at work is when you leave a vehicle outside on a hot sunny day to find later that the interior of the car has become hotter than the exterior because the heat that entered through the windshield and closed windows is now trapped inside. Question: if the windshield can let in the heat, why can't it let it out? The answer is that it has to do with the different wavelengths of energy where the windshield can allow in one wavelength to go through, namely *solar radiation* (experienced as sunshine), but not another, namely *infrared radiation* (experienced as heat). When gases, such as carbon dioxide, are poured into the atmosphere at rates faster than the ability of natural processes to handle it then it increases the capacity of the atmosphere to magnify the greenhouse effect producing an increase in planetary temperatures with disastrous long term consequences (melting glaciers leading to rising sea levels; increasing oceanic temperatures leading to the death of ocean life, as well as rising incidence of

hurricanes, droughts, floods and similar weather changes; and so on.) Two of the biggest processes involved in the transformation of carbon dioxide—ordinarily a life-sustaining gas (necessary for photosynthesis) in a balanced environment—into an atmospheric pollutant are both human-engineered: the massive and relentless burning of fossil fuels (oil, gas, coal) and the destruction of forests. Controlling carbon dioxide pollution (often referred to as reducing the carbon footprint) would involve changing our resource-wasting and environment-polluting lifestyle, which is something most people, sadly, are unwilling to do in practice. At the same time, those who profit from the burning of fossil fuels (e.g. the big oil corporations) have hired conservative right wing think tanks to mount a campaign to undermine the credibility of scientists who work on global warming issues. In other words, a scientific issue (whether global warming is taking place or not) has become politicized by the conservative right for the sake, ultimately, of profits! Remember, that to the capitalist a forest—to take just one example—is nothing but just a bunch of trees (instead of a life-sustaining ecosystem); it only has significance when it is reduced to a pile of silver.

Globalization: This concept has as many definitions as those willing to define it, in part because some view it as a benign (or even desirable) phenomenon while others see it as a malignant development, and in part because it has several different dimensions: economic, political, social, cultural, and so on. In my courses I see it as neither benign nor malignant, depending upon whose perspective one is taking—but there are exceptions (as I will point out in a moment). Yes, but what is globalization? In a nutshell globalization is, as the term suggests, the deliberate and/or fortuitous universalization of institutions, practices, and beliefs across geographic (national) boundaries at all levels (economic, political, cultural, etc.) intrinsic to the development of civilizations and empires. From this perspective there is a directly proportional relationship between the degree of globalization and the size of the empire or civilization. The bigger the empire or civilization, the higher degree of globalization. While there are many examples one can provide to illustrate globalization, one example that you should be able to comprehend readily concerns music. So, when we see the emergence of rap bands in countries as diverse as United States, Indonesia, China, Nigeria, and Russia then we are witnessing an aspect of cultural globalization. From a cultural perspective, in addition to music, films (Hollywood cinema) and television provide us with an excellent example of two more important agencies of globalization. From an institutional perspective, the formation of such bodies as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the International Criminal Court (and even such global NGOs as *Oxfam* and *Doctors without Borders*) are instances of globalization.¹³ Because of the historically-determined hegemony of Western civilization today, globalization has been characterized by five fundamental characteristics: the universalization of *Western* institutions, beliefs, practices, values, norms, and so on; the rise of the transnational capitalist conglomerate as the predominant agency for globalization; the invention and deployment of satellite technology; the worldwide development of the Internet; and the rise of **techno-financialism**. While the view of globalization as a fundamentally malignant development in the eyes of some may be debatable, there are clear instances where globalization is, without question, a malignant development: such as in the case of global terrorism, the international narcotics trade, human-trafficking, transnational migration of diseases (e.g. AIDS), and **global warming**. In the future, the emergence of alternative centers of world power (e.g. in Asia) may lead to a different conception of globalization from the one we understand today—especially in the realm of culture and politics, if not necessarily economics. From the perspective of the world's poor, globalization can also have a very negative consequence. This is because at the simplest level globalization, in economic terms, has come to mean the relentless drive by corporate capitalism to penetrate every corner of the planet on the much ballyhooed premise—especially in Western countries like the United States—that everyone so effected by this drive will benefit equally via the logic of the so-called “trickle-down economics” (meaning in effect that, most bizarrely, if you allow the rich to get even richer by means of *untethered* capitalist enterprise the poor will also benefit). One does not have to be a rocket scientist to realize that in a world that was made economically unequal over a period of several centuries as a result of Western imperialism (forms of which continue to persist to this day) the push for globalization *on balance* has simply made the rich richer and the poor poorer between *and* within countries. (From an ecological perspective too, globalization has not been healthy for the planet.)

Hamitic Theory: When Europeans first stumbled across the architectural and artistic expressions of the wondrous achievements of Africans of antiquity (e.g., the Pyramids, the Zimbabwe Ruins, etc.) a dominant view that emerged among them to explain their origins, as I explained in class, was that they were the handiwork of a race of people from outside Africa.¹⁴ As Edith Sanders (1969) explains, while tracing the origins of this particular Western myth: “[t]he Hamitic hypothesis is well-known to students of Africa. It states that everything of value ever found in Africa was brought there by the Hamites, allegedly a branch of the Caucasian race.” However, she further explains, “[o]n closer examination of the history of the idea, there emerges a previous elaborate Hamitic theory, in which the Hamites are believed to be Negroes.” In other words, as she observes, “[I]t becomes clear then that the hypothesis is symptomatic of the nature of race relations, that it has changed its content if not its nomenclature through time, and that it has become a problem of epistemology” (p. 521). Not surprisingly, her carefully reasoned exegesis unveils a wicked tale of the lengths to which Westerners have gone to deny an entire continent part of its history; all for the purpose of constructing a racist ideology that could permit the rape of a continent without causing so much as a twinge in the consciences of even the most ardent of Christians. In fact, with great convenience, the myth actually begins in the Christian cosmological realm. The necessity to describe the origins and role of this myth here (albeit briefly) stems, of course, from its pervasive influence on Western attitudes toward the darker peoples of the world ever since the rise of Christianity in the West, generally, and more specifically, its subterranean influence on how Western colonial policies on education (as well as in other areas of human endeavor) in Africa were shaped and implemented—as will be shown in the pages to come. Furthermore, there is also the fact of its continuing lingering presence even to this day, in various permutations at the subconscious and conscious levels, in the psyche of most Westerners when they confront Africa—symptomatic of which, to give just one example, is the virulent attack on Bernal by the Eurocentrists (mentioned earlier).

Now, as just noted and bizarre though this may appear, the Hamites make their entry into the Western racist discourse initially as a degenerate and accursed race, not as an exemplary, high achieving race (relative to black people) that they were eventually transformed into. Those familiar with the Bible will recall that in it there are two versions of Noah, the righteous and blameless patriarch who is saved from the Great Flood by a prior warning from God that involves the construction of an ark by Noah (Genesis 6: 11–9: 19); and the drunken Noah of Genesis 9: 20–9: 27 who inflicts a curse on one of his three sons, Ham. It is the latter version that is of relevance here. Here is how the story goes in the King James version of the Bible:

¹³ NGOs refers to organizations formed outside governmental jurisdiction by the citizenry and its an acronym for Non-governmental Organizations.

¹⁴ For a discussion of the politics behind the anthropological explanations of the origins of the Zimbabwe Ruins (Great Zimbabwe) see Kuklick (1991) who describes the depth of ridiculousness to which they had sunk—exemplified by a decree by the white minority government of Ian Smith that government employees who publicly disseminated the now long established fact (e.g., through carbon dating) that the Zimbabwe Ruins were of indigenous (African) provenance and not some mythical foreign race would lose their jobs.

20. And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: 21. And he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. 22. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. 23. And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. 24. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. 25. And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. 26. And he said, Blessed be the LORD God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. 27. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.

Thus was born the Biblical curse of Ham (which in reality was a curse on his son Canaan).¹⁵ Initially, in the period of Latin Christianity of the Middle Ages, the curse of Ham was used as a justification for the existence of slavery in a generic sense, that is without reference to skin color. Considering that slavery during this period encompassed all manner of European ethnicities and was not restricted to people of African descent alone, this is not surprising. However, by the time one arrives in the seventeenth-century when the enslavement of Africans is now well underway in the Americas, the curse of Ham becomes the justification for this enslavement; that is Ham and his progeny have been transformed into an accursed black people ordained by God to be slaves of white people (the progeny of Japheth) in perpetuity. (Aside: placed hierarchically in between these two groups were the progeny of Shem, namely, Jews and Asians.) Before reaching this point, however, first there had to be a connection made between the color black and the curse of Ham. The problem is best described by Goldenberg (2003: 195):

To biblical Israel, Kush was the land at the furthest southern reach of the earth, whose inhabitants were militarily powerful, tall, and good-looking. These are the dominant images of the black African in the Bible, and they correspond to similar images in Greco-Roman culture. I found no indications of a negative sentiment toward Blacks in the Bible. Aside from its use in a proverb (found also among the Egyptians and the Greeks), skin color is never mentioned in descriptions of biblical Kushites. That is the most significant perception, or lack of perception, in the biblical image of the black African. Color did not matter.

So, the question is how did color enter into the curse? Here, there is some disagreement. Goldenberg suggests that the linkage takes place through two principal exegetical changes: the erroneous etymological understanding of the word Ham as referring, in root, to the color black (which also spawns another serious exegetical error, the replacement of Canaan with Ham in the curse); and the exegetical seepage of blackness into the story of the curse (which originally, he observes, was colorless) as it was retold, beginning, perhaps, in the third or fourth-century C.E. with Syriac Christians via a work titled the *Cave of Treasures*, and then further taken up by the Arab Muslims in the seventh-century following their conquest of North Africa (and the two, in turn, later influencing the Jewish exegetical treatment of the story). Goldenberg further observes that the *Cave of Treasures* in its various recensions down the centuries extends the curse to not just Kushites, but all blacks defined to include, for example, the Egyptian Copts, East Indians and Ethiopians (that is they are all descendants, according to the *Cave of Treasures*, of Ham). Hence, Goldenberg quotes one version as reading “When Noah awoke...he cursed him and said: ‘Cursed be Ham and may he be slave to his brothers’...and he became a slave, he and his lineage, namely the Egyptians, the Abyssinians, the Indians. Indeed, Ham lost all sense of shame and he became black and was called shameless all the days of his life forever” (p. 173). On the other hand, taking the lead from Graves and Patai (1966)—as for example Sanders (1969) does—the connection, it is suggested, occurs via the agency of Jewish oral traditions (*midrashim*), specifically those contained in one of the two Talmuds, the Babylonian Talmud (*Talmud Baveli*)—the other Talmud is the Palestinian Talmud (*Talmud Yerushalmi*). The Talmuds were a compilation of *midrashim*, which for centuries had been transmitted orally, put together by Jewish scholars in their academies in Palestine and in Babylonia. Although the *Talmud Baveli* was compiled in fifth-century C.E., it did not make its appearance in Europe until probably sixth-century C.E. Now, the *midrash* relevant here was concocted, according to the gloss by Graves and Patai (1966: 122), in order to justify the enslavement of the Canaanites by the Israelites; and here is how it goes (reproduced from the version compiled by Graves and Patai 1966: 121):

(d) Some say that at the height of his drunkenness he uncovered himself, whereupon Canaan, Ham's little son, entered the tent, mischievously looped a stout cord about his grandfather's genitals, drew it tight, and [enfeebled] him.... (e) Others say that Ham himself [enfeebled] Noah who, awakening from his drunken sleep and understanding what had been done to him, cried: “Now I cannot beget the fourth son whose children I would have ordered to serve you and your brothers! Therefore it must be Canaan, your first-born whom they enslave....Canaan's children shall be born ugly and black! Moreover, because you twisted your head around to see my nakedness, your grandchildren's hair shall be twisted into kinks, and their eyes red; again because your lips jested at my misfortune, theirs shall swell; and because you neglected my nakedness, they shall go naked, and their male members shall be shamefully elongated.” Men of their race are called Negroes, their forefather Canaan commanded them to love theft and fornication, to be banded together in hatred of their masters and never to tell the truth.

Anyhow, regardless of whether it was early Eastern Christians, or Jews or Muslims who were responsible for corrupting the biblical story along two axes, replacing Canaan with Ham and rendering Ham black, this much is incontrovertible: Medieval Christians in the West would in time adopt it as their very own because it would allow them to develop an ideology of exploitation and oppression of black peoples, especially beginning in the fifteenth-century onward, without violating their religious sensibilities.

Notice then that through this mythological trickery two basic elements of Christian cosmology are retained: that one, all human beings are descended from a common ancestor (Adam whose line of descent includes Noah) and that, two, not all human beings are equal. Hence, the peoples of the European peninsula (the conventional use of the term continent in relation to Europe is an ideologically driven misnomer as a quick glance at a world atlas will confirm) on one hand, and the peoples of the African and Asian continents on the other, stand in a racial hierarchical relationship of master/ servant/ slave. Since this was a Biblical determined order, it followed then that no Christian need lose sleep over the morality of exploiting and enslaving other human beings.

15. It may be noted here that it is the ancestors of Canaan, the Canaanites, who are conquered by the Israelites giving rise to that well-known passage in the Bible (Joshua 9: 21) “And the princes said unto them, Let them live; but let them be hewers of wood and drawers of water unto all the congregation; as the princes had promised them” (emphasis added). The Canaanites living in the city of Gibeon saved themselves from the possibility of being massacred by Joshua (for no other reason beyond the fact that their land had now been promised by God to the Israelites) by pretending to be foreigners from outside the Land of Canaan and entering into a peace truce with Joshua. However, upon discovering this deception, Joshua cursed the Gibeonites relegating them forever to become “hewers of wood and drawers of water” in the service of the Israelites.

Now the question that one must ask here is, When do the descendants of Ham, while still residing in Africa, rejoin the family of Europeans as a subgroup of Caucasians? It occurs during the period of the beginnings of the colonization of Africa. There are two factors that account for this development: the emergence of scientific explanations of race during the era of the Enlightenment when theological explanations began to give way to scientific explanations of the natural world; and the arrival of Napoleon's Army in Egypt in 1798, accompanied by French scientists who would go on to establish the new discipline of Egyptology. The former factor established the possibility of polygenesis as an alternative to the biblical theory of monogenesis (all human beings were descendents of Adam); that is not all human beings have a common ancestor, but that some had emerged separately as a subspecies of humankind. The latter factor's role turns on the startling discovery by the French scientists that the Egyptian civilization, that is the civilization of black people, was the precursor of the Western civilization. Now, this finding met with considerable opposition in the West since for some it flew in the face of the prevalent racist notions that dialectically justified and drew succor from the ongoing Atlantic slave trade, while for others it stood in opposition to the biblical notion of black people as accursed descendents of Ham. The resolution of the problem of determining who were the ancient Egyptians, therefore, was resolved by turning to a polygenetic explanation. Specifically, following a rereading of the Bible the notion emerged that the Egyptians were the descendents of that other son of Ham, Mizraim, who it was argued had not been cursed as Canaan had been. By isolating Canaan from his brothers, Mizraim and Cush, it was possible to suggest that only the descendents of Canaan had been cursed, and not those of Mizraim and Cush.

The ancient Egyptians therefore were not a black people, it was argued, but a Caucasian subgroup, the Hamites. To provide scientific support for this view, Western scientists in the nineteenth-century, especially those working in the United States (perhaps spurred on by the need to justify slavery in the face of rising abolitionist sentiments), emerged with the bogus "science of craniometry," that purported to prove on the basis of the measurement of human skulls a hierarchy of intelligence among different groups of people (blacks with supposedly the smallest crania, and hence the smallest brain, falling to the very bottom).¹⁶ On the basis of this bogus science it was quickly established that the ancient Egyptians were not black Africans, but Hamites. However, it is important to point out here that the Hamites were not completely shorn off of their early inferior status as descendents of the accursed Ham. Rather they were considered to be an inferior subgroup of the Caucasian group, but superior to black peoples. (In other words, a new internal hierarchy was established among the descendents of Jepheth where the Tuetonic Anglo-Saxons were at the very top and the Hamites at the very bottom and eastern and southern Europeans—Slavs, Italians, Portuguese, Greeks, etc.—somewhere in the middle.) Thus was born the infamous Hamitic theory that was used to explain any expression of the grandeur of African history that Europeans came across. Hamites were Africans, but they were Caucasian in origin—they came from outside Africa.¹⁷

Hani, Chris: At the time of his assassination (which had been preceded by several other assassination attempts on him by South African security agents while he was in exile) Hani was the general secretary of the South African Communist Party (took up the office in 1991 from the ailing Joe Slovo; he had joined the party in 1961) and a member of the national executive committee of the ANC. His popularity (especially among young blacks) rested not only on his charisma, but his intimate involvement with ANC's guerrilla campaign as one of its top leaders. Hani (full name Martin Thembisile Hani) was born on June 28, 1942 in Cofimvaba in the rural Transkei. His original ambition had been to become a priest, but his father, a migrant worker in the mines, wished otherwise. In the same year that he graduated with a BA in Latin and English (Fort Hare, 1961), he also joined Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK—the military wing of the ANC), having been a member of the ANC since 1957. The following year he was forced to go into exile with a number of other members of MK fearing imminent arrest. His years abroad until his official return with other ANC and SACP leaders in 1990 were spent on building ANC's capacity to wage a guerilla campaign, in the course of which, it appears, he did see some action in the Zimbabwean liberation struggle in the late 1960s.

Hegemony: Very simply, in my classes, I imply by this term to mean the unwanted domination of one by another—e.g. as in a racist society, or in a patriarchal society, or a colonial society, and so on. However, hegemony can occur at many levels in many different ways, and in fact it is possible that victims of hegemony may not even know that they are victims of it (especially in cases of ideological hegemony—of which capitalism, as an ideology, is a good example). But how is ideological hegemony imposed? Very simply, through the process of socialization. When you march to the beat of your own drummer then you have taken the step in the right direction toward freedom from the hegemony of others.)

Homelands: "Self-governing" areas of territory, during the apartheid era, for Afro-South Africans (dubbed initially as "bantustans," but later called "Black Homelands," and later still "Black States" and arguably similar in principle and provenance to U.S. First American reservations in the United States) legislatively carved out of the countryside, on the basis of SAAG-designated ethnicity, by means of the 1959 *Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act*. In order to deflect international criticism on one hand, and on the other to diffuse black opposition to apartheid (against the backdrop of an ever increasing reliance on black labor), SAAG, under the leadership of Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd, came up with what it thought was the ingenious concept of ethnically-based "self-government" for Afro-South Africans—geographically rooted in the rural Afro-South African reserves (known as "native reserves") that had been established through the 1913 *Natives Land Act* and which could trace their origins to the time of the British colonial period—where through the subsequent 1970 *Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act* all Afro-South Africans were stripped of their South African citizenship and instead made "citizens" of the reserves. A total of ten ethnic groups were identified and allocated their own homelands which for the most part were not only economically non-viable but politically too they were nothing more than a charade in self-government given the absence of meaningful political power (even in those homelands that had been

16. The literature on the historical origins of the ideology of racism in the West is fairly extensive. As an entry-point into this literature the following select sources will prove to be, for present purposes, more than adequate: Bieder (1986); Davies, Nandy, and Sardar (1993); Drescher (1992); Frederickson (2002); Gould (1971); Hannaford (1996); Huemer (1998); Jackson and Weidman (2004); Jordan (1968); Kovel (1988); Libby, Spickard, and Ditto (2005); Niro (2003); Pieterse (1992); Reilly, Kaufman, and Bodino (2003); Shipman (1994); Smedley (1993); Stanton (1960); and Wolpoff and Caspari (1997). Note that although Jordan, and Libby, Spickard, and Ditto are very specific to the U.S. context, they are included here because of their treatment of an important element in the formation of Western racist ideologies not given as much attention in the literature as it deserves: the role of sexuality.

17. For more on the Christian cosmological and "scientific" roots of Western racist discourse, see also the sources mentioned in the preceding note.

granted “independence,” namely, Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, and Ciskei).¹⁸ In reality, all that the homelands project achieved was that by means of this divide-and-rule strategy they helped to further institutionalize the use of the reserves as black labor reservoirs; they were neither recognized by most Afro-South Africans, other than the traditional non-democratically appointed authorities that “governed” them, nor by the international community. It may be noted that the homelands project also abolished the meager indirect representation in parliament Afro-South Africans had had (before the *Self-Government Act* was enacted they had been allowed to elect to the Senate four *nhite* representatives on the basis of a system of electoral colleges). As one would expect, with the abolition of apartheid the homelands system was also scrapped.

Hollywood: I use this term in a generic sense (that is, not necessarily referring to the Hollywood film studios) to refer to that archetypical cinema that was invented first by such big studios as MGM, Warner Brothers, Universal, etc. in the 1930s and 40s and that has today become the dominant entertainment medium throughout the world—leaving aside television. It is cinema that is characterized by, among other things, high production values; commercialism at the expense of art in which sex and violence reign supreme (**voyeurism**); a readily identifiable categorization of film output into genres (e.g. thrillers, Westerns, drama, comedies, etc.); both textual and subtextual ideological messages that reinforce hegemonic Eurocentric values laced with racism, sexism, and classism; and of course mass-marketing. It is cinema that rests on big budgets, the creation and voyeuristic marketing of the celebrity “star,” the unending quest for **verisimilitude** through technology, and, today, its finance and distribution by what I call the TMMC (the transnational multimedia conglomerate). In other words, my use of the term “Hollywood” must be understood in the sense of a perversion of the edificatory and consciousness-raising potential of cinema (even as it entertains) in the relentless quest for profits—the latter achieved by pandering to the lowest common denominator in the values and tastes of the **ignorantsia**. (Guys, remember my formula of frustration: masses – m = ignorantsia. You still don’t get it? What are you left with when you remove the letter “m” from the word “masses?”) Note: Even those films that appear to subvert, at least on the surface, the basic cultural ethos of the Hollywood film by challenging some of its racist, sexist, etc. values, in the end fall in line with the dictates of the TMMC mass marketing machine—symptomatic of which is the simultaneous denial (usually subtextually) of the possibility of challenging the system through collective action. That is, from the perspective of social change, the dominant motif is one of *anarchy* (to be understood here in its ideological sense and as a synonym for chaos). A good example of such a film is *Crash*.

Ideology: Throughout this course, unless indicated otherwise, this term is used to mean a “style of thought” or a system of ideas and concepts *which may or may not be cogent and correct*, but which color world views and shape behavior. The term, therefore, is used in the Parsonian neutral sense (that is, as an internally consistent cognitive system). Consequently, it must be distinguished from the Marxian usage of the term (the antithesis of “true” political consciousness), as well as the positivist usage (the antithesis of “true” social science).

Ignorantsia: In my classes this term is used to signify a body of people in a society who share one common characteristic: the absence of “political consciousness” among them. It is important to note, therefore, that the term is used in a social structurally neutral sense. That is, members of the ignorantsia transcend the conventional boundaries of class, gender, nationality, ethnicity, race, religion, age, educational qualifications, and so on. In the West, this lack of political consciousness is attributable to the surrender of the critical intellect on the part of the ignorantsia in exchange for crumbs scattered by corporate capital from its (capital’s) table. A problem that W. E. B. Du Bois (1996: 642), for example, described thusly: “If we are coming to recognize that the great modern problem is to correct maladjustment in the distribution of wealth... [then] in this crime white labor is *particeps criminis* with white capital. Unconsciously and consciously, carelessly and deliberately, the vast power of the white labor vote in modern democracies has been cajoled and flattered into imperialistic schemes to enslave and debauch black, brown and yellow labor, until with fatal retribution they are themselves today bound and gagged and rendered impotent by the resulting monopoly of the world’s raw material in the hands of a dominant, cruel and irresponsible few.” Mesmerized by the ideology of capitalist consumerism, members of the ignorantsia are unwilling to question the domination of their lives by the dictates and demands of corporate capital. A classic example of this behavior is the rising popularity of bottled potable water among the ignorantsia today. There is an inability to see that it is the activities of corporate capital that are polluting water supplies, and therefore there is a concomitant inability to seek a political solution to this problem by means of legislative restraints on corporate capital. Instead, however, the ignorantsia simply goes along with the solution that corporate capital has devised: marketing to the consumers, the ignorantsia, bottled potable water (which itself has a negative impact on the environment because of the resources needed to bottle, transport and market the water)—needless to say this is a win, win situation all around, *but only for corporate capital*. Note that, as an antonym of the word intelligentsia (defined for our purposes as those who navigate between the mediocrity of the ignorantsia and the decadence and hubris of the bourgeoisie), the term is suffused by a pejorative flavor; this is not accidental: it is an outcome of frustration and exasperation (but not hopelessness) with the behavior of the ignorantsia. Consider the deeply depressing spectacle, in this final part of the first decade of the twenty-first century, of the U.S. ignorantsia being led to the slaughter house like sheep by U.S. corporate capital and its acolytes—symptomatic of which is the former’s apparent indifference to deeply profound matters, ranging from the ever-widening politically engineered quality-of-life chasm between the rich and the rest, to the systematic attack on human and civil rights in the name of a mythical “national interest,” to the misuse of national resources on ill-fated imperial adventures to make the world “safe” for capital, to the acceleration, as a result of the activities of corporate capital, of the journey toward the abyss of irreversible planetary environmental destruction, to the relentless unconscionable pursuit of materialism on the backs of slave and semi-slave labor domiciled in the countries of the Afro-Asian and South American ecumene. At the same time, the use of this term is an effort at steering away from the romanticization of the unwashed (the working classes) by the radical left—a pastime in which it often revels. However, the term also signifies a belief that there is sufficient room in Western capitalist societies for the ignorantsia to develop alternative ways of thinking and behaving so as to break the mental chains that binds it to capital. The term ignorantsia, therefore, must be seen to incorporate two implicit messages: despair *and* hope.¹⁹

18. The ten homelands, with their ethnic affiliation, were Bophuthatswana (Tswana), Ciskei (Xhosa), Gazankulu (Machangana-Tsonga), KwaNdebele (Southern Ndebele), KwaNgwane (Swazi), KwaZulu (Zulu), Lebowa (North Soto), Transkei (like the Ciskei also Xhosa), QwaQwa (South Sotho), and Venda (Vhacenda). For more on the homelands see Omond (1985)

¹⁹ One legitimate question that arises here is how does one define “political consciousness” or who is a politically conscious person? At the immediate level it may be assumed that a person who lacks political consciousness is someone who lacks political knowledge about society. Yet there are many political science professors who would easily qualify for membership among the ignorantsia. Political consciousness goes beyond the matter of knowledge and information. Knowledge, of course, is very important, but it is not a sufficient factor. Political consciousness should be seen more as a state of mind where the unending desire to acquire knowledge and information about society takes place within the context of three attitudes of mind

IMF: International Monetary Fund

Imperialism: The imposition of *nonterritorial* hegemony (in contrast to the *territorial* hegemony of **colonialism**). Further, in my classes it refers to the imperialism that arose upon the heels of the launch of the European Voyages of Exploitation (the conventional usage of the word “exploration” is a clear Eurocentrist misnomer), and therefore must be distinguished from all other forms of imperialism that preceded it—such as those of the Ancient world. The distinction is an important one in that “modern” imperialism was a symptom of the development of the capitalist mode of production in a particular cultural milieu (specifically that of Europe) that saw religious proselytization as a duty incumbent upon all—including the state—against the backdrop of the rise of the modern nation state. In other words, imperialism was an outcome of the dialectic in the structural/ideational binary. (Note that this is one of those concepts where there are as many definitions as those willing to define it.²⁰)

Indians: In the African context the term refers to peoples designated in this course as **Afro-Asians**. In the U.S. context it refers to peoples designated in this course as **U.S. First Americans**.

Inkatha Freedom Party: An ethnic based cultural organization founded by Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, hereditary tribal chief of the Zulu people, in 1975 in KwaZulu, a “homeland” for the Zulus during the apartheid era, that would be transformed by him into a political party in 1994 in order to take part in the multi-racial elections. Although Buthelezi claimed to be an arch opponent of apartheid, the fact that the apartheid government tolerated him throughout the period when other anti-apartheid leaders and organizations had been banned, speaks volumes. Certainly these organizations came to see him as nothing more than a creature of apartheid, even though at one time in his younger days he had been a member of the ANC. In the waning days of apartheid, conflict between supporters of Inkatha and other anti-apartheid organizations (especially the ANC) were frequent, fierce and chillingly bloody—aided and abetted by the apartheid government—as Buthelezi tried to jostle for a political stake in a new South Africa beyond that of leadership of a discredited ethnic homeland. Guys: a question to ponder: politically, why is the continued presence of the Inkatha Freedom Party important for South Africa?

International Monetary Fund (IMF): Like the World Bank, this is also an international capitalist financial institution (that also excludes communist countries from membership) but whose purpose is different from that of the World Bank in that its main concern is to help maintain the stability of the international financial system—one tool that it uses toward this end is to provide emergency loans to governments that are unable to pay their foreign debts but with strict and often onerous conditions attached to the loans that usually impact the poor and the vulnerable in most egregious ways. The IMF was set up following a conference in July 1944 of non-communist nations in Bretton Woods (in New Hampshire, United States), as the Second World War was about to end, called the Bretton Woods Conference or officially the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference. Note that the IMF was one of the two financial institutions (the other was the **World Bank**) that the conference inaugurated and hence the two together are also often referred to as the Bretton Woods institutions. (Note that the legacy of the Bretton Woods institutions after more than sixty years of existence is that inequality in the world between countries and within countries has grown exponentially—a clear indication of their true purpose: the promotion of *unbridled* corporate capitalism on a world scale.)

Ironical Allegory: An important ingredient of satire is irony. Irony refers to the production of double meanings via any one or more of several devices: contrast, contradiction, incongruity, etc. Irony is especially present in satire made up of indirect aggression. A well known ironic device used by literary satirists is the irony of allegory. An allegory is an entire story created and presented for the purpose of producing two different levels of meanings. One level is immediately perceivable and it is one that is not intended by the allegorist, and the other is hidden and which constitutes the real meaning that the allegorist wishes his/her audience to take away with them. “Allegory presents its messages in terms of something else, a literal set of events, persons, conditions, or images having a corresponding level of existence involving meaning, conceptions, values, or qualities.” (Tost, 1991:187) The important point, however, is that in satiric allegories, the two different levels of meanings are set in opposition to each other producing thereby irony. A classic allegorical tale is George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, as is Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*. The film *Planet of the Apes* is another example of allegory, but in cinematic form. In both these instances the story itself comprises an entirely imaginary or fictitious world, but possessing all the characteristic features of the human world, and it is presented

corresponding to three issues: civilization, truth, and the status quo. A politically conscious person recognizes that civilization has two dimensions to it: the moral and the material, and it is the former that is of paramount importance. By moral civilization is meant the attainment of civilized attitudes and behavior vis-à-vis other human beings and other forms of life on this planet. Central to moral civilization is the attitude and behavior that is motivated by concrete efforts to respond to the question: What can I do, in terms of my personal attitudes and behavior toward all life forms (beginning with my immediate family and then extending outward to my relatives, friends, community, other communities, society, other societies and other planetary life forms, etc.) so as to make this planet a better place for them to live in? Underlying this response would be such positive behavioral things as altruism, love, morality, humanity, magnanimity, forgiveness, charitability, amicability, open-mindedness, justiciability, and so on. A person who is politically conscious is a person who seeks the truth in relation to society as a whole with the objective of understanding how that society can become a better society. What kind of truth? It is truth relating to how the status quo has come about and how it is maintained—that is, who benefits from it and who suffers from it. This task requires one to be fully conversant with all historical processes that explain the status quo. A politically conscious person is never satisfied with the status quo. Or to put the matter differently: a politically conscious person is not a political conservative; that is he/she shuns the ideology of *political* conservatism (here political conservatism must be distinguished from cultural conservatism.) So, what then is political conservatism? Very briefly, it is an ideology that advocates the preservation of the existing or a bygone political, social, and economic order because it favors the interests of a minority, the rich and the powerful.

²⁰ Those wishing a quick entry into the various theories behind this concept will do well by thumbing through these five separate collections of essays on the subject: Chilcote (2000a, 2000b), Mommsen and Osterhammel (1986), Owen and Sutcliffe (1972), and Patnaik (1986). For a critique of the current resurgence of nostalgia for European imperialism among neoliberals and right wing conservatives in the West, couched in advocacy of what we may term as “imperialism with a human face,” see Amin (1992), Bartholomew (2006), and Foster (2006), who all provide us with a look from various angles at the most enduring and core feature of European imperialism of whatever age, and most aptly described by Amin thusly:

The intervention of the North [OD countries of the Euro-North American ecumene] in the affairs of the South [all PQD countries] is—in all its aspects, at every moment, in whatever form, and a fortiori when it takes the form of a military or political intervention—negative. Never have the armies of the North brought peace, prosperity, or democracy to the peoples of Asia, Africa, or Latin America. In the future, as in the past five centuries, they can only bring to these peoples further servitude, the exploitation of their labor, the expropriation of their riches, and the denial of their rights (pp. 17–18).

in order to contrast with the real world for judgmental reasons. Such fictitious worlds created for this purpose have been variously labeled as utopias, dystopias, beast fables, and science fiction. Often writers will produce combinations of these different worlds rather than rely on one specific type. In allegorical satire, it may be noted, the irony is not only inherent in the creation of the parallel (but contrasting and oppositional) worlds of the real and imaginary, but the irony itself also serves to act as satire. George Orwell's *Animal Farm* is both ironical and satirical. (See also **parody, satire**)

Jim Crow: A phrase that refers to the racial segregation that had existed de facto in the United States prior to the Civil War (primarily brought about as a result of the massive immigration of the European working class and peasantry to the United States in the early 1800s) that became de jure, mostly in the South, following the abolition of slavery. This juridically-based form of segregation arose with the return of the former confederate governments to power (effected through the use of terror—see Nieman [1991]) in the post-Reconstruction era, in spite of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. constitution that had firmly established the civil and human rights of African Americans.²¹ The power of an alliance of white agrarian and urban capitalist classes in the U.S. South bent on restoring as many features of the old slave order as possible, operating through such terrorist groups as the Ku Klux Klan, was such that not only did they systematically and brutally disenfranchise African Americans (and other blacks), but managed to create a political and legal environment in which the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the legislative intent of the amendments—by means of a ruling in an infamous case called *Plessey v. Ferguson* (1896) that came up with the bogus doctrine of “separate but equal.” (This doctrine would not be overturned until a ruling in another Supreme Court case, *Brown v. Board of Education* [1954]). However, like its counterpart, apartheid, Jim Crow evolved to be more than simply racial segregation; it was a neo-fascist political order, a proto-totalitarian system in which the civil and human rights of those whites who opposed racial segregation (albeit a tiny minority) were also wiped out. The term Jim Crow itself is said to originate from a song sung by an enslaved African American owned by a Mr. Crow and overheard and later popularized (beginning in 1828 in Louisville) by Daddy Rice (Thomas Dartmouth Rice) through the medium of black minstrel shows—comedic song and dance routines performed by whites in blackface based on highly demeaning negative stereotypes of African Americans. The song's refrain went:

Wheel about and turn about
And do jis so,
Ebry time I wheel about
I jump Jim Crow

Johannesburg: South Africa's industrial and financial capital and which owes its birth to the discovery of gold. It is home to the “capital” of South Africa's black people, Soweto. Soweto was the segregated township that did not even merit a name under apartheid (the name is an acronym).

Kathrada, Ahmed Mohammed: His character in the film asks incredulously, “Soft targets? Do you mean women and children?” The ANC had made a decision very early on, when *Umkonto We Sizwe* was formed, not to target civilians in their guerrilla campaigns on moral grounds. Kathrada, the son of Indian Muslim immigrants, was born on August 21, 1919 in Schweizer Reineke, a small town 240 miles from Johannesburg. He became involved in the political activities of the Transvaal Indian Congress from the age of 12 and was first sentenced to prison as a result of these activities at the age of 17 (he lied about his age to the police). As he grew older, his political activities expanded to a wider national level so that on more than one occasion he would be placed under banning orders. More significantly, however, three times, in 1955, in the Treason Trials of 1956-61, and the Rivonia Trial of 1963-64 he would be tried together with Mandela, Sisulu and others, and with them he was eventually given life imprisonment and banished to Robben Island. He was freed with Sisulu and others from Polsmoor in 1989. In 1991 he was elected to the national executive committee of the ANC and became head of its Public Relations department. Kathrada, it ought to be noted, is among the many anti-apartheid activists to emerge from the South African East Indian community—quite out of proportion, in terms of their numbers, to the community's small percentage of the total population (about 3%). One possible explanation for this was the presence within the community's intelligentsia of a political tradition that combined in a unique amalgam the influences of Gandhism, Marxism, and African and East Indian nationalism (and for some, Islam).

KGB: Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (Committee for State Security)—the Russian secret police and intelligence agency of the Soviet era.

Labor-aristocracy: A derogatory term originally used by Lenin which in my classes is used fairly similarly to refer to a section of the proletariat that delusively sees its *objective interests* to lie more closely with that of capital than other workers because of access to privileges not enjoyed by all workers (e.g., possession of “whiteness” that permits the “purchase” of better pay and working conditions relative to those who lack this property value; or possession of a relatively well-paying job in an environment of massive underemployment and unemployment.)²²

21. The text of the Amendments (but only the relevant parts from the perspective of this course) are as follows:

Thirteenth Amendment (ratified December 18, 1865): Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Fourteenth Amendment (ratified July 23, 1868): Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Fifteenth Amendment (ratified March 30, 1870): Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous conditions of servitude. Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

²² In its original usage, Lenin was commenting on the politics of trade unions, that is whether they were an institutional embodiment of pro-capital proclivities and therefore not suited to revolutionary politics or whether they were authentic proletarian organizations but often hijacked by labor “aristocrats.” Here is the key paragraph:

But we wage the struggle against the “labor aristocracy” in the name of the masses of the workers and in order to win them to our side; we wage the struggle against the opportunist and social-chauvinist leaders in order to win the working class to our side. To forget this most elementary and most self-evident truth would be stupid. And it is precisely this stupidity the German “Left” Communists are guilty of when, because of the

Law of Historical Irreversibility: A natural law that postulates the impossibility, for logistical reasons alone, of restoring the rights that ensue from the **Natural Law of Prior Claim** on the improbable assumption that there was agreement by all concerned on restoration of these rights in the first place. (A perfect example is the circumstance of the Aboriginal Americans *vis-à-vis* the European settler and African slave descendants today in the Americas.)

Mandela, Nelson: Mandela was born on July 18, 1918 (in Umtata, in the then Cape of Good Hope). His father, Henry Mandela, was the chief of the Tembu, a Xhosa-speaking people. In a country where higher education opportunities for black people were few, this privileged background allowed him to eventually graduate from the English-speaking University of Witwatersrand to become a practicing lawyer by establishing South Africa's first African law firm, in partnership with Oliver Tambo, in 1952. Some years earlier, in 1944, he had joined the ANC, becoming one of its leaders in 1949. As a flamboyant man who loved fancy clothes, women and fast cars, and given his privileged background and high educated status (there were relatively few African professionals in his day), it is perhaps surprising that he became a very active and militant ANC member, since he had so much to lose. Anyhow, as a rising star within the ranks of the ANC leadership he had the opportunity to travel abroad in 1961 (following his acquittal in the infamous Treason Trials of 1956-61) to be wined and dined by a number of African leaders (such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, and Leopold Senghor of Senegal), as well as leaders of the Labor and Liberal parties in England. On his way home, he stopped over in Ethiopia for a few months to undergo rudimentary training in guerilla warfare. However, only a few days after his return he was already sitting in jail, he was arrested on August 5, 1962, charged with illegal political activity and leaving the country without a passport. While he was still on Robben Island serving a five-year prison sentence, he was brought back for trial in 1963 on another more serious charge, of plotting to overthrow the apartheid State by armed rebellion (treason). At that trial, which came to be known as the Rivonia Trial, Mandela (together with others) was sentenced to life imprisonment on June 12, 1964. From 1964 to 1984 Mandela and his colleagues spent their years at the notorious maximum security prison on Robben Island. In April 1984 they were transferred to Pollsmoor Maximum Security Prison in Cape Town for fear that their presence on Robben Island was helping to further politicize other younger political prisoners pouring into the prison in the aftermath of the Soweto Rebellion. Following a medical operation, Mandela was separated from his colleagues, and moved to more comfortable surroundings at Victor Verster prison near Paarl. He would not gain freedom until February 11, 1990. In 1991 he was elected to the presidency of the now unbanned ANC, and three years later, with the overwhelming election victory of the ANC, he would become the first black president of South Africa. He stepped down from the presidency of the ANC in 1997 (to be replaced by Thabo Mbeki), and of South Africa, in 1999. He is no longer involved with active politics. For their efforts in bringing about a relatively peaceful transition to a new democratic South Africa, Mandela and De Klerk shared the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize.

Guys, a question to ponder: how did the long imprisonment of Mandela help the country of South Africa in the long run? Or did it?

Mandela, Winnie (premarital name: Winifred Nomzamo): Born in Pondoland in the Transkei in the mid-1930s, her fame would come to rest on her marriage to Mandela (in 1958, as his second wife)—they had met two years earlier when she became involved with his political activities. (During the prolonged Treason Trials of 1956-61, Mandela divorced his first wife to marry Winnie, despite the large age gap between the two.) In the years that Mandela was in prison, Winnie, as a political activist in her own right, and as the spouse of one of the most important political prisoners in South Africa (if not the world), came to face constant harassment from the police, including being placed under banning orders, and even spending time in prison (1969-1970). For a long time she was the heroine of the anti-apartheid movement, until it began to become clear around the mid-1980s to many, especially those in the ANC, that her politically reckless behavior, motivated by fame and ambition, was becoming a liability. The kidnapping and murder of a fourteen year old boy by the chief of her bodyguard (who came to be known as the “Mandela Football Club”) proved to be the first major step toward political anonymity. Even though she did come to hold a post in Mandela's government as the deputy minister of arts, culture, science and technology, following her election as president of the ANC's Women's League, she was eventually expelled by Mandela because of her continued courting of controversy with her attacks on the new government, among other things. The Mandelas separated in 1992 after her infidelity came to light; they divorced in 1996.

Marginality: Refers to pushing people to the “margins” of society by means of prejudice and discrimination (with the result that they fall to the bottom of society in terms of economic and political power). Marginality, obviously, is the anti-thesis of democracy.

Meritocracy: An ideological concept that is at the heart of capitalist-democratic thinking much beloved by both liberals and conservatives alike. It is a bogus concept in that it rests on fallacious reasoning (as will be shown in a moment). Meritocracy is a concept that sees the allocation of material rewards in society as resting on merit, which itself is assumed to be based on such qualities of an individual as intelligence, effort and ambition and not on membership of preordained social groups—whatever their definitional criteria: class, sex, race, ethnicity, and so on. In other words: from the meritocratic point of view, one's class status in society is based on social achievement, not social ascription. One of the most widely used and accepted measurement of social achievement in modern societies today is educational qualifications or academic achievement. Now, in a meritocratic society academic achievement is presumed to rest on equality of educational opportunity. However, equality of educational opportunity itself is supposedly governed by the principle of meritocracy: namely that academic achievement is a function of one's individual qualities of intelligence, effort and ambition in school, and not on one's social background, be it in terms of class, race, sex, ethnicity, and so on. It follows from all this that if there is a slippage in academic achievement then explanation for it must be sought in flaws in the individual's qualities (perhaps there is limited intelligence, perhaps there is insufficient effort, perhaps ambition is lacking, etc.). And if this slippage is consistent among some social groups then these flaws must also be universal within these groups. (A corollary of this view is that since these groups (leaving class aside) are presumed to be biological constructs, regardless of what science states, the flaws are biologically determined and hence society is powerless in the face of their immutability.) However, the meritocratic logic rests on the assumption that we do not live in a society that is social structurally riven for historically determined reasons (rather than biological reasons), and where social groups exist in unequal power relations. But is this assumption correct? Is the social structure biologically determined? More to the point, Does academic achievement rest solely on individual qualities? Is it not possible that it may also depend on where one is within the social structure because one's location in that structure allows one access to specific educational advantages (manifest in such ways as access to resource-rich schools, qualified teachers, safe neighborhoods, etc.) In fact, research in support of this point is so extensive and ubiquitous in the field of education that it even renders reference citations to it redundant.

reactionary and counter-revolutionary character of the trade union top leadership, they jump to the conclusion that... we must leave the trade unions!! that we must refuse to work in them!! that we must create new and artificial forms of labor organization!! This is such an unpardonable blunder that it is equal to the greatest service the Communists could render the bourgeoisie (Lenin 1965 (1920): 43-44).

Millennium Development Goals: Meeting in September 2000 at the United Nations in New York at the start of the new millennium (in the Gregorian calendar) at what was labeled as the Millennium Summit, the world's leaders pledged to work toward improving the lot of the world's majority, the poor. This pledge, signed on to by the entire membership of the United Nations and a host of international nongovernmental organizations, was embodied in a set of eight specific goals that came to be called the Millennium Development Goals, to be achieved by 2015; they ranged from elimination of extreme poverty and hunger to reducing gender inequality to fighting HIV/AIDS to promoting environmental sustainability. While the agenda was indeed a worthy one, the implementation of its goals, especially by the target date, has always been in doubt and today it is accepted that it won't be met—thanks to a variety of factors ranging from the parsimony of the rich in the global North to devotion of precious resources to “making the world safe for Western corporate capitalism” to inefficiencies, corruption, and armed civil strife among the intended beneficiaries of the agenda in the global South. Question: Under the circumstances, was the Millennium Summit a waste of time? Answer: No, because to dream of a better future is the first step toward that goal (no dream, no future—just the nightmare of the present).

Mode of Production: Rather than become involved in an extensive debate on what precisely constitutes a mode of production, in my classes the term is used in the sense of a heuristic device very roughly corresponding to a “socio-economic system.”²³

MLK: Martin Luther King, Jr.

NAACP: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (a predominantly U.S. African American civil rights organization)

Native Americans: See **U.S. First Americans**

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Natural Law of Prior Claim: A universal law in the Aristotelian sense derived from the condition of being human (in contrast to the sources of *positive law*) that postulates that those who have occupied a particular territory before all others are naturally entitled to that territory; consequently, they have prior claims over it against all interlopers. The concept of citizenship by birth, for instance, derives its legitimacy from this law. As may be surmised, the abrogation of this law is only possible under conditions of violence. The profound and sobering implications of this law can be deduced from the following thought experiment: What if, tomorrow, Native Americans were to acquire the power sufficient to propel them to the headship (in all senses of the word, political, military, etc.) of the Americas? How would citizenship of the present descendants of all those who have migrated into the Americas over the centuries, literally at the point of the gun, be now defined? A taste of the answer—however repugnant it may be to all those who believe in the desirability of a multicultural democracy in that country, and anywhere else for that matter—is to be found today in the ongoing events in Zimbabwe (Will South Africa be next?) where the moral claims to citizenship by its white residents have been proven to have rested all along on armed political power that slipped out of their hands with independence in the 1980s. In other words, regardless of how one wishes to prevaricate on this matter: citizenship in lands that were colonized by Europeans, *where the original inhabitants are still present today*, ultimately resides in monopoly over power, and not moral claims. (See also the counterpart of this law, the **Law of Historical Irreversibility**.)

Necklacing: The horrifying lynching of fellow Africans suspected (but never of course proven guilty) of being police informers and spies by mobs in African townships like Soweto. It involved placing a car tire (the “necklace”) over the victim and then setting it ablaze until the victim was burned to death while onlookers stood by. This awful barbaric response, never condoned by the ANC, was a desperate response to the equally barbaric, brutal and illegal underground war (involving murders, imprisonment, torture, etc.) that the South African security police waged against anti-apartheid activists in the segregated African townships.

Neocolonialism: A variant of **imperialism**, referring to the imperialism of a former colonial power *following* the granting of nominal political independence to its colony.

Neofascism: In my classes refers to a juridically determined political system in which a dominating group enjoys many freedoms and privileges associated with democratic societies, but against the backdrop of a dominated group subjected to many burdens and disabilities characteristic of a fascist political system—that is a system based on a virulent fusion of authoritarianism, militarism, jingoism, patriarchy, and regimented capitalism. The demarcation between the dominated and the dominant usually resting on race or ethnicity or class. Since this term is used in my classes with reference to apartheid-era South Africa (as well as the U.S. South of the Jim Crow era), a word or two about that. Because, on one hand, the South African state possessed almost all the features of a fascist state—especially when viewed from the perspective of the historical experiences of blacks—and yet, on the other hand, because there was democracy and respect for the rule of law (to a significant extent) in respect of the Euro-South African minority, the designation of the apartheid state as a neofascist state is appropriate. Given the total dependence of the Euro-South African capitalists on black labor meant that a “Final Solution” in the Nazi style (in respect of the Jews) to the “black problem” (i.e., genocide) could not be on the agenda. At the same time, considering that increasingly, by the late 1980s, almost all urban black youths were by definition “political activists,” the fascist Chilean solution (adopted by the military thugs in Augusto Pinochet's Chile following the U.S.-inspired and supported military coup in 1973)—of simply slaughtering the political activists in their thousands—was also not possible without provoking widespread international condemnation and retaliatory action.²⁴ Under these circumstances, the political strategy that was called for in organizing opposition to this neofascist state was one that judiciously combined the use of both nonviolent resistant strategies and violent (guerrilla warfare) strategies.²⁵ This is the strategy that the ANC for example came to adopt and with eventual success: beginning with the 1990 de Klerk “WOW” speech and the subsequent freeing of Nelson Mandela on February 11, 1990, South Africa would begin groping its way toward a nonracist democratic order.

Neoimperialism: a subtler variant of **imperialism** characteristic of the late twentieth century and beyond in which the U.S. role looms large and where such U.S. foreign policy projects as the so-called “war on terror” are symptomatic.

NGO: Nongovernmental Organization

Nkosi Sikelel' iAfrika: The national anthem of South Africa (sung at several points in the film). Composed originally in Xhosa in 1897 by Enoch Sontonga, a music loving teacher at a Methodist mission school in Johannesburg, with stanzas added later at various times by others, it, in time, became a popular hymn in African churches and at political meetings. On April 20, 1994 the hymn together with the existing national anthem, the *Call of South Africa*, were declared national anthems of the postapartheid South Africa. Two years later, a combined but shortened

²³ See Benton (1984) and Rigby (1987) for a succinct summary of the debate about the concept. Sources mentioned in the text that accompany the discussion on the Bantu Mode of Production are also relevant here.

²⁴ The motion picture, *Missing* provides a hint of what a “Chilean” fascist solution looks like from the perspective of the victims.

²⁵ See Wolpe 1988 for a further discussion of these issues.

version of both anthems became the new national anthem. A few of verses of the original English translation version of *Nkosi Sikelel' iAfrika* (God Bless Africa) go like this:

Lord, bless Africa;
May her horn rise high up;
Hear Thou our prayers And bless us.

Chorus

Descend, O Spirit,
Descend, O Holy Spirit.

Bless our chiefs
May they remember their Creator.
Fear Him and revere Him,
That He may bless them.

Bless the public men,
Bless also the youth
That they may carry the land with patience
and that Thou mayst bless them.

Nonviolent civil disobedience: A strategy for political change, but one that should not be confused with a “pacifist strategy.” That is, it is *not* a “do-nothing” strategy. As Gandhi practiced it in South Africa (and later India) and Martin Luther King, Jr. in the United States, the nonviolent civil disobedience strategy involves creative resistance to tyranny (sit-ins, boycotts, demonstrations, petitions, and so on) that stops short of using violence, even in the face of the violence of the enemy. The strategy is to appeal to the conscience of the oppressor by refusing to answer the oppressor’s violence with one owns violence, but all the time refusing to submit to the unjust laws of the oppressor.

OD: Over-Developed/Developed. Used in my classes (together with PQD) to refer to the comparative socio-economic status of different countries across the planet.²⁶

Otherness: This term refers to the ideology of the *Other* in which human beings of a different skin color, or gender, or class, or nationality, or culture (understood in the broadest sense to include everything about human existence that is learned and not biologically inherited, ranging from food to music to politics to religion to economics, etc.) are consistently portrayed/treated as inferior beings for the purpose of dehumanizing them—as a device for their “erasure” or exclusion or exploitation or dispossession or even the perpetration of genocide. This ideology can only emerge in the context of a hierarchic notion of “us” versus “them” (in other words, Otherness requires a dyadic sense of a self standing in opposition to someone else). Among the key instruments behind the manufacture of this ideology is **essentialism** and what I call the “malignant stereotype,” while at the same time Otherness itself is an important weapon in the arsenal of the racist, the sexist, the “classist,” and so on. Question: but what comes first: the ideology of otherness or whatever nefarious project (exclusion, dispossession, etc.) it serves? The answer is that both come first: that is, each is bound to the other dialectically but always against the backdrop of power (the power to dominate, exploit, vilify, etc.)

Parliamentary system. A governmental system in which the leader of the political party that wins the most seats in a national election becomes the country’s leader—either as prime minister (if there is a separate office for a head of state) in which case he is simply the head of government or as president (where both leadership of the government and leadership of the country is fused into one). In other words, unlike in a presidential system, the leader of the government in a parliamentary system is not elected to his position through a national election. Note that where there are separate offices for the head of state and the head of government then the head of state usually holds a ceremonial position without much political power (as in the case, for example, of the monarch in Britain today). By the way, Canada has a parliamentary system in which the two offices are separate. Do you know who the head of state is in Canada? (How come you do not know?)

Parody: From the perspective of humor, parody is the imitation of any behavior, event, speech, writing, etc. with the intention of producing amusement, or sometimes even derision. Parody may have aggression and certainly has play and laughter in it (see the section satire), but usually lacks judgment. Parody appears to be most successful when the subject of the parody, says Feinberg (1967:185), has “sufficient

²⁶ Following the thought-provoking work of Lewis and Wigen in their *Myth of Continents* (1997), an effort has been made in this work to dispense with two egregious terms: the “Third World” and “developing countries.” The normative hierarchy implicit in the term Third World is simply unwarranted in this day and age. Moreover, it is an erroneous term now given the dissolution of the Soviet bloc and the rapid erosion of communism in China (the so-called “Second World”). As for developing countries it simply does not make sense today (if it ever did). New categories are needed to designate the different levels of economic development. Leys (1971: 32), writing more than three decades ago pointed out the problem: “The very expression developing countries has come to sound embarrassing precisely because it so obviously rests on the linear conception [of development] and sometimes refers to countries which are in fact stagnating or even regressing.” While any categorization will, to some degree, be arbitrary, it must do the best it can to come as close to reality as possible without, however, becoming so unwieldy that it loses its user-friendly value; but certainly anything is probably better than the current scheme that lumps, for example, Burkina Faso and Djibouti in the same category with Brazil and India or Ireland and Hungary with Germany and United States. Toward this end, five categories appear to strike a proper balance: pre-developing (e.g., Burkina Faso, Jamaica, Zambia); quasi-developing (e.g., Egypt, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa); developing (e.g., Brazil, India, Poland, Russia, South Korea); developed (e.g., Australia, Canada, Denmark); and over-developed (e.g., Britain, Germany, United States). Sometimes, where necessary, in the text these five categories will be collapsed into two primary divisions expressed as: pre/quasi/developing (PQD) countries, and over/developed (OD) countries. Of course, no one ever dares to admit, be it academics or politicians, the inherent dissemblance that undergirds such terminology—that in order for all to achieve the much sought after status of “developed” we would need the resources of three or more planet earths combined since the present status of the over developed is being maintained on the basis of their consumption of more than two-thirds of the world’s resources (even though they constitute a mere one third of the world’s population).

individuality of style or content to be distinguished." "That individuality," he further explains, "may consist of significant originality or mere eccentricity." Since parody depends on first imitation and then exaggerating certain features of the style, behavior, affectation, etc. that is being imitated, parody can be considered a form of caricature—except it operates in either the literary or theatrical (including film and television) mode. (Three common examples of media that indulge in parodies in the U.S. are the magazines *National Lampoon* and *Mad*, and the television program on NBC, *Saturday Night Live*.) The purpose of the parody may include criticism, or it may simply be there to elicit laughter. A common example of harmless parody is when a stand-up comic imitates a U.S. president—and the humor will be found not so much in what the comic says while pretending to be the president, but how well he carries off the parody. Another example of parody, though in reality it is not parody because it is done by animal, is when an ape imitates human visitors at a zoo, and in the process provoking much amusement among the humans. Why parody—especially the innocent harmless kind—generates humor, is another one of those mysteries of humor that remains to be explained. Needless to say, the success of a parody is dependent not only on the person doing the parody but also on the audience viewing the parody. For unless the audience has prior knowledge of the subject of the parody then the failure of the parody is almost assured. When parody is imbued with the elements of aggression and judgment, then it of course becomes transformed into satire. Three good examples from literature that illustrate this point: Joseph Heller's novel *Catch-22*, George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. While in all three literary works parody abounds, the authors' infusion of their work with the elements of aggression and judgment render the work satirical. (See also **ironical allegory, satire**.)

Pass: A form of internal "passport" that Afro-South Africans had to carry at all times on their person when living and working outside their "homelands," that is in "white" South Africa, under the totalitarian pass law system established by SAAG. Its purpose was to control their movement for both economic and political reasons. Failure to produce the pass when asked by the police usually meant arrest, a fine, and sometimes imprisonment. A deportation order (to one's supposed "homeland") would also follow if the pass lacked an appropriate permit. In any given year the number of persons arrested under the pass laws numbered in the tens of hundreds if not thousands. It should be noted that the pass was not an original SAAG invention, as with so many other features of apartheid, it borrowed the concept from a practice established in earlier times by both the Dutch colonists and the British.

Peasantry: refers to either subsistence farmers (but who will also produce for the market on an opportunistic basis from time to time), or small-holder farmers who rely primarily on family labor for production for the market. Peasant farmers are to be distinguished from commercial farmers who produce exclusively for the market and rely primarily on hired labor. In the South African context, examples of peasant farmers include the frontier Afrikaner farmers of the colonial era, and the aboriginal African quasi-sharecroppers of the colonial era (prior to the passage of the 1913 *Land Act*).

Personal Democracy: See **Democracy**.

Petite bourgeoisie (sometimes spelled as "petty bourgeoisie"). Refers to, in my classes, the group of people in a *capitalist* society who mainline sociologists usually refer to as the "lower middle class": that is, people ranging from small business owners to professionals. In other words, they are the people who (while aspiring to bourgeois status) structurally sit between the capitalist class proper (the bourgeoisie) and the working classes. In a racial state, such as the apartheid state or the colonial state, the petite bourgeoisie within the subordinate group will usually be those who are the intermediary between the dominant race and the subordinate race (e.g., the clergy, lower level civil servants, small property owners, office workers, interpreters, traders, teachers, nurses, and policemen). Note, however, that this role may also be played by the *traditional elites*, such as chiefs—or their state-appointed equivalents—though they are not considered part of the petite bourgeoisie (since the latter term is reserved for those associated with a modern capitalist order.)

Political consciousness: A concept that refers to a state of mind characterized by an unending desire to acquire knowledge and information about society against the background of specific ideational and methodological approaches, of which these four are central: (1) civilization; (2) objectivity; (3) truth; and (4) the status quo. (1) *Civilization*. A politically conscious person recognizes that civilization has two dimensions to it: the moral, and the material; and it is the former that is of paramount importance. By moral civilization I mean the attainment of civilized attitudes and behavior vis a vis other human beings, and other forms of life on this planet. Central to moral civilization is the attitude and behavior that is motivated by concrete efforts to respond to the question: What can I do, in terms of my personal attitudes and behavior toward all life forms (beginning with my immediate family and then extending outward to my relatives, friends, community, other communities, society, other societies and other planetary life forms, etc.) to make this planet a better place for them to live in? Underlying this question would be such positive behavioral things as altruism, love, morality, humanity, magnanimity, forgiveness, charity, amicability, open-mindedness, justifiability, and so on. (2) *Objectivity*. Conservatives like to talk about being "objective," but the quest for "objectivity" as normally understood is inherently chimerical. The problem was raised by, among others, Gunnar Myrdal (1969) two decades ago. He framed it thus:

The ethos of social science is the search for "objective" truth. The most fundamental methodological problems facing the social scientist are therefore, what is objectivity, and how can the student attain objectivity in trying to find out the facts and the causal relationships between facts? How can a biased view be avoided? More specifically, how can the student of social problems liberate himself from [a] the powerful heritage of earlier writings in his field of inquiry, ordinarily containing normative and teleological notions inherited from past generations and founded upon the metaphysical moral philosophies of natural law and utilitarianism from which all our social and economic theories have branched off; [b] the influences of the entire cultural, social, economic, and political milieu of the society where he lives, works, and earns his living and his status; and [c] the influence stemming from his own personality, as molded not only by traditions and environment but also by his individual history, constitution and inclinations? (1969:3-4.)

The answer to his question, as he himself, implied is that objectivity is impossible in the social sciences in the sense in which conservatives (also referred to as positivists) advocate. Consequently, any study of any phenomenon or "object" in the social sciences will invariably be colored (not necessarily consciously) by the researcher's own subconscious proclivities, and manifest at the level of choice of questions asked, choice of data collected and examined, choice of methods used, and so on. There is, however, another problem too: all work in the social sciences, even that which purports to be for the sake of the advancement of basic knowledge alone, is ultimately (and if not directly at least indirectly) programmatic. That is, all studies in the social sciences contain within them a mission—whether articulated or not—relating to the ultimate value or purpose of the study: which is to either preserve or change the status quo; this also has a bearing on "objectivity" in the social sciences. (Some, such as Kuhn [1970], have gone so far as to say that even in the natural sciences there is no such thing as "objective" science.) However, guys, I must also emphasize here that the position that "objective" social science does not

exist is not to say that anything goes; that anything any one says about any thing is all valid. Rather, it is to say that the quest for knowledge must adhere to the principle of critical thinking, which I define as a mode of thinking that is characterized by such principles as these:

- a fiery passion for truth;
- a profound belief in the value of honest research;
- patience and open-mindedness to take seriously the views of others;
- a deep sense of commitment to the acquisition of knowledge and information on a variety of issues, both, personal as well as public;
- uncompromising honesty in confronting personal biases, prejudices, stereotypes, etc.;
- possession of limitless curiosity regarding all kinds of subject matter;
- A willingness to confront, where necessary, accepted theories, concepts, modes of thinking, worldviews, etc. in the service of advancing knowledge; and
- a refusal to make judgments that are not based on reasoned reflection.

(3) *Truth*. A person who is politically conscious is a person who seeks the truth in relation to society as a whole with the objective of understanding how that society can become a better society for all its members in terms of social justice, economic progress, environmental safety, and so on. What kind of truth? It is truth relating to how the status quo has come about and how it is maintained—that is who benefits from it and who suffers from it. This task requires one to be fully conversant with all historical processes that explain the status quo, which in turn requires him or her to be multi-disciplinary in approach given the multidimensional nature of all human existence. For, in the words of that brilliant intellectual, Paul A. Baran, “the seemingly autonomous, disparate, and disjointed morsels of social existence under capitalism—literature, art, politics, the economic order, science, the cultural and psychic condition of people—can all be understood (and influenced) only if they are clearly visualized as parts of the comprehensive totality of the historical process.” (1961:12-13) Since no society is perfect in terms of social justice, human advancement, and general human happiness, the politically conscious person is of necessity continuously questioning the status quo and striving for its perfection. Consequently he/she is by definition an insurrectionist, a revolutionary (but whose weapons are pens and whose ammunition are words) because he/she does not wish to permit the beneficiaries of the status quo (the rich and the powerful) from obfuscating the truth: that the status quo, especially in capitalist societies, benefits primarily the rich and the powerful and that it has evolved to this end through human agency and not some supernatural being or even just “nature.” This point was best presented by Barrington Moore, Jr. in his magnum opus some thirty years ago:

[A]ny simple straightforward truth about political institutions or events is bound to have polemical consequences. It will damage some group interests. In any society the dominant groups are the ones with the most to hide about the way society works. Very often therefore truthful analyses are bound to have a critical ring, to seem like exposures rather than objective statements, as the term is conventionally used.... For all students of human society, sympathy with the victims of historical processes and skepticism about the victors' claims provide essential safeguards against being taken in by the dominant mythology (1966:523).

It follows from this that even in those instances where an unjust order has been overthrown and a new just order is being constructed, the task of those who are politically conscious is not over. The new order will still have imperfections. Hence as long as human societies remain imperfect the job of the politically conscious is a permanent one. To put it differently: a politically conscious person is someone who is essentially, to use Baran's words: “a social critic, a person whose concern is to identify, to analyze, and in this way to help overcome the obstacles barring the way to the attainment of a better, more humane, and more rational social order. As such he[/she] becomes the conscience of society and the spokes[person] of such progressive forces as it contains in any given period of history. And as such he[/she] is inevitably considered a “troublemaker” and a “nuisance” by the ruling class seeking to preserve the status quo.” (1961:17) (4) Status quo. A politically conscious person is never satisfied with the status quo. Or to put the matter differently: a politically conscious person is not a political conservative; that is he/she shuns the ideology of political conservatism.

Guys, it follows from the foregoing that a person who lacks political consciousness is not simply one someone who lacks political knowledge about society. After all, there are many political science professors who would easily qualify for membership among the ignorantsia. Political consciousness goes beyond the matter of knowledge and information. Knowledge, of course, is very important, but it is not a sufficient factor.

PQD countries: Pre-Developing/Quasi-Developing/Developing countries. Used in my classes to refer to the comparative socio-economic status of different countries across the planet. (See note under **OD** for an explanation of the source of this categorization.)

Procedural democracy: See **Democracy**

Proletariat: refers to those who permanently derive their livelihood on the basis of wage-employment and who, as a result, have the capacity to develop “worker-consciousness,” an attribute that refers to the willingness to join forces in order to demand better pay and working conditions. They are to be distinguished from those who may also seek wage-employment, but only as a supplement to another source of livelihood (e.g., subsistence farming) and who are termed in my classes as *quasi-proletariat*.

Pseudointellectual: similar to the **ignorantsia**, but with intellectual pretensions

Rivonia Trial: The Rivonia Trial that led to life-imprisonment for Mandela, Sisulu and others, arose as a result of a police raid (involving a tip from a CIA infiltrator, Gerard Ludi) on the secret headquarters of *Umkonto We Sizwe*, the Lilliesleaf Farm, located on the outskirts of an affluent suburb of Johannesburg called Rivonia.²⁷ The raid had unearthed a small cache of arms and other ordnance, together with incriminating documents. The 28-acre farm was owned by the Communist Party of South Africa which had purchased it a year after the ANC had been banned in 1960. Among those arrested were a number of South African Jews and East Indians including, Lionel Bernstein, Dennis Goldberg, Arthur Goldreich (who had pretended to be the owner of the farm), Bob Hepple, James Kantor, Ahmed Kathrada, Moosa Moolla, A. Jassat, and Harold Wolpe. Interestingly, except for Bernstein, Goldberg and Kathrada, the others were able to escape by various means

²⁷ Ludi claims in a BBC documentary, *Nelson Mandela: Accused #1* (2004), that the CIA was forced to provide the information it had on Mandela's movements to the South African security service because it had arrested one of their spies (inadvertently) in Durban but would not let him go. They used their info on Mandela as a bargaining chip to obtain the release of their operative.

prior to or during the trial, and fled the country. (Another arrestee who escaped during the trial was Walter Mkwayi, but he was re-arrested a year later, and served his life-sentence on Robben Island with the others.) The conclusion of the trial saw life-imprisonment being pronounced by Judge Quartus de Wet on eight of the nine remaining defendants (one, Bernstein, was acquitted, but rearrested and placed on bail, but he fled from South Africa too). Besides Goldberg, Kathrada, Mandela, and Sisulu, they were Govan Mbeki, Raymond Mhlaba, Elias Motsoaledi, and Andrew Mlangeni. The government prosecutor was Dr. Percy Yutar (ironically, from the perspective of the Jewish defendants, a South African Jew). Under South African law, treason was punishable by death, so why were those found guilty given life instead? Due to world-wide protests, which forced the prosecution to seek life-imprisonment rather than the death sentence they had originally wished for. During the trial, among the more memorable of Mandela's long four-hour speech (delivered on April 20), were these oft-quoted lines:

During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

Guys, question to ponder: were the South African Jews (considered "white" in apartheid South Africa) and other whites who actively opposed apartheid, "traitors" to the white race?

Robben Island: This is a roughly five-square mile island some six miles off the coast of Cape Town in Table Bay that has been used at various times, ever since the arrival of the Dutch colonial settlers at the Cape, primarily as a place for imprisonment or exile of prisoners, mentally disabled, leprosy sufferers, and so on. The name of the island is an anglicization of the Afrikaans name for it, *Robbeneiland* (meaning seal island). From around 1965 to 1991 the island served as a maximum security prison housing mainly black prisoners, and it became infamous among black people as a place where the task of the jailors was to break the spirit of political prisoners by means of a regimen of harsh treatment. (There is a mind-numbing scene in the film that speaks to this.) In the years following the Soweto Rebellion, however, the prison island also became a status symbol for potential young political prisoners. They began to designate the island as "Mandela University." The mere presence of Mandela, Sisulu and others on Robben Island was enhancing the politicization of the young. In 1997, Robben Island ceased to be a prison and it was converted into a museum. The United Nations, in 1999, placed it on the list of *World Heritage sites*. (Guys, what is a "World Heritage site?")

Satire: Defining satire is about as difficult as defining humor itself. For not only does it occur in many different forms of humor (literary humor, stand-up comedy, political cartoons, comics, and so on) but it also has many roles to play, depending upon what culture and society one is looking at. Going by George A. Test (1991:12), who to date provides the most complete treatment of the subject yet available, defines satire in this way:

Satire may more easily be explained and understood as a bent possessed by many human beings but more highly developed in some individuals and expressing itself in an almost endless variety of ways. The aptitude may reveal itself in a mock nursery rhyme or a mock office memo, in a takeoff on a film genre, in graffiti, poetry or fiction, in mock opera, in newspaper cartoons, in a seemingly endless number of ways. The faculty, if that is the best word for it, will in its essence manifest itself in an expression or act that in various ways combines aggression, play, laughter, and judgment. Each of these acts or expressions is a complicated form of behavior particular to an individual but also influenced by a person's social environment and ultimately by that person's culture.

Satire, then, is the permutation to varying degrees, depending upon the nature of the satiric work or satiric expression, of four basic elements: (a) aggression, (b) play, (c) laughter and (d) judgment. Satire involves verbal aggression. To elaborate:

(a) The satirist employs satire in order to give vent to his/her anger, dislike, frustration, intolerance, hatred, indignation and the like at or about someone or something via verbal *aggression*. As Test (1991:260) aptly puts it:

Whenever and wherever there have been differences among persons and groups--personal, social, religious, philosophical, political--there have been strong emotions aroused that have expended themselves in verbal aggression. Kings, dictators, and presidents, wars and revolutions, racial antagonism, social movements--Socrates, Lewis Phillippe, Richard Nixon, the Revolution of 1688, various phases of the women's movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Reformation --whenever the social structure has been threatened or fragmented, various expressions of satire have erupted.

The verbal aggression can be of the direct kind (as in name-calling) or as is more often the case in public, indirect (as in a play or a mythical story involving anthropomorphic animals), but the overall objective remains the same: at the immediate level to make the targeted person(s) or group(s) appear foolish or stupid or less important or lowly or satanic, etc. The level of directness of aggression is inversely proportional to the degree of fictionality involved in the satiric story or expression. That is the greater the degree of use of fictional elements, in a satiric story for example, the less direct will the verbal aggression be perceived. At the same time, the level of directness is inversely proportional to the status and power held by the target of the satire--that is, the more powerful the person(s) being targeted by the satirist, the more likely that the satiric story or expression will be clothed by the satirist (unless he/she is suicidally inclined) with fictional elements in order to make the verbal aggression embodied by the satiric attack indirect. Obviously, satire is not without risks to its practitioners. Angered targets may retaliate, and in fact throughout history there are examples of satirists who have been persecuted (Voltaire, Daumier, Defoe, the editors of the magazine *private Eye*, etc.). The more recent example, as Test (1991:11-12) reminds us, is that of the Palestinian political cartoonist Naji al-Ali, who suffered not only deportation from Lebanon and Kuwait, but was also a target of an assassination attempt while in exile in London; he died a month after he was shot on July 29, 1987.

(b) Linked together with verbal aggression in satire is the paradoxical element of *play*. Hence even as the satirist attacks his/her victim he/she often does it in the context of playfulness. The playfulness is usually there to temper the verbal aggression. Two examples will illustrate this point: the court jester in the royal households of Europe of yesteryear and the celebrity 'roaster' of today in the U.S.; they both engage in satire, but it is acted out in the context of playful merrymaking. Play does not only take this concrete form in satire; it can also take the form of an imaginary kind--as when fables, fantasies and allegories are constructed. Whatever form play takes in satire, its central role remains the same: to permit satiric expression without offending its target to the point of inviting retaliation. Play, in other words, helps (like fictionality) to render the verbal aggression of the satire indirect.

(c) *Laughter*, of course, is an essential element of satire since satire is a form of humor. In fact, there is no such thing as humorless satire. However, it should be noted that laughter is to be understood here in its broadest sense--referring to any degree of amusement; ranging from

a sly grin to a roar of thunderous laughter. Satirists will incorporate whatever technique of inducing laughter they may be comfortable with in their satire: farce, parody, burlesque, exaggeration, etc. From the perspective of the satirist, laughter is absolutely crucial to his/her enterprise; for it serves as the hook to pull in the audience—the greater the potential for laughter present in the satire, the greater its popularity, and consequently the larger the potential audience (leaving aside those who are the targets of the satire) for the work of the satirist. Besides providing obvious pleasure of entertainment to those who choose to sample the satire, laughter has another function too: it acts to serve the role of adding insult to injury from the perspective of the person(s) or group(s) targeted. That is, in linking laughter with verbal aggression the satirist renders his/her satire even more potent and devastating—with sometimes negative consequences for the satirist if the target happens to be powerful and intolerant. Yet, on the other hand, laughter can also serve the role in satire of weakening the sting of the verbal aggression. This would be especially the case if the target of the satire joins in with the laughter—as in the case of court jesting or celebrity roasting for example. In such a situation laughter serves to sugarcoat the aggression of the satirist.

(d) The fourth major element on which satire rests, according to Test (1991), is *judgment*. That is until the satirist makes a judgment on who or what should be the target of his/her satire (whether it is a person or a group of people, whether it is an institution or an organization, whether it is a society or a culture, whether it is a style of life or a fashion of dress, whether it is religion or politics, whether it is a work of art or music, whether it is a book or an article, whether it is a profession or a vocation, or whatever else it may be) it remains a neutral artistic expression. As he puts it: "It is aggression waiting for a target; it is laughter waiting for a stimulant; it is play waiting for a game." (p. 27) In other words, once the satirist has taken hold of satire it ceases to be neutral, it is transformed into a weapon; and the purpose to which it is put is varied indeed: it has been used for the best of intentions and the worst of intentions, and in support of the best of causes and the worst of causes. "It has been used by malicious, envious, and spiteful persons and it has been used by idealistic and moral persons. It has been used by person in all walks of life, all kinds of cultures and systems of government in countries all over the world. It has been used to attack governments and to bolster governments, it has been used to attack and to defend religion." (p. 28)

Having looked at the key elements that make up satire, it remains to look at a special problem that afflicts almost all satire: that of communication. In order for satire to succeed it must be perceived by the audience as satire and nothing else. Satire is both highly localized humor (bound to a specific time and place) and highly demanding. The audience must not only be conversant with the context out of which a particular piece of satire has emerged (be it political, religious, social, economic, etc.), but must also be in sympathy with the motivations of the satirist (unless the audience itself is the target of the satire) to the point where it can appreciate the unique elements that make up the satire: verbal aggression, play, laughter and judgment. Under the circumstances, the potential for communication failure is considerable—for satire makes a great deal of demand on the knowledge, intellect and tolerance of the audience. In fact, as Test (1991:253) puts it, "[t]he demands of satire and its irony for special knowledge and choosing among values gives satire a unique capacity for alienating an audience, quite apart from any individual irony blindness—inability to pay attention, lack of practice, incapacity for attaining the appropriate emotional state..." (See also **ironical allegory, parody**.)

Settler-colonialism: A variant of **colonialism**, referring to colonization that entailed settlement by colonial populations. Such settlement was usually, but not always, permanent—compare the colonization experiences of Kenya and South Africa.

Sisulu, Walter: Sisulu was born on May 18, 1912 in Qutubeni in the Transkei. In terms of South African racial terminology he was a *colored*, that is, a person of mixed parentage (his mother was a black domestic servant [Alice Sisulu] and his father a white civil servant [Albert Victor Dickinson]). He was raised by his mother. His interest in politics was initially awakened by Garveyism—imported into South Africa by, among others, Clement Kadalie, a trade union leader—and consummated by joining the ANC in 1940 and subsequently founding, together with Mandela and others, the ANC Youth League in 1944. As a member of the league, he was afforded the opportunity to travel fairly widely abroad in the 1940s and 50s. He was one of the ANC defendants in the Rivonia Trial, and together with them sentenced to life imprisonment. He was also among the 156 who were tried in the marathon 1956-61 Treason Trials. Two years following his release on October 15, 1989 (together with Kathrada and others), he was elected the deputy president of the ANC. He died on May 6, 2003.

Social structure: Refers to the arbitrary (usually) division of society in a hierarchic order by those in power along one or more criteria, such as economic power, race, ethnicity, gender, age, income, and so on. This division is not always necessarily *de jure*, it can be *de facto*.

Socialization: Refers to the process of passing values, norms, mores, etc. from one group of people to another—e.g. from the older generation (parents) to the younger generation (children), or from a peer-group to a new member of the group. This process involves agencies of socialization (which range from the family to the church; from the state to the school; from peers to the media; and so on.)

Stereotype: Refers to the generalization of a quality in an individual to an entire group of people that the individual belongs to. (Note, therefore, that stereotypes by definition dehumanize those who are stereotyped.) Stereotypes are created by artists (writers, actors, filmmakers, painters, musicians, comedians, journalists, etc.) in order to justify discrimination and prejudice. The newest stereotype popularized in the West in recent years—especially following 9/11—is that Arab and Asian Muslims are all terrorists. Some stereotypes can go out of fashion because of changed circumstances (e.g. the stereotype that all Russians are communists is no longer in vogue today.)

Structural Adjustment: Very simply put this seemingly benign term refers to a policy/program for eliminating the role of government in every human endeavor that has the potential to be “privatized,” meaning capable of being converted into capitalist profit making ventures by big business. So, for example, structural adjustment advocates are against the idea of governments providing even such basic services to their citizenry as water supply, or operating prisons, or providing education because they can all be provided by private entities, that is businesses. The rationale behind this approach is that, supposedly, capitalist enterprises are not only more efficient than the government in providing these services, but that they would also help to reduce the tax burden. The foolishness of this kind of thinking is highlighted by the fact that not all human needs can be adequately provided for on the basis of the profit motive—that is why we have governments in the first place—and that “efficiency” among corporate capitalist monopolies when it comes to *captivate* markets is simply measured by, to all intents and purposes, how much they can “steal” through both legal and extra-legal means without getting caught. Notice also that the current economic policies being pursued by Western countries (such as the United States, one of the foremost champions of structural adjustment) has been, most ironically (or perhaps most hypocritically) an almost complete repudiation, in effect, of this policy as they have moved to dramatically and directly intervene in the economy by means of various “economic stimulus/bail-out-the-crooks” strategies aimed at trying to rescue their economies from going into complete free fall!

Structure: In my classes I usually use this term to refer to the historically-rooted institutionalized and seemingly “natural” relationships that systemically bind a whole together, but whose construction, while the prerogative of those with a monopoly over power and to which the powerless are in thrall, is often transparent to neither with the passage of time once it is completed. At a social level, generally speaking,

structure and agency has a dialectical relationship: meaning one shapes the other. At the individual level, structures of society constrict individual agency. Note, structures are not always human-made. The climatic environment is an example of a structure too. (See also social structure.)

Substantive Democracy: See **Democracy**

Southern strategy: A political strategy devised by Republicans to secure the electoral victory of President Richard M. Nixon that rested on convincing the white **ignorantia** in the South—by appealing to their racism in the context of the gains of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s—that their objective interests lay with the Republican Party. This strategy, in various forms, continues to be wielded to this day (consider that the majority of white males in this country have consistently voted for the Republican Party since the days of Nixon).

State: Denotes a socio-political, spatially bounded entity at the center of which is to be found a formally organized central political authority. The “state” is both an abstract as well as a concrete entity. In its concrete manifestation, the state is readily visible via its various apparatuses, e.g., the bureaucracy, the army, etc. that together constitute what is known as the “government.” This term should not be confused with the term “state” as used to denote a fragment of a federal political system; e.g., as in “New York state, Michigan state,” etc., in the United States.

Structure: The historically-rooted institutionalized and seemingly “natural” relationships that systemically bind a whole together, but whose construction, while the prerogative of those with a monopoly over power and to which the powerless are in thrall, is often transparent to neither with the passage of time once it is completed. This definition draws on the *structuralism* of Louis Althusser and the concept of *structuration* first articulated by Anthony Giddens.²⁸ At the simplest level, structure can be considered as a metaphor for those *relatively* enduring aspects of society that allows it to retain some degree of functional coherence akin to the structure of, say, a building (the walls, roof, and foundation).

Tambo, Oliver: President of the ANC from 1969 to 1990, and the partner of Mandela in their law firm they had established in 1952. He was born in Mbizana in eastern Mpondoland to subsistence farmers on October 27, 1917. He became fully active in the ANC by cofounding with Mandela, Sissulu, and others, the youth wing of the organization, the ANC Youth League, in 1944. Thereafter, he would steadily rise in the ranks of the ANC concurrently with Mandela and Sissulu, among others. Following the banning of the ANC on March 23, 1960, he was sent abroad to help set up the headquarters of the ANC in exile in a number of countries, including Zambia, where he would spend most of his life, until the unbanning of the ANC. He returned to South Africa on December 13, 1990 with other exiled ANC leaders. Due to ill-health, however, he gave up his position as ANC president to Mandela in 1991; he died of a stroke two years later on April 24, 1993. (In the film *Mandela visits his grave*.)

Techno-financialism: A term coined in my classes, for want of a better word, to refer to the ongoing phase in the evolution of global corporate capital that is characterized by a level of globalization unprecedented in human history—in terms of geographic magnitude and operational intensity—driven by corporate capital’s ability to harness two primary factors of production: computerized information technology, and the ability to move across national boundaries at the speed of light (literally) gargantuan self-generated financial resources that dwarf the annual national budgets of the majority of the world’s nations.

“Textual erasure”: I have come up with this term to refer to the non-inclusion of a group of people, for discriminatory reasons, in the audio-visual “texts” of the mass-media in this society (films, tv shows, radio programs, and so on). This is most clearly visible at the time of, for example, film casting where ordinary roles, which in real life could be performed by anyone (including blacks, women, etc.), are assigned exclusively to whites or males. In this instance, textual erasure results from stereotypes or outright racism/sexism on the part of filmmakers. For example, the stereotype that blacks occupy only lower class positions in society [which of course is not entirely true]—therefore film roles featuring middle or upper class positions should not be assigned to black actors. A group who are almost always targets of textual erasure in films (for racist reasons) are Asians—even though many of them in this country are middle class and professionals.

Terreblanche, Eugene: Leader of a neo-Nazi white supremacist group, the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging (Afrikaner Resistance Movement – AWB), that achieved some media prominence for their oppositional activities against the dismantling of apartheid. Known more for his flamboyant gestures (e.g. riding to court on horseback) and buffoonery than for coherence in aims and strategy, Terreblanche has always been, in reality, a sideshow in South African politics. The AWB is now no longer operational; however, other right-wing neo-Nazi racist groups continue to exist in South Africa—often with links to other similar organizations in Europe, the U.S., Australia, and so on, and sporadically active in criminality and violence. (Interestingly, it has been reported in the South African media that among those involved with the AWB was Steven Hatfield—the U.S. scientist from Maryland erroneously fingered by the FBI for the post-9/11 anthrax attacks.)

Terrorism: note that this term is defined here in the context of the pre-9/11 era (that is, before the onset of the current ongoing so-called “war on terror” which has clearly added a relatively new gloss to the definition of terrorism). In the pre-9/11 context, then: the term even in that period was clearly fraught with much disagreement; for, one person’s terrorist is another’s freedom-fighter. Wilkinson (1973) suggests a compromise: to label the terrorist activities of the state as “repressive terrorism” and the terrorism of those attempting to overthrow the state as “revolutionary terrorism.” In making this distinction the purpose is to get beyond the issue of who has legitimacy in using the weapon of terror and instead concentrate on what terrorism is and the role it plays in politics. Terrorism to start with is a political activity, not a criminal activity, in the sense that the object is a political goal (either to overthrow the state or to repress those trying to overthrow the state). As a means to a goal and not an end in itself it is clearly a tactic or a strategy. This strategy is to create among opponents (or supporters of the opponent) a pervasive climate of fear with the hope that the opponent will give in. Among the elements that go toward creating this climate of fear three are of central significance: (a) the victims are always civilians (if the victims are soldiers or guerrillas then clearly it is not terrorism but war). (b) Violence is an integral part of terrorism where its use (regardless of the form it takes: rape, murder, torture, bombings, and so on) will be indiscriminate, arbitrary and unpredictable. (c) It follows from (a) and (b) that terrorism does not subscribe to any “rules of war” nor is it circumscribed by moral restraints of any kind. Whether used by the state or by revolutionaries the fact that terrorism involves victimization of those not equipped to defend themselves, i.e., civilians, terrorism as a strategy for achieving political goals must be condemned. Neither the state (which usually employs terrorism via the agency of hired thugs (right wing death squads in El Salvador and in South Africa are prime examples) nor the guerrillas have a right to subject civilians to violence and death, however just their cause may be.

²⁸ See, for instance, Althusser (1972), and Giddens (1986).

This is one situation where means clearly do not justify ends.²⁹ In fact a very legitimate argument can be advanced along the lines that those whose consciences have become immune to the death and suffering of their victims caused by their terrorist activities are very likely to use terror as a weapon of choice once they have achieved power whenever they run into opposition—regardless of whether the opposition stems from within or without their own ranks and regardless of whether it occurs via lawful channels. Two examples to support this point: the reign of terror unleashed by Stalin in the Soviet Union in the 1930s and the reign of terror inflicted on the Cambodian people during the period 1975–78 by the Pol Pot regime (these blood-thirsty thugs would later be named, characteristically, as “freedom fighters” by the Reagan Administration following their ousting from power with assistance from the Vietnamese in 1978.)³⁰ In both cases, the terror eventually spread to their own ranks consuming their own. (Though it is possible that the widespread use of children by the Pol Pot regime to do its dirty work probably further aggravated the situation given that children are less likely to comprehend the value of human life than adults.) Bristol (1972: 2–3) in a brilliant essay on the Gandhian strategy of nonviolence makes the same point with a slightly different nuance:

One of the most insidious results of participation in the use of violence is that, no matter how noble their motives, how great their courage, and how deep the sacrifices they make, violence does produce a change in those who employ it. . . . So often when hatred, distortion, torture, murder, destruction are used to bring down a ruthless and inhuman tyranny that awedly needs bringing down, it is discovered that the terror and ruthlessness of the old tyranny reappear in a new guise. All too frequently, in human experience, wars of liberation have been fought with lofty courage and high idealism only to result tragically and ironically in the rebirth of tyranny with new tyrants in charge.

Does terrorism work, however? It depends upon the situation and the nature of the enemy. Hence “repressive terrorism” of the Chilean fascist junta seems to have worked in eliminating the opposition to all intents and purposes, whereas in El Salvador it has not entirely succeeded. In South Africa repressive terrorism succeeded in the short run but the 1990 de Klerk “WOW” speech showed that it ultimately failed. In the Middle East and Northern Ireland “revolutionary terrorism” seems to have achieved little for the Palestine Liberation Organization and the same was true for the Irish Republican Army respectively. In the first case (as happened in the second case) peace is most likely to come as a result of largely political factors involving outside pressures from key benefactors to reach a negotiated settlement where the cost of not reaching such a settlement is rendered much higher than doing otherwise for all parties.³¹ One other point: terrorism should not be confused with guerrilla warfare which also uses violence, except that it is targeted exclusively against the military, it obeys the “rules of war” and it is not above moral constraints in how far it can go with violence. Examples of such guerrilla war include that fought by Fidel Castro and Ernesto “Che” Guevara in Cuba against the corrupt U.S.-supported regime of Fulgencio Batista in late 1950s and the liberation wars in the former Portuguese territories in Africa (see below). One cautionary note about the issue of revolutionary violence: there is today a general distaste in the West for revolutionary violence everywhere.³² Yet while on the surface this may appear laudatory on closer examination it reveals plain hypocrisy. To begin with a general amnesia clouds the issue: Westerners tend to forget that the historical foundations of Western democracy itself rests solidly on violent revolutionary upheavals: the Puritan Revolution (the English Civil War), the French Revolution and the War of Independence and the Civil War in the United States. (Even the whites in South Africa have their history of revolutionary violence: the Boer War.) More importantly, opposition to revolutionary violence conceals a pernicious hidden agenda arising out of a deliberate tendency for the beneficiaries of the status quo—the rich and the powerful—to equate, in the words of Barrington Moore (1967: 505) “the violence of those who resist oppression with the violence of the oppressors,” and thereby promulgate the falsehood that “gradual and piecemeal reform has demonstrated its superiority over violent revolution as a way to advance human freedom.” Even a cursory examination of history indicates that while violent resistance against oppression by the oppressed has generally been met with universal condemnation, the violence of the status quo has gone unchallenged, even when it has been demonstrably greater in magnitude than the revolutionary violence that rose to challenge it. Take for instance the case of the French Revolution: the number who actually perished at the hands of the revolutionaries (estimated to be about 40,000) were far fewer than those who died as a result of the injustices of the *ancien régime*. Consequently, as Moore (1967: 104) so rightly reminds us with reference to this fact: “to dwell on the horrors of revolutionary violence while forgetting that of ‘normal’ times is merely partisan hypocrisy.” There is one other point that must be noted on this issue: violence need not necessarily always imply blood-shed. Violence can also take the form of unjust juridical constraints: a case in point is the entire panoply of laws that made up the apartheid system. Hence the denial of human rights is surely violence. Clearly then there is more to it than meets the eye when politicians in the West decry revolutionary violence: their agenda has little to do with morality; rather it has more to do with the preservation of the status quo upon which rests their hegemonic power. Having said this, however, it should also be pointed out that revolutionary violence, if one can go by the histories of some of the communist nations, e.g., the Soviet Union, China, and Cambodia, is also heavily tainted with the blood of the innocent: the people at the bottom, the peasantry, who were victims of the old order yet again found themselves re-victimized by the new order. In fact, the rivers of blood of the innocent have, at times, run very deep in these societies.

²⁹ There is, however, one exception: when the target of terrorists is not people but property. Since terrorism is usually the weapon of the weak, great mileage may be achieved by revolutionaries if their terrorist activity is restricted to destroying capitalist property—which in capitalist systems is less expendable than people’s lives. The ANC had claimed that its terrorist activities were so targeted, yet awful “mistakes” were made where innocent civilians were killed (see TRC 1999).

³⁰ The motion picture *Killing Fields* provides a glimpse of the widespread terror that the Pol Pot regime unleashed on its own people in the name of “socialism.” Millions upon millions would perish in this self-created Cambodian holocaust that in its barbarity and magnitude would come close to the Jewish Holocaust in Nazi Germany. And the world would simply stand and watch, as in the case of the Jewish Holocaust—not even the self-proclaimed champions of civilization, freedom, democracy, etc. would see fit to lift a single finger to assist the Cambodian civilians. Only an invasion by Vietnam in 1978, for other reasons, would put an end to the carnage. Although Pol Pot himself was never brought to account for his crimes (having died in April 1998—possibly as a result of suicide), some of his lieutenants were arrested and brought before the long-delayed U.N. organized genocide tribunal that commenced proceedings in Phnom Penh on November 20, 2007.

³¹ Hence, in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict peace will only come when the Israeli state is subjected to credible international sanctions and the simultaneous suspension all U.S. aid, regardless of the form it takes, to that country.

³² Though it appears that in the 1980s this distaste withered away in the case of the Reagan Administration when it began funding counterrevolutionary movements (e.g., in Nicaragua and Angola).

Theory: A systematic ideational construction—made of properly defined concepts and logically interconnected propositions—that is at once verifiable (in the immediate sense of being consistent with known facts and available evidence) and provisional (capable of revision), and that is built via the dialectic of a humanist (speculative, creative, etc.) and scientific (measurement, predictive power, etc.) method.

Tutu, Desmond Bishop: In the film we see him in spliced news clips addressing a large crowd in London and later casting his vote in the first-ever multi-racial national elections. Tutu was born on October 7, 1931 in Klerksdorp. His ambition was to become a doctor, but unable to afford medical education he became a teacher, and later a cleric when he was ordained a parish priest of the Anglican Church in 1961. Using his moral authority, and advocating non-violent strategies of resistance to apartheid, Tutu, an articulate man, would become in time a prominent South African cleric. In 1978 he assumed the post of the general secretary of the South African Council of Churches, and several years later, in 1985, he acquired the distinction of becoming the first black bishop of Johannesburg. (In apartheid South Africa this was a major achievement.) A year later, he achieved a similar distinction when he was elected as the first black archbishop of Cape Town. Among his other achievements include receiving the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1984, and his appointment by Mandela as the head of the *Truth and Reconciliation Commission*—a commission of inquiry set up to investigate human rights abuses during the apartheid era, and whose mandate included the controversial device of amnesty from prosecution for those who confessed and repented for their crimes.

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

U.N.: United Nations

U.S. African Americans: An ethnic category in the United States that refers to all peoples who can trace part or whole of their ancestry to the peoples of Africa (excluding Afro-Arabs and Afro-Asians) prior to the European intrusion in that continent. In different time periods they have been variously referred to as **blacks**, Negroes, and **Coloreds**. (See also **Africans**.)³³

U.S. Euro-Americans. See **Blacks**.

U.S. First Americans: In this course an ethnic category that refers to the Americans who peopled the Americas *prior* to the arrival of the European settlers, and their descendants. (Others may refer to them as “Indians” [a gross misnomer if ever there was one] and/or “Native Americans” and/or “Aboriginal Americans.”)

USSR: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Verisimilitude: Verisimilitude in cinema refers to the appearance or illusion of reality achieved through *mimesis* which permits what is happening on the screen “believable” and which in turn allows the filmmaker to commandeer and manipulate the emotions of the audience.³⁴ In other words, the relationship between verisimilitude and the **willing suspension of disbelief** on the part of audiences—the fundamental tool of imagination that permits one to enjoy/appreciate a film—is directly proportional. A documentary film has the greatest amount of verisimilitude followed by films made in the *cinéma vérité* tradition. However, all Hollywood-type films seek maximum verisimilitude, especially through manipulation of production values, without of course making the film look like a documentary. Notice that there is a fundamental contradiction here: verisimilitude is highly desirable but it should not have the quality of a documentary. Another major contradiction of course is that in so far as verisimilitude depends on the manipulation of production values it runs counter to what happens in real life (for instance, our lives are not accompanied by sound tracks). Verisimilitude in cinema is of particular concern to me because of its dependence on high production values which in turn demand a high level of technology and financial resources in the production of the film and which in turn requires corporate mass-marketing. The outcome of this circumstance is that the quest for verisimilitude in cinema becomes the unwitting tool of the socialization of marginality in racist (or sexist or capitalist) societies. Here is how, beginning with why cinema was invented in the first place:

1. The human desire for pleasure in the form of performance entertainment (genetically determined? Perhaps).
- ↓
2. Leads to an eternal and insatiable quest for verisimilitude.
- ↓
3. Leads to the invention of cinema/television (and mass visual entertainment).
- ↓
4. Requires expensive technology (production, and distribution).
- ↓
5. Requires large financial outlays—especially because films are a gamble.
- ↓
6. Requires marketing to as large an audience as possible to recoup the financial investment.
- ↓
7. Requires themes and depictions that are in consonance with the outlook of the majority of the audience—Euro-Americans, males, etc.
- ↓
8. In the areas of race/ gender/ class relations these themes and depictions will play to pre-existing racist/ sexist/ class stereotypes, as well as act to reinforce them. In other words: There is a dialectical relationship between, say, racism and sexism in film, and racism and sexism in society at large.
- ↓
9. Also leads to “textual erasure” of blacks, women, etc. from scenes and story lines altogether—as if they don’t exist in society at all.
- ↓
10. Final outcome: leads to socialization of “marginality” of blacks, women, the working class, etc. (because films have become a powerful medium of socialization in general).

Viva: A Portuguese word, etymologically of Italian roots, meaning “long live” (hence the slogans, “Viva ANC,” “Viva Mandela,” etc.) borrowed by black South Africans from the *relatively* successful African liberation struggles of the 1960s and early 1970s against Portuguese colonialism in the neighboring countries of Mozambique and Angola.

³³ See the excellent article by Hanchard (1990) that discusses the contested terrain of nomenclature vis-à-vis U.S. African Americans, as well as the ideologically loaded conventional practice of the designation of United States as “America.”

³⁴ Mimesis refers to the art of faithfully copying (to the extent possible), in literature, theater, film, etc., the reality of the human world.

Voyeurism: This term has several different meanings (e.g. paraphilia), but in my courses the term signifies what I would refer to as “visual **exoticism**.” For example, the *National Geographic* magazine, which is more than a hundred years old now, has been the bastion of what I call “voyeuristic exoticism” in this country, and in the West generally. In another sense the invention of the moving visual image (as represented by cinema, television, etc.), it can be legitimately argued, represents the technological expression of voyeurism—from this perspective, cinema, by definition is an expression of voyeurism. However, in the case of Hollywood cinema a particularly significant characteristic of cinematic voyeurism is what is usually referred to in the literature as “the stare.” The stare here does not refer to the neutral viewing or seeing but rather the culturally-determined *looking* where, depending upon who is doing the looking, the “look” becomes a psychological act of projection. In the case of Hollywood films it is often the projection of male fantasies of sexual desire where the female cast (especially the lead female actor) becomes the male viewers’ subject of phalocentric “objectification.” Consider: how often do you see male frontal nudity versus female frontal nudity in Hollywood films?

WASP: White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (a usually pejorative term referring to a white person in the United States of Anglo-Saxon ancestry, or simply European ancestry, with racist/ethnicist inclinations—consequently the acronym may also stand for White Anglo-Saxon *Pig*).

West: In general, for purposes of this course, this term refers to white publics living in the Euro-North American (and Australasian) ecumene collectively. (See also **Global North, OD**)

Whiteness: Guys: In order to define this term let me begin by asking you to consider the following two quotes: The first is by Etherington (1989: 286-87) and it is part of his account of relations between the European settlers and missionaries in the colony of Natal (that would later become part of South Africa and which today is called KwaZulu-Natal) in the nineteenth-century.

[A] settler complaint was that... missionaries attempted to convert people who were not capable of becoming true Christians. According to a Methodist district superintendent, the major reason why settlers would not contribute to missions was “skepticism as to the converting power of the gospel upon the native population.” A candidate for the Legislative Council once told an election rally that a “corps of police officers could do more to civilize the Kaffirs, than all the missionaries in the Colony.” Lieutenant-Governor Pine reinforced local prejudice by telling the Methodists that experience had taught him “the extreme difficulty of really converting savage nations to a knowledge of our religion...” It was as though the settlers unconsciously feared that Christian Africans would have a more powerful claim to equal rights than an uneducated population devoted to their ancient beliefs. (Emphasis added.)

This second quote is from Ostler (2004: 17-18) who seeks to explain the ideological premises of the dispossession of the U.S. Native Americans in the U.S. West following the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory from the French in 1803 (as if it was theirs to sell in the first place).

Though many men and women who “settled” western frontiers became virulent Indian haters and advocated extermination, most theorists offered assimilation as an alternative. Assimilation resolved the contradiction between a commitment to dispossession with its implications of genocide on the one hand, and Enlightenment and Christian principles of the common humanity of all people on the other.... Yet the basic premise of assimilation, that Indian ways of life were inferior, was linked to increasingly systematized theories of racial classification and hierarchy that tended to reinforce ontological thinking about race.... American elites eventually tried to resolve the contradiction between imperialism and humanitarianism through the idea that whereas rare individuals might become “civilized,” Indians were an inferior race that was inevitably destined to vanish. Although Americans knew at a practical level that Indians controlled a significant proportion of North America, on an ideological level they conceived of the entire continent as empty.

O.K. So, what is my point? It is impossible for the psyche of a people to remain completely unaffected by their unprincipled and violent abrogation of the rights (that is those subsumed by the **Natural Law of Prior Claim**) of other peoples over a period spanning centuries and on a scale that is simply unfathomable by the human mind—most especially when those so victimized continue to live among the interlopers. It is not surprising then that the denouement of such shameful markers in the history of the colonization of the United States and South Africa as the enslavement of Africans and Asians (in South Africa—1650s–1830s) and First Americans and Africans (in the United States—1500s–1863/1865); the Hundred Year War (1799–1879); the aftermath of the Louisiana Purchase (1803); the Trail of Tears (1838); and Wounded Knee (1890), on the ideological plane has been the development among the descendants of the European settlers of what may be described as the hegemony of the ideology of “whiteness.” United in their common history—that transcends class, gender, ethnicity, religion, and any other social structural division one may care to identify—of gross criminality (in terms of crimes against humanity), a perverse racist sense developed among them of entitlement to human and natural resources, before all other peoples, on the basis of nothing more than their skin pigmentation. Fortified by the power to continue across centuries, all the way to the present, to inflict hegemony upon others (and contrary to the logical expectation of feelings of remorse, the quest to seek forgiveness, the magnanimity to consider restitution, and so on, befitting a people that have never ceased to trumpet to this day their membership of a supposedly superior civilization) the descendants of the European colonial settlers elevated the notion of whiteness as signifying entitlement to privilege to one of Darwinian naturalness (or in the case of those of a religious mind a God-given right).

While the literature on the subject of the hegemony of whiteness is burgeoning, a brief foray into its principal characteristics is all we can afford guys, given limitations of page-space, in this glossary. There are seven central elements around which the ideology of whiteness is organized:

- a pervasive and stupefying ahistoricism;
- the deep illusion that whiteness is an immutable biologically determined concept, rather than one of contingency (exemplified by the profound inability to clearly and consistently define who a “white” person is across time and space);
- the fallacy that whiteness equals civilizational superiority (a Eurocentrist hubris);
- the preposterous belief that whiteness is a synonym for humanness;
- the notion of whiteness as “property”;
- the belief that possession of this property entitles one to privileges that others without this property are not entitled to;
- and the idea that what constitutes knowledge is a prerogative that belongs only to those who possess this property (and therefore, even describing and questioning whiteness, its practice, its historical antecedents, and so on is akin to dabbling in superstition).

But of what relevance is the concept of whiteness to the subject matter of our class? Simple: as I have explained quite a few times, we cannot comprehend the functions of racism in this society without understanding this concept. The reason is that “whiteness” has become the ideational element in the ideational/structural dialectical binary that not only underwrites the material basis of the prosperity

of the peasant/proletarian European interlopers and their descendants to this day, but also helps to shape the character of the relations that currently exist between whites and blacks in the U.S. There is however, one fly in the ointment in the analysis so presented: A question arises that is not so easily dispensed with: Exactly how does whiteness interact with the overall process of accumulation that in the last instance is the driving force of all capitalist orders? Very briefly: whiteness within the working-classes of European ancestry serves as an ideological vehicle for the subjectification of the objective and the objectification of the subjective in the domain of class-relations, which in the end benefits capital. This explains, for instance, why in the United States cross-racial working class alliances have been notoriously difficult to organize or sustain, permitting capital almost unfettered access to political power. It also explains, to turn to a wholly different time-period, why most of the poor whites in the slave-holding South (who could not afford to own slaves) supported the plantation aristocracy in maintaining the slave order—so much so that when that order came under severe threat they en masse took up arms in its defense (reference here is of course to the U.S. Civil War).

A close reading of the foregoing, to sum up, should lead to this conclusion: whiteness performs a contradictory role. It is, at once, a source of privilege, and a source of oppression for the working classes of European ancestry; similarly, for capital whiteness serves to undermine accumulation as well as enhance it. In other words, like all ideologies whiteness is an inherently contingent cultural artifact in its practice; it all depends on the level and specificity of the analysis one undertakes, and the place and time-period in question, to comprehend the contradictory role of whiteness, today—as well as in the past. In one sense the policy of affirmative action has always existed in this country from the very beginning of European colonial settlement, in the shape of legalized racist and sexist discriminatory practices that gave preference to whites in general, and white males in particular, in all areas of the economy, politics and society (from employment to voting rights). In other words, white racism and sexism has always been another name for illegitimate “affirmative action”—in support of whiteness and patriarchy. Yet, when legitimate affirmative action policies were instituted beginning in the 1960s in order to help rectify the historically rooted injustices of racism and sexism, considerable opposition among whites (even among liberals—including, ironically, white females) to this policy emerged.

Whites: See **Blacks**.

Willing Suspension of Disbelief: I generally use this phrase in a loose sense to mean the willingness by audiences to allow their emotions to be manipulated by a beam of light in the form of projected images—which I should remind you can be turned off with a simple switch in the film projector. A stricter, that is common, definition refers to the willingness of audiences to believe what is happening on the screen in *particular* genres of films or *specific* actions/scenes in a given film as “real,” but only for the duration of the film of course (unless one is a child). One genre, for example, that requires a very high dose of the willing suspension of disbelief is the science fiction film. Consider: people can only enjoy a *Superman* film if they are willing to believe (while watching the film) that Superman can really fly. (Once the film is over they can throw that silly notion out of the window.) Another good example of films that rely wholly on the willing suspension of disbelief by audiences are Disney cartoons where animal characters are not only completely anthropomorphic but are capable of fantastical antics. (Compare here too the *Flintstones* cartoon series.) Magical realism in literature and film, to give yet one more example, depend wholly on a willing suspension of disbelief.

World Bank: This is a global capitalist financial institution, whose members today comprise almost the entire membership of the United Nations (with the exception of communist countries such as Cuba), that was founded in 1944 at Bretton Woods (in New Hampshire, United States) with the purpose of eliminating poverty around the world by providing low-cost long-term loans to governments and it comprises two institutional wings: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association. (The World Bank itself is part of a larger entity called the World Bank Group.) Because the United States is the biggest shareholder in the bank it has traditionally reserved the right to appoint the president of the Bank, a prerogative exercised by whoever has been the president of United States when the occasion has arisen. It is important to stress that while it may appear that the Bank has a laudatory mission, in reality its activities have been far from benign given its emphasis on an economic development agenda that protects the interests of the rich over those of the poor—achieved through the enforcement of capitalist economic principles (neo-liberal economics) that favor, though in not so many words, the hegemony of transnational corporations. So, for example, it has been a strong advocate of the policy of structural adjustment (though in recent years it has toned down this emphasis in the face of strident criticism from those countries so affected by this policy).

World Trade Organization (WTO): This capitalist organization was founded in 1995 with the purpose of promoting world trade on the basis of what is usually referred to as free trade (meaning no trade barriers like customs and excise duties). In one sense it is the institutional embodiment of **globalization**; consequently, as with the Bretton Woods institutions, the WTO has really been more concerned with making the world as safe as possible for Western corporate capitalism more than promoting equitable world exchange of goods and services.