African Americans and South Africa

Y. G-M. Lulat

NOTE: This reading comprises Chapter 15 ("U.S. African Americans and South Africa, 1800s–1948") and Chapter 16 ("U.S. African Americans and South Africa, 1949–2008") from a book titled *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* by Y.G-M. Lulat (New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing Group, 2008). For more on the book click here: http://bit.ly/sabook

Chapter Contents

15

U.S. African Americans and
South Africa, 1800s–1948

Free U.S. African Americans have had relations with at least two African countries that are of long-standing—going as far back as the nineteenth century; of these two, paradoxically, one is South Africa (and the other is Liberia).[1] In fact, relations with South Africa, as we have already had occasion to mention, date back (albeit tangentially) to the seventeenth century—thanks to the U.S. whaling industry. In surveying these relations, however, it is necessary to indicate at the very outset two important points that have to be kept in mind throughout the ensuing discussion: First, given the consistent exclusion of U.S. African Americans by U.S. Euro-Americans from *effective participation* in the foreign policy decision-making process—albeit not for want of trying to counter this exclusion—throughout U.S. history (until recently), U.S. African American contributions in the area of U.S. relations with South Africa had been largely in the realm of nonofficial relations: that is, in the area of cultural relations.[2] It is only since the mid-1980s, that U.S. African Americans began to have a *meaningful* influence on U.S. foreign-policy-making process—mainly via congressional activity. Second, U.S. African American attitudes toward and contacts with South Africa, at whatever level, cannot be completely separated from the more general matter of attitudes toward and contact with Africa as a whole. Throughout U.S. African American history, up to the present day, the theme that has remained consistent in this latter area has been a pronounced ambivalence derived from a base of ignorance fostered, in part, by U.S. Euro-American racism against blacks. Thus what was true in the years following the Civil War, ably described by Redkey (1969: 2) as follows, continues to hold true for the vast majority of U.S. African Americans to this day:

> As long as ignorance about contemporary Africa prevailed in the Afro-American community, hope romanticized the fatherland and fear fostered shame. Most blacks were ready to shift to either side, depending on their circumstances. Romantic Africa became in their minds a refuge from white persecution, the only place on earth where black men could truly be free. Humiliation at the African's supposed backwardness led to confusion and guilt because Afro-Americans felt that they should be proud of their origins, but they knew little worthy of pride.[3]

In relation specifically to South Africa, however, it is also true that knowledgeable U.S. African Americans had come to harbor a seething rage at the racially-determined suffering and indignities that blacks in that country had to put up with at the hands of whites, most especially after the institutionalization of the apartheid system.[4] As Magubane (1987) points out, the collective historical experience of blacks in both parts of the world had been foundationally central to the particular type of economic, social and political development that Europeans would engineer in these two areas; thereby creating a basis for U.S. African American interest in South Africa that was rivaled only by interest in one other African country, Liberia (putting aside ancient Egypt). At the same time, U.S. African Americans increasingly became aware that as long as the apartheid system continued to vio-

late the African continent, no person of African descent anywhere in the world could stand tall and proud. In fact, politically conscious U.S. African Americans have long understood that respect and dignity for the African diaspora was indissolubly linked with the status of Africa in the world. Only a free and strong Africa could provide them with the psychological platform from which to build their own economic and political strength. Consequently, to U.S. African Americans, on the eve of the twenty-first century, South Africa remained of special moral, psychological and political significance, just as it did over a hundred years before, on the eve of the twentieth century, as the following discussion will show.[5]

The earliest large-scale presence of U.S. African Americans in South Africa, it appears, was a result of happenstance.[6] In 1894, four years after a successful concert tour of South Africa by the U.S. African American choir, the McAdoo Singers (also known as the McAdoo Minstrels or Virginia Jubilee Singers) led by Orpheus Myron McAdoo, had sparked much excitement among Africans, a choir group of African students from South Africa (led by two white South Africans, and called the African Native Choir), while on a visit to the United States, ran into severe financial difficulties that left them stranded in Cleveland, Ohio.[7] While little is known of what became of others, eight of them were able to obtain assistance from U.S. African American clergy in Cleveland; among them was a 21-year-old student by the name of Charlotte Manye Maxeke (who fate would single out for an inadvertent but important role).[8] She had come in contact, accidentally it appears, with a young minister, Reverdy Ransom, of the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church—a U.S. African American denomination and he in turn introduced her to one of the church leaders, Bishop Benjamin Arnett, who was known to be a strong supporter of mission activity, in Africa, by U.S. African Americans. Arnett helped Charlotte to enroll in a college run by the denomination, the Wilberforce University, in Ohio. At the same time, he opened his home to her, making her part of his family (Williams 1982).[9]

Now, it so happened that Charlotte's uncle in South Africa was none other than Mangena Mokone, the leader of a newly formed Ethiopianist Methodist church. Mokone, a minister in the English Wesleyan Methodist Church of South Africa, had resigned from it in October of 1892 to found the new church in Pretoria in November of the following year that they named the *Ethiopian Church.* The immediate specific incident that provoked Mokone, and a number of his colleagues, to embark on this drastic and, it would appear, unprecedented action was an all-white meeting of Wesleyan ministers from which they had been excluded (Odendaal 1984: 25).[10] This incident, serving as the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back, was part of a range of discriminatory practices that had begun to be institutionalized by the Church following its decision (a few years earlier in 1886) to segregate its religious and other services, and which Mokone would now enumerate in a "Declaration of Independence" he issued upon his resignation (Chirenje 1976: 257). Mokone learned of Charlotte's scholarship at Wilberforce University and the existence of the AME Church following a visit on May 31, 1895, to his niece, Mrs. Kate Makanya, in Johannesburg; she had received a letter from Charlotte, who was her sister, written on AME Church stationery.

Mokone immediately set about writing one of the leaders of the AME Church, a Bishop Henry McNeal Turner, informing him about his own Ethiopianist church: "I am the minister of the above [Ethiopian] mission and also the originator of the same. I have two ordained ministers or priests and seven deacons. It is entirely managed by us blacks of South Africa" (Chirenje 1976: 258) Mokone then went on to ask for assistance with the sponsorship of Africans to study at U.S. institutions. In contacting Turner, little did Mokone know that he was dealing with a remarkable man; one who, among other things, not only happened to have had the distinction in 1863 of being the first U.S. African American chaplain to be appointed to the U.S. Army by Abraham Lincoln (Williams 1982), but who was also consumed by thoughts such as the following: "If all the riff-raff white-men worshippers, aimless, objectless, selfish, little-Souled and would-be-white negroes of this country [United States] were to go to Africa, I fear it would take a chiliad of years to get them to understand that a black man or woman could be somebody without the dictation of a white man. … There isn't much real manhood in the Negro in this country today" (from Chirenje 1976: 258).

Before we continue, however, it is important to draw attention to this simple fact, not emphasized often enough, by those whose principle object of their professional lives is the study of the lives of others: that when faced with severe conditions of oppression that span generation upon generation and which as a result have acquired the patina of inevitable irreversibility, those who

would dare to be insane enough to challenge these conditions will often bring forth views, ideas and strategies that, depending upon circumstance, may be perplexingly contradictory and even serve to potentially or actually vitiate their objective (of ending oppression)—in other words, they are, at the end of the day, only human. Consequently, as one passes judgement on the significance of their contributions to the Manichean struggle against oppression, it must be tempered by an acknowledgment of this fact. In the context of this particular chapter, one has in mind Henry McNeal Turner (as well as people such as James E. Kwegyir Aggrey, W. E. B. Du Bois, Marcus Garvey, S. M. Bennett Ncwana, James S. Thaele, and Booker T. Washington).

Bishop Turner was a grand visionary—but a contradictory character as we will see momentarily—who saw in U.S. African American missionary activity in Africa the salvation (economic, political and spiritual) of both Africans and U.S. African Americans. Thus Turner shared the sentiments of many of his contemporaries who not only believed in the Christian duty to evangelize but also saw a moral duty in assisting Africa, the land of their forefathers, to "redeem and regenerate" itself. This sentiment is best captured in the following quote from an editorial published in the *Independent*, on the occasion of the "Congress on Africa and the American Negro," held in December 1895 in Atlanta—sponsored by the Stewart Missionary Foundation for Africa of the Gammon Theological Seminary (a school for black ministers run by the white-controlled Methodist Episcopal Church): "What the Christian faith, Christian education, and Christian example have done for the Negro in the United States, these influences can do for the Negro in Africa. It is natural that seven million Negroes, escaped from slavery, rising by culture, industry and economy to a high plane of civilization, should turn their thoughts to the Dark Continent, where untold millions of their race are living in a state of savagery, and that they should feel a strong desire to assist in the redemption of Africa" (from Noer 1978: 41).

At the same time, U.S. African American leaders felt that through their "civilizing" work in Africa they would be able to gain the respect of Euro-Americans in the United States. By helping to transform Africa into a land of Christians, it was felt, whites would not only be thankful at such an evangelical accomplishment, but they would also begin to treat U.S. African Americans as equals (Williams 1982). As Bishop Turner explained, "while Africa [was] shrouded in heathen darkness," the likelihood of raising their own status in the United States was nonexistent. At one point, Turner took his argument so far as to outrageously suggest, in an address at Fisk University in 1894, that it was the will of God that Africans be enslaved, so that "they might come into contact with Christian civilization, and by intercourse with the powerful white race they might fit themselves to go back to their own land [in Africa] and make of that land what the white man had made of Europe and of America" (Williams 1982: 100). He even went further, and proposed a ridiculous plan for the enslavement of Africans by "civilized" whites and U.S. African Americans for a period of seven years. Thereafter, they would be returned to Africa "raised to a plane of civilization that would be a blessing to them" (p. 100).[11] He continued, "The elevation of the Negro in this and all other countries is indissolubly connected with the enlightenment of Africa" (p. 102). Writing in 1899, the AME Church mission secretary, H. B. Parks, put the matter to U.S. African Americans even more forcefully: "Can you see the immense credit that will reflect upon the American Negro when the world is forced to recognize the success of the movement? [Such recognition would] do more to improve your condition at home than years of legislation.… Do you see that this is the road through which God would have the race ascend to its proper place of greatness? Is the race spirit strong enough in you to see it?" (Williams 1982: 102).[12] Consequently, given the pro-mission sentiment toward the end of the nineteenth century among U.S. African American clergy in general and those in the AME in particular, initial inquiries from Mokone were a godsend, it quickly led to a strong interest within the AME Church to extend its existing missionary activities in Africa (principally Liberia) to South Africa.[13]

THE AME CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA

The AME Church, as we have already seen, was founded in 1787 (with an ex-slave by the name of Richard Allen being among its more well-known founders), as a result of frustration with the racist discrimination that permeated the U.S. Methodist Episcopal Church. In terms of origins, therefore, both the Ethiopian Church of South Africa and the AME Church shared a similar background. Not

surprisingly, contact between the AME Church and the Ethiopian Church via the agency of Bishop Turner proved to be fortuitously propitious for Africans in South Africa. For, had it not been for the AME Church, it is doubtful that the Ethiopian Church would have survived for long, given the inexperience of its leaders, lack of resources, and animosity from the white churches and authorities. Within a year of commencement of contacts between the AME Church and the Ethiopian Church, plans were initiated to form a union between the two churches.[14] For this purpose, in 1896, Reverend James M. Dwane was dispatched by the Ethiopian Church to the United States to formalize the union. He was received by Bishop Turner and the AME Church mission secretary Parks and taken on a speaking tour of the South. Dwane made a favorable impression on the AME Church clergy and the laity as well—as Turner would observe: "everywhere Dwane went in this country the people rose by the thousands to their feet to rejoice over him" (Williams 1982: 56). Dwane returned home after being appointed general superintendent of the AME Church in South Africa, in September 1896. Two years later, in April, it was the turn of an AME Church representative from the United States, in the person of Bishop Turner himself, to visit South Africa. Bishop Turner, in making what was his third trip to Africa, would make the visit to South Africa no less than triumphant. During the month or so he spent in that country, Turner managed to accomplish much: he preached to enthusiastic Africans in their thousands; breaking tradition, he ordained sixty-five Africans and appointed Dwane as the assistant bishop; he helped to organize the Transvaal and the South African annual AME Church conferences and assisted in the membership recruitment drive that enabled the church to raise its membership level to above ten thousand. On this trip, Turner also bought a site in Queenstown for an AME Church school.

Interestingly, Bishop Turner also had occasion to meet with the Afrikaner leader and president of Transvaal, Paul Kruger, who reportedly said "[y]ou are the first black man whose hand I have ever shaken" (Noer 1978: 59). It appears, according to Chirenje (1976), that this leader of a people who had despised Africans almost from the first day that they set foot on African soil, preferred to see missionary work by whites among the Africans terminated. Thus Turner, reporting on his meeting, would say about Kruger: "[t]he President received our church with great cordiality, though I must confess, if reports be true, it was not so much love of it as from distrust of white missionaries, whom he greatly dislikes" (p. 265). It has to be remembered that the Afrikaners believed that Africans had no souls to be saved, because to them Africans were not human beings in the full sense of the word. To Kruger, therefore, blacks ministering to blacks made greater sense than whites ministering to blacks—even if they were English (whom he also despised with a passion).

Without any doubt, Bishop Turner's visit provided a further impetus to Ethiopianism in general in South Africa. Being conscious of racism there, and having long been wedded to ideas that were opposite to those of people such as Booker T. Washington, he was of the firm opinion that for Africans (just as for U.S. African Americans in the United States) "churches of their own and ministers of their own race, with the required learning and ability, would be of far more benefit in a progressive measure, than worshipping among whites" (Williams 1982: 56). To Turner, the Booker T. Washington "philosophy" as expounded by Washington in his infamous 1895 "Atlanta Compromise," was simply anathema. He refused to support such ideas of Washington's as that U.S. African Americans forego political action in support of civil rights and instead concentrate on achieving economic prosperity—as if the two were separable—via self-help programs and industrial/agricultural training. While there is no doubt that Washington was genuinely concerned with the fate of the U.S. African American community in general, his struggles with W. E. B. Du Bois for the leadership of U.S. African Americans would reveal that he was also "hungry for personal power… and he found it difficult to differentiate between what was good for the race and what contributed to his own power" (Redkey 1969: 25).[15] Redkey states that Washington was always "hyper-sensitive" to white opinion, which in the African context translated into supporting European colonialism. In fact, Washington would even suggest that Africans in South Africa would in the long run benefit more by remaining under European tutelage rather than fighting for political independence. Through the "gospel of soap and candles, hammer and saw, and loom" Africans would be able to achieve progress and prosperity (Noer 1978: 40). Bishop Turner, on the other hand, advocated a policy of "Africa for the Africans" and opposed the notion of the necessity of white rule.

In 1899, Dwane made a second trip to the United States to try and raise more funds for his the church, as well as to see if his rank could be upgraded to that of a full Bishop; however, given the

limited financial capabilities of the AME Church, Dwane was unable to obtain the funds he wanted. He returned to South Africa somewhat disillusioned and resentful and proceeded to lead a break-away movement—which then went on to join the white-dominated Anglican Church as a semi-independent body called the *Order of Ethiopia*. Mangena Mokone and most of his colleagues, however, refused to follow Dwane and remained loyal to the parent AME Church. While Turner was shocked at this development, he advised those ministers who had remained loyal to allow the secessionists to withdraw peacefully, so as to minimize the negative consequences of the rift. He also predicted that while the secession was a setback it would not permanently cripple the AME Church in South Africa. In fact, in 1901 differences were resolved and the church grew, so much so, that by 1906 it had established its presence in the Cape, the Transvaal, the Orange Free State, Natal, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Southern Rhodesia, and Barotseland. Its membership had reached nearly 11,000 and its ministers numbered some 250. By 1914, its membership would exceed 18,000 (Williams 1982: 57).

The AME and Education

The Ethiopianists had hungered for institutions of learning of their own and in fact it is a factor that cannot be discounted, as Campbell (1995) has suggested, in the alacrity with which the Ethiopian Church folded itself into the AME Church shortly after the former's founding. Although perpetually haunted by inadequate resources, the AME Church did its best in responding to this hunger: it opened a number of primary and central primary schools, as well as the three higher-level institutions: Bethel Institute (which trained teachers and evangelists), Chatsworth Institute (which provided industrial training), and the Lillian Derrick Institute for Boys (later it would be called the Wilberforce Institute). The last, as Campbell's account shows, had considerable impact on the education of Afro-South Africans, being responsible for training, over a period of some fifty years, not only numerous AME ministers, but a whole generation of African schoolteachers in the Transvaal. An AME school at Evaton near Vereeniging, thirty miles south of Johannesburg, had become the germ of the Wilberforce Institute. Its rudimentary beginnings are indicated by the fact that in 1908 its buildings comprised two mud and daub huts.[16] From such humble origins it would grow into a credible educational institution, though it would never make it to the status of a true postsecondary institution of higher learning; that is a college or a university modeled on its U.S. namesake as its founders had originally hoped. The problem, at least in the early years, was always lack of funds. The mother church in the United States, with extensive commitments of its own and drawing on a flock that itself, in relative terms, was not economically well off, was unable to carry through its yearly commitments to help fund the institution on a regular basis. At the same time there were pressures from the government to modify its curriculum and *adapt* it to the needs of the African (namely a Tuskegee-style curriculum) popularized in South Africa by white liberals such as Charles T. Loram. Though here, admittedly, the Institute's faculty, who were either U.S. African Americans or Afro-South Africans trained in the United States, went along with the notion of an "adapted" curriculum. What this meant in practice was a curriculum emphasizing vocational education or industrial education as it was called then.[17] In the end the Institute was taken over by the apartheid government in the wake of the 1953 *Bantu Education Act*, and by closing down or transferring its various sections reduced it over time to a school whose sole purpose was to train students for the ministry.[18]

It ought to be noted that the initial success of the AME in South Africa was also, in a large measure, attributable to the misperception among the whites that the U.S. African American missionaries were all harbingers of the Booker T. Washington ideology; which, of course, the whites did not find threatening. The liberals among them were particularly impressed, for example, by the achievements represented by the Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes. Moreover, any "philosophy" that advocated political quiescence on one hand but hard work on the other, and one propounded by black people themselves, was bound to appear as music to Euro-South African ears. However, although some effort was made via the import of Tuskegee graduates, with the active cooperation of the British colonial office, to establish a "miniature Tuskegee Institute" at the American Zulu Mission in Natal and develop other similar training programs, such efforts, says Noer (1978: 113), in the end did not amount to much because of a variety of problems, not least among them the reluctance of European employers to replace European workers with African workers.

One may note here that, in one sense, the growing white resentment against the AME and U.S. African Americans in general did have one positive effect: a long mooted idea of a government college for Afro-South Africans (initially referred to as the Inter-State Native College) would finally become a reality with the founding of the South African Native College—later to become Fort Hare University College—an institution that would come to play a prominent role in the education of Africans, even beyond South Africa's borders.[19] Its establishment was a direct result, in part, of the desire by Euro-South Africans (especially missionaries and government officials) to stem the flow of Afro-South African students to the United States; in fact, the report of the *South African Native Affairs Commission* had recommended that such a college be established toward this end, and thereby eliminate what it felt was the pernicious influence of U.S. African American education on black South Africans.[20] The wheels of bureaucracy, however, tend to turn slowly (especially when the interests of a marginal constituency are involved); hence the college did not open its doors until about a decade later, in 1916.

The Political Impact of the AME

By the time of the First World War, however, white attitudes toward the presence in South Africa of U.S. African Americans, in general, had begun to sour. On one hand there was the matter of the rightful place of the black man (which included the U.S. African American) in the general scheme of things, which the U.S. African American in South Africa was not above challenging. For example, a number of protests were lodged by U.S. African Americans, via the U.S. consul, at the treatment they were receiving from Euro-South Africans. A Reverend A. M. Middlebrooks of Pinebluff (Arkansas) complained that he was being prevented from baptizing converts in the Transvaal, and although his complaint was found to be true, the U.S. consul in Cape Town reported to the State Department in Washington that nothing could really be done about it. He observed that the Euro-South Africans (British and Boer alike) still held to "the old idea that existed in the Southern States that the Colored man should be kept in ignorance… they claim that if the Kaffir is given an education he could not be handled as submissively as he could if he were kept in ignorance" (from Noer 1978: 116). At the same time, there were protests by U.S. African Americans at the racist social restrictions blacks in general were being subjected to by whites—e.g., harassment on sidewalks, harassment in trains, not being allowed to purchase liquor, and so on. In 1904 a group of sixteen U.S. African Americans complained to the U.S. representative in Johannesburg, demanding that their rights "as natives and citizens of United States," be protected.

As would be expected, not much really came out of the many complaints that the U.S. representatives received from the U.S. African Americans. For even where the representatives did bother to raise the issue, the response of the authorities was to either ignore them or to tell them that their complaints related to issues that were of domestic and not international concern. Consequently, the representatives advised U.S. African Americans to simply avoid coming to South Africa. As a U.S. consul warned, "there is a great prejudice against the black man in this country and the American Colored man would not be able to obtain the same treatment in this country as at home" (Noer 1978: 116). If the behavior and complaints of U.S. African Americans represented a thorn in the side of the Euro-South Africans, what really helped to turn them away from all U.S. African Americans—eventually precipitating their almost total expulsion from South Africa—was undoubtedly activities of those U.S. African Americans who supported Bishop Turner's views.

To Turner, European imperialism represented not a vehicle for the improvement of the lives of Africans but a means for dispossessing them; it represented nothing less than a gigantic theft of their lands and resources. He shared the sentiments of one of the church's ministers who called upon the AME Church to protect Africans from the fate that had befallen the U.S. First Americans: being crushed under the "iron wheels" of white invasion (Williams 1982: 137). To Turner, the political and economic debauchery that colonialism brought to Africa was far more damaging than all the exaggerated claims of African barbarity. According to Williams (1982: 137), Turner "simply did not trust whites when they held political power over blacks, and he recognized that racism was deeply embedded in the white mind." When a Baptist U.S. African American missionary, R. A. Jackson, wrote from South Africa that the Euro-South Africans, in many areas, had created "a hell on earth" for the Africans, observes Williams, it further helped to reinforce Turner's anti-imperialist views. Not sur-

prisingly then, when Turner visited South Africa one of the ideological messages that he brought along with him was the one encapsulated in the words: "Africa for the Africans."

While Turner's visit was by no means political in intent, it is clear, however, that given the nonaccommodationist political views he held his visit served to reinforce the development of an Ethiopianism among Africans that was implicitly political and radical in nature. Hence, even though Ethiopianism was not a political movement per se, it had the effect of complementing the extant political activities of the emerging modern African elite. It has to be remembered, as Odendaal (1984) points out, that the original source of dissension between the European and the African clergy was not over matters of biblical interpretation and church tenets but rather over social issues. Therefore, by definition, the Ethiopianist churches carried with them a covert political message: that of African nationalism. The consequence of this fact is explicated well by Odendaal (1984: 82): "The relationship between the so-called Ethiopian or separatist church movement and the politically active groups… was a highly significant factor in inter-African co-operation and in the political activation of Africans at grassroots level. Hitherto, while scholars have recognized the political implications of religious independence, they have had the difficulty in establishing direct connections between the independent church movement and participation in the emergent political organizations. However, the link is emphatic."

The most convincing evidence of the political impact of Ethiopianism on the growth of African nationalism comes from many of the leaders of the Ethiopian churches themselves. For besides being church leaders they were also actively involved in activities of organizations such as the South African Native Congress; names include: Pambani Mzimba, James Dwane, Jonas Goduke, Mangane Mokone, I. G. Sishuba, H. R. Ngcayiya, and Edward Tswewu (Odendaal 1984: 82). One may also observe here that prior to the arrival of the AME Church in South Africa, whatever influence U.S. African Americans had had on Africans had been mainly one of political passivity (Chirenje 1976: 251).

The Euro-South Africans were not entirely blind to the political implications of the Ethiopian movement. Consequently, when the *Bambatha Rebellion* took place in Natal, not only was the movement blamed for the rebellion, but it also turned them against U.S. African Americans in general and those associated with the AME Church in particular. The rebellion probably did receive some ideological nourishment from Ethiopianism, but it was not instigated by the Ethiopianists. The immediate source of the rebellion was a deep and widespread grievance, among other grievances, against the imposition in 1905 of a poll tax on all adult males in Natal.[21] The long-simmering resentment escalated to the point where armed confrontation became inevitable. The following year, in February, two Euro-South African police officers would be killed in the Richmond area of Natal by armed Africans—thus touching off the rebellion. Chief Bambatha and his followers hid in the dense Nkandla forests and engaged the enemy in guerrilla combat for about a month before they were defeated. By June 1906 the rebellion had been effectively crushed, though sporadic disturbances continued up to 1908. As can be imagined, the reaction of the Euro-South Africans to the rebellion was one of extreme, but typical, brutality: close to 4000 Africans were killed in contrast to two dozen or so Euro-South Africans who died at the hands of the rebels (Odendaal 1984: 68). While one consequence of the rebellion was a positive one in that it helped to engender a greater sense of unity among Africans, there was also a serious negative consequence for them: it helped harden European attitudes.

The Euro-South Africans increasingly felt that they had been too soft in their policies toward, not only the Africans, but the U.S. African Americans as well—and this perception was notwithstanding the deeply racist character, as we have seen, of their hegemony over the Africans. Already, the European denominations and the government authorities had begun to voice their concern over the influence of U.S. African Americans—especially members of the AME Church. For example: in 1898, among the criticisms leveled against Ethiopianist Africans was this one in the white-owned *South African Congregational Magazine*: "There is not a vestige of spirituality in this [Ethiopian] movement. In connection with it the Ethiopian does not change the skin, nor the leopard his spots, but only his ministerial diet. He is taking black missionary from America instead of white missionary from England. That is all the difference. He turns English Methodism out of the door to bring Negro Methodism down the chimney. He bites the white hand that has ministered for many years… and kneels to kiss the black hand whose opening promises to make him a bishop" (from Chirenje

1976: 267). Under the circumstances, it was perhaps not surprising that in 1903 the government-appointed *South African Native Affairs Commission* commenced an investigation of the AME Church and Ethiopianism; it culminated in a five-volume report released in 1905 that just stopped short of recommending the proscription of the AME Church in South Africa. Testimony presented before the Commission by many whites was characterized by themes such as the following, expressed by Reverend James Scott, a Free Church of Scotland missionary from Natal: "I would like to say that there is a danger of a great deal of evil happening through these Blacks from America coming in and mixing with natives of South Africa. These men from America for generations suffered oppression and they have naturally something to object to in the white man. These men from America come in and make our natives imagine they have grievances when there are no grievances" (from Chirenje, p. 272).

Bishop L. J. Coppin, the first resident U.S. African American Bishop sent out to South Africa by the AME Church in 1901, together with a number of other U.S. African Americans, testified however, to the effect that the views of Bishop Turner were not the views of the AME Church. Such testimony proved strong enough to dissuade the commission from proscribing the Church, even though the report had concluded that U.S. African Americans, through direct and indirect influence and financial support, were responsible for much of the militancy of the Ethiopian churches, and went on to further note that Ethiopianism was a movement that stood against Euro-South Africans. The report went on to call upon U.S. African Americans to refrain from "mischievous political propaganda" if they wished to continue their ecclesiastical work in South Africa (Noer 1978: 120). These sentiments were also evident in the local press. Hence, for example, one journalist, by the name of Roderick Jones, published an article in 1904 titled "The Black Peril in South Africa" in which he castigated the influence of U.S. African Americans on Africans. The following year he wrote another on the political implications of Ethiopianism, saying inter alia: "When Ethiopian missionaries, saturated with American democratic ideas, go up and down the land telling the Kaffirs that South Africa is a black man's country, and that the blacks must "stand up for their rights," it is impossible to ignore the political aspect of the propagandism." He continued: "American Negroes, whose teachings, if not deliberately seditious, implant in the native mind crude ideas about the brotherhood of man, and fosters a separatist spirit wholly incompatible with strict loyalty to… white rule." He went on to state that there was a growing feeling among the Euro-South Africans to "bundle the American Negro, bag and baggage, out of the country, under a law excluding undesirables" (from Noer, p. 120–121).

We should also point out here that in addition to blaming U.S. African Americans in South Africa, the commission in its report also laid blame for the militancy of Ethiopianism at the door of U.S.-trained Africans. Here the report was drawing attention to a well-known fact: the role played by U.S. educational institutions, especially U.S. African American institutions, in the education of Africans from South Africa. For instance, by 1900 there were ten Africans who had studied or were studying at Lincoln University, while at Wilberforce University there were eleven (Williams 1982: 153). By 1907, it was estimated by the European authorities, 150 Africans had studied in the United States and of which some twenty had participated in the Bambatha rebellion (Noer 1978: 122). The disquiet that this "study-abroad movement" provoked is captured by the lament of a Euro-South African missionary:

> Each year an increasing number of young men and women are sent from Africa, at the expense of the American Methodist Episcopal body, to study in the Negro universities of the United States. There they obtain a superficial veneer of knowledge, while breathing the atmosphere of race hatred which pervades these so-called seats of learning.
> After the attainment of a more or less worthless degree, these students return to their own country to preach, with all the enthusiasm of youth and the obstinate conviction of the half-taught mind, a gospel usually far more political than religious. (From Campbell 1995: 249)

By 1910, says Noer (1978: 123), the position of U.S. African American clergy in South Africa had deteriorated to a level where all were viewed with suspicion, and efforts were initiated to curtail their movement and work. Later, they would be excluded nearly altogether from any ecclesiastical work in the country by means of a regulation that required foreign missionaries to obtain government permits before they could be allowed to work. To the Euro-South Africans, just as once all U.S. African Americans were viewed as harbingers of the Booker T. Washington message, now all U.S. African American missionaries came to symbolize Ethiopianism and violence—and hence a threat to their

hegemony. Even Theodore Roosevelt would join in the fray by siding with the Euro-South Africans in an address to the AME Church convention in Washington, D. C., in January of 1909 (Williams 1982).

Resentment against U.S. African Americans in general by the beginning of World War I was also spurred by a general perception among the Euro-South Africans that the U.S. African American was a clear example of what the African should not be allowed to become. It appears that those Euro-South Africans who had had the opportunity to observe, at close hand, the nature of racist segregation among the Southern states in the United States came away with the conclusion that the greatest tragedy that had befallen the United States was the error in declaring that U.S. African Americans were equal to whites. The result of this error, they argued, was to be seen in the false hopes engendered among U.S. African Americans and the concomitant hypocrisy of a political system that denied them their political rights by means of trickery and violence (Jim Crowism). Liberal Euro-South Africans were especially appalled at white crime against U.S. African Americans as well as the level of terrorist violence that was used against them in order to deprive them of their constitutional rights. They felt that this highly deplorable situation was a direct result of raising false expectations among the U.S. African Americans, which then provoked fear and terrorist retaliation among the whites. The following sentiment, expressed by the *Rand Daily Mail*, in the course of running a series of exposes on the Southern United States, was typical: "Is it not better to learn a lesson from the experience of the United States, and from the first refuse to build up false hopes amongst the native population, or provide a possible foundation for raising up of endless charges of political trickery in the future? The race problem of Southern America [Southern states] has been made more difficult by the well-meant, but unstatesmanlike, Fifteenth Amendment of the Constitution, which has produced nothing but bitterness and allegations of bad faith" (from Noer 1978: 125). Needless to say, this was a bizarre (but typically racist) twist on white perfidy: blaming its victims.

By the outbreak of the First World War, therefore, three major developments were under way that would affect U.S. African American relations with South Africa: first was a slow but steady legislative push by Euro-South Africans to effectively eliminate the direct missionary presence of U.S. African Americans in South Africa and to discourage other U.S. African Americans from coming to South Africa; second, the tightening of existing and implementation of new segregationist laws in South Africa aimed at keeping the African "in his proper place"; and third, in consequence, a growing perception among U.S. African Americans in the United States that the supposed benefits of colonialism were beginning to be outweighed by its disadvantages. A vocal proponent of this view was W. E. B. Du Bois, a prominent U.S. African American leader and intellectual, who as early as 1897 would lay the foundations for his anti-imperialist position by stating: "The advance guard of the Negro people—the 8,000,000 people of Negro blood in the United States of America—must soon come to realize that if they are to take their just place in the van of Pan-Negroism, then their destiny is not absorption by the white American… not a servile imitation of Anglo-Saxon culture, but a stalwart originality which shall unswervingly follow Negro ideals" (Redkey 1969: 22). Du Bois, through the pages of his journal, *Crisis*, castigated the Euro-South Africans for instituting a system that was an imitation of white rule in the Southern United States and denounced the hypocrisy of the white man's justice as it affected black people. To Du Bois, white rule in the United States and in South Africa meant only one thing for black people: exploitation and oppression.

The period up to the First World War, therefore, was a distinct chapter in U.S. African American relations with South Africa. Initially left alone, and sometimes even welcomed, U.S. African American missionaries were able to do their work in South Africa without much European hindrance, the result of which was a considerable impact on the lives and political thinking of Africans, who in most instances welcomed them as their overseas brethren. Later, however, faced with the prospect of African challenges to their hegemony, the initial tolerance displayed toward U.S. African Americans by the Euro-South Africans turned to intolerance and dislike, thus marking the beginning of the end of direct sizable U.S. African American missionary presence in South Africa.

Pre-War Influence: An Assessment

In assessing the impact of the U.S. African American presence in South Africa in the period up to the First World War, one begins by noting that there were two distinct schools of thought among U.S. African Americans concerning Africa in general and South Africa in particular: one represented

by people such as Bishop Turner and the other represented by that nationally prominent leader, Booker T. Washington. By far, the dominant view during this period was that of Washington's. As already noted above, Washington, in 1895 in Atlanta, had promulgated his infamous policy of compromise where he asked U.S. African Americans to forego political action in support of civil rights and instead asked them to concentrate on achieving economic prosperity via self-help programs and industrial and agricultural training. Advancement was to be sought not through the ballot box but via the hammer and the plow. Extending this line of reasoning to South Africa, Washington and his supporters saw in British imperialism the salvation of the African. Opposing Ethiopianism in general, he felt that the African could achieve civilization only under the tutelage of white rule. In fact, says Noer (1982: 113), "moderate black leaders in the United States, committed to Washington's 'accommodationist' strategy and financed by white supporters, labeled Ethiopianism an 'insidious poison' that was 'a racial rather than a religious movement.'"[22]

In explaining the origins of this accommodationist ideology, Marable (1976: 320), in a highly perceptive article, notes that "Washington's ideology was, essentially, the ideology of the ghetto bourgeoisie, those Black small entrepreneurs who demanded a share of the political economy of America." He further observes: "These ghetto bourgeoisie were less concerned about challenging segregation, as were W. E. B. Du Bois and other petit bourgeois intellectuals, because their political and cultural prestige stemmed from their economic dominancy over segregated Black consumers." In other words, the economic success of these self-made ghetto bourgeoisie (small merchants, lawyers, newspaper men, ministers, teachers, affluent farmers, and so on) depended upon some degree of racial exclusivity. This is not to suggest that they had desired such exclusivity, but that once its inevitability was ensured through white racist terror that characterized Jim Crowism, a new ethos took hold of them. Seeing their self-made (a la Horatio Alger) bourgeoisie status—even if a fringe one—within the context of a virulently oppressive circumstance, they came to explain their relative success in terms of their appropriation of "symbols of individualism, Social Darwinism and the Puritan work ethic" (Marable 1976: 321). In terms of political ambitions, this class would ask for no more than suffrage based on property ownership and schooling rather than on the principle of universal suffrage; the whites of course were excepted because their rights to universal suffrage could not be challenged. The ghetto bourgeoisie harked back to the political economy developed by the Bourbons (Redeemers) in the 1880s.[23] Consequently, supporting Washington, who as one of their own was among the best in articulating this new ghetto bourgeois ideology, was a logical outcome. They helped to popularize his ideology among the U.S. African American peasants and working class.

Given then that the years between 1890 to 1914 were difficult years for most U.S. African Americans, as the virulence of white racism escalated, there was much rethinking, ideological experimentation, and for many even hopeless despair. Under these circumstances, attitudes toward Africa were highly ambivalent, even though there was tacit acknowledgment that the links with Africa, however tenuous, could never be completely torn asunder. Consequently, as Redkey (1969: 31) puts it: "Only a few understood that the fate of black men on both continents was closely linked, that Afro-Americans not only could help Africans, but that Afro-Americans could in return be helped by Africans. Together they had suffered at the hands of whites, and together they could redeem themselves and perhaps the whites as well."

Fortunately, however, for many Africans (though not all, as will be noted in a moment) in South Africa their first meaningfully sustained contact with U.S. African Americans took place via the agency of the AME Church whose missionaries would have (at least at the beginning) an important positive role to play in the initial stirrings of African nationalism in that country.[24] For, it has to be remembered that the presence of nascent capitalism among the black petit bourgeois elite against the backdrop of an exceedingly virulent white racism that produced the Washingtonian ideology was also present in other areas of the African diaspora, as well as in Africa itself. Hence, in South Africa, men like John Langalibalele Dube, one of the prominent Africans from South Africa who would receive part of his education in the United States, shared fully the ideas of Washington.[25] Not only did they view the masses with suspicion (Marable 1976: 324) and believe in Tuskegee-type self-help programs and Christian education but saw their salvation as lying in the hands of the British (its liberal segment, that is). The fact that Dube, for example, was able to mount a challenge (albeit an unsuccessful one) to the highly discriminatory *South African Natives Land Act* between 1912 and 1915 with

the help of paternalists and liberals within the British colonial administration was, to him and his colleagues, proof positive of the advisability of conservative accommodationist political tactics.

Discussing Dube specifically, Marable explains that throughout Dube's life he (Dube) sought the advice and company of the same type of white liberal politicians, businessmen and religious leaders in the United States, Britain and South Africa, that Washington depended upon to maintain his "personal hegemony over Black America," and in the process producing his own version of a conservative accommodationist African nationalism. (1976: 333) Walshe describes the essence of the political thinking that produced this type of nationalism thus: "In both countries [United States and South Africa] the white population was seen as permanent and there was the expectation of a constitutional struggle based on moral claims. Those civil liberties already enjoyed by their white fellowmen were to be gradually extended, and equal opportunity within the established practices of society was the goal. Freedom was neither national independence nor a socialist reformation, but freedom for individual achievement and a nonwhite contribution to the wider society" (p. 54–55). In other words, to put it bluntly, it was a form of pseudonationalism: one that could never bring itself to admit that a black person could ever be a full political, economic and social equal of the white person but yet was willing to accept that at least he/she was a human being with certain basic rights.

The arrival of the AME Church in South Africa, therefore, was fortuitously propitious in that it helped the African Ethiopianists in moving the African masses in the direction of authentic African nationalism; that is, one not guided by white liberal paternalism. This is not to suggest that the AME missionaries were radicals in the tradition of the Garveyites (see below); in fact when compared to them the missionaries were very conservative, but rather that unlike such black petit bourgeois leaders as Washington in the United States and Dube in South Africa, they were not wholly enamored of the white person. Psychologically, this had a major implication for Africans, who for centuries had been taught by whites that they were incapable of doing anything worthy for themselves. In a sense, then, the AME Church introduced the ideology of "Black Consciousness" (albeit in its rudimentary form) to Africans by means of their very practice as an *independent* black church organization. As Johnson (1978: 219) explains: "The very existence of a large, internationally organized church run entirely by black people put the lie to the [white] Southern African notion that blacks could not run their own affairs. In the midst of a society which prohibited virtually all nontraditional forms of African authority and decision-making this image had a great impact on the rising self-awareness and self-confidence in the African community." Is it surprising then that very shortly after the arrival of the AME in South Africa it became the object of white hatred?

But there was another very significant dimension to the political contribution of the AME Church: it was the first black organization in South Africa that looked at blacks not in terms of ethnically divided groups but as a single national entity; that is, a South African entity and even a "Pan-African" entity. As Ngubo (1981: 154) observes, the Church's "work and influence transcended linguistic and territorial boundaries and initiated an organizational pattern that united Zulu, Xhosa, and Sotho groups in a common cause." In other words, U.S. African Americans can share in the credit for laying the foundations for the development of African nationalism in South Africa. As a people who over the centuries had been forced to come together as a single entity in the cauldron of U.S. slavery, they were in an ideal position to encourage the Africans to overcome the politically negative aspects of their ethnic divisions in the service of the common good, without which there was no hope of building a common front against white racist hegemony (which in time would acquire the appellation of "apartheid").[26]

To conclude this part of the chapter: prior to World War I, U.S. African American presence in South Africa took three forms: religious, educational, and (indirectly) political. The religious presence took the form of Ethiopianism—one molded by the likes of AME's Bishop Henry McNeal Turner, whose condemnation by John Tengo Jabavu (a Washingtonite African) in an editorial in his newspaper, *Imvo*, as a firebrand spoke volumes for the radical but positive political perspective he brought to religious work (Davis 1978: 66). The educational presence took two forms: the AME received Africans to study at its own educational institutions as well as other U.S. African American educational institutions in the United States, and the AME built its own schools in South Africa for Africans. The political consequence of these activities was five-fold; the AME Church: provided a means for transforming at the level of political consciousness an inferiority complex (a heritage of the military defeat of the Africans at the hands of the Afrikaners and the English over a period of nearly two

centuries) via the practice—though not necessarily explicit articulation—of the ideology of "Black Consciousness," as a counter to the ideology of whiteness; through its organizational practice of seeing their African brethren as one national entity it provided a means for the Africans to overcome politically debilitating ethnic barriers—thereby helping to sow the seeds of African nationalism; provided a way for Africans to be exposed to radicalizing political influences in the United States at some of its educational institutions; and through its Ethiopianist heritage and practice, it reinforced the Ethiopianism of the Africans in South Africa—as epitomized by the slogan "Africa for the Africans." Even from a purely religious perspective, though, the AME Church made an important contribution. It encouraged the African converts to go back to the authentic roots of Christian teachings in the effort to cleanse them of the corrupting influence of the ideology of whiteness that had been characteristic of much white missionary proselytization in South Africa (and elsewhere in the Afro-Asian and South American ecumene for that matter). The increasing awareness among Christian Africans that spiritual redemption did not lie in a "white" god but a universal God was in itself a major step forward toward political consciousness.

However, side by side with the influence of the AME Church, a significant number of petit bourgeois Africans were also influenced by ideas of Booker T. Washington as a result of educational study in the United States. Therefore, just as there were two major competing political schools of thought in the United States, represented by people such as Washington on one hand, and Turner on the other, there were also two political schools of thought among Africans: one Ethiopianist (radical) and the other Washingtonian (conservative). After World War I, a new type of black diasporic influence would come to South Africa from the United States, it would be both overtly political, and overtly radical—more importantly, it would be aimed at the masses (the working classes and the peasantry), challenging both the materially structural hegemony of whites and the ideological hegemony of the emerging black petite bourgeoisie: Garveyism.

GARVEY AND GARVEYISM

The near demise of direct U.S. African American missionary activity in South Africa brought about by European prejudice did not imply the end of all U.S. African American political influence on Africans. In the period between the two World Wars the growth of the ideology of Pan-Africanism (the Marcus Garvey version) in the United States, would eventually result in its export to South Africa; bringing in its wake a further boost to the development of African nationalism.

If an agenda can be distilled from the various pronouncements and writings of Pan-Africanists then five distinct items on that agenda emerge: (1) The self-identification by Africans as one people rather than as separate ethnic groupings; (2) the development of bonds of unity among Africans and people of African descent around the world; (3) the emigration of diaspora Africans back to Africa; (4) formation of formal organizations of unity bringing together Africans and the African diaspora; (5) and development of transcontinental intellectual channels of communication among the African elite and those of the African diaspora (Geiss 1974: 3–6). If these elements can be considered as a means toward an end, then the end was the freedom of Africans and diaspora Africans from the tyranny of white oppression, be it in the form of racist segregation or colonialism and imperialism.[27] Now, in the development of this Pan-Africanist ideology, the phase of Garveyism was without a doubt a distinct and highly important phase. For it would do is to render Pan-Africanism an ideology accessible to the ordinary black masses, the working classes and the peasantry (both in the United States and elsewhere in the black world). Until Garvey's arrival on the political scene, Pan-Africanism had always been the ideological preserve of the black intellectual elites given, as one can easily detect from the Pan-Africanist agenda, a distinct absence among them of any serious effort to consider the issue of class and how it interfaced with race-related matters. (The oppression of black peoples, then as today, has always been a matter of a dialectical interplay between class and race.) In other words, Garvey, perhaps inadvertently, stumbled upon what had always been this Achilles' heel of Pan-Africanism. Given then the importance of the Garveyite version of the Pan-Africanist ideology and given the impact it had on the evolution of African nationalism in South Africa (and elsewhere on the African continent) it is necessary at this juncture to digress a little, in order to describe who Garvey was and what Garveyism represented.

As a result of a combination of propitious global and national factors, Marcus Mosiah Garvey, a person of African descent born on August 17, 1887, in Jamaica, began his political work in the United States at the beginning of the 1920s. Among these factors, as Lewis (1988) observes, were the return of U.S. African American soldiers from the European war theatre who brought with them a heightened political consciousness (born out of fighting for the democracy and freedom of others in Europe) that left them dissatisfied with the hypocrisy of whites in the United States regarding democracy—it seemed that democracy was only for whites but not for others, not even if they had given their lives for it; the success of the Russian Revolution and its positive impact on the consciousness of the intelligentsia of the world's oppressed—the revolution was seen as a concrete testimony to the fact that international capitalism and its corollary, imperialism, were not invincible; the mass migration of blacks from the South to the urban North—bringing in its wake a greater receptivity to radical ideas as a result of proletarianization and rapid urbanization; and the absence of a distinct, nationally significant leadership among U.S. African Americans capable of mobilizing the mass of working-class U.S. African Americans.

Influenced in his early years by black intellectuals such as the Jamaican Robert Love—who would write on the occasion of the dismemberment of Africa: "Africa has been the carcass upon which the vultures of Europe have descended and which they have sought to partition among themselves, without any regard whatever for the rights of the Africans" (from Lewis, p. 25)—and coupled with experiences gained from working and traveling in other parts of the Caribbean and South America, Garvey would return to Jamaica from England (where he had gone to work and travel for a short period) to set up the *Universal Negro Improvement and Conservation Association* (UNIA) and the *African Communities' League*, on August 1, 1914.[28] At the time of the founding of these organizations, according to Lewis, Garvey had not yet shed the influence of ideas typical of people such as Booker T. Washington. Hence, not only did the organization include pro-British resolutions in its manifesto, but it also sought the patronage of whites. One of the resolutions, for instance, stated that the organization supported Britain in its war efforts and it gratefully acknowledged, in the words of the manifesto, "the great protecting and civilizing influence of the English nation and people, of whom we are subjects and their justice to all men, especially to their Negro subjects…" (from Lewis, p. 51). It is only as a result of a visit by Garvey to the United States in 1916 that the process of enlightened radicalization of Garvey's thinking would begin. The visit, ironically, was intended to raise funds in order to build "a Jamaica Tuskegee" and hence the visit was supposed to be a temporary one; as it turned out, he would remain in the United States until his deportation in 1927.

Within a few weeks of his arrival, Garvey made contacts with individuals who would come to have a major impact on the transformation of his political consciousness. These people included Caribbean Africans, such as Dolfus Domingo who told Garvey emphatically that Jamaica did not need an institution of the type represented by Tuskegee (that is one that taught black people to accept rather than fight the racism of the whites), and U.S. African Americans, such as John Bruce, William Ferris and Hubert Harrison. Garvey had known of the first two because they were contributors to the *African Times and Orient Review,* one of the first international journals serving colonized peoples everywhere, published in London (by the staunchly anti-imperialist Egyptian, Duse Muhammed Ali), and on which Garvey would serve for a short time. Harrison was well-known for his radical activities; he, for example, helped in the inauguration in June 1917, at a mass rally, of the Anti-War Afro-American Liberty League; he also chose the occasion to introduce Garvey at the rally. Interestingly, Bruce, Ferris, Harrison and even Ali would all become involved with Garvey's internationally known publication, the *Negro World*, published in Harlem from 1918 to 1933, and which would serve as a powerful vehicle for the spread of antiracist and anti-imperialist Pan-Africanist ideology.[29] This publication came to be so feared by racists and colonialists, that in many colonies of the French, Portuguese, British, etc., the publication was banned, and in at least one (Dahomey) the penalty for possessing the *Negro World* was death (Lewis 1988: 81).[30]

Shortly following his arrival in the United States, Garvey began a nationwide tour that took him through all but ten of the U.S. continental states. The tour gave him the experience needed to develop a U.S.-based UNIA, which within a short time, by 1917, had overtaken, in terms of size and importance, the one he left behind in Jamaica. It may be noted here that part of the impetus that Garvey found for building the U.S.-based UNIA was probably his awareness of the desperate need to raise the consciousness of U.S. African Americans themselves (most especially the working class).

The intensity of white racism in the United States—it is estimated that via public murders (lynch-ings), the Ku Klux Klan, that racist band of white terrorists, abetted and supported to varying de-grees by most other whites (including their state governments), claimed the lives of some thirty-six U.S. African Americans in 1917, followed by sixty in 1918, seventy-six in 1919 and between 1920 to 1922 an annual average of fifty (Lewis 1988: 62)—did not necessarily translate into heightened po-litical consciousness among U.S. African Americans. Lewis (1988: 59) observes, for example, that Garvey had to contend with not only the racism of whites but the misguided prejudices displayed by many, though not all, U.S. African Americans in respect of black people originating from the Carib-bean and elsewhere. To Garvey, many U.S. African Americans, in the words of his spouse, "lacked long-ranged vision, they were not overseas travelers as some of the whites, they knew practically nothing of the countries beyond their shores, and nothing of the history of their African ancestors; they regarded Africans as "naked savages" and West Indians as "monkey-chasers. …" She continues:

> On the other hand, Colored Americans could not understand why that "foolish foreigner" would go hungry and stand up talking about Africa until he brought tears to the eyes of some of his sidewalk hearers, when he could use that "silver tongue" to live well and wear good clothes. Twice Garvey got dizzy and fell off soap-boxes because he was hungry, (unkind remarks were that it was a stunt to get the sympathy of the crowd). [To Garvey]… fine cloths, and liquor did not make a real man. One had to possess the good earth unmolested, to have the means of economic stability, to be able to plan and administer one's own destiny—that was freedom, and that was being "somebody," with "something" in this material world (Jacques Garvey 1963: 14–15).[31]

Yet, there were a sufficient number of people within the largest single concentration of the Afri-can diaspora, to heed the call to all black people, that Garvey had sounded just prior to his departure for the United States, to support vigorously "the worldwide movement of doing something to pro-mote the intellectual, social, commercial, industrial, and national interest of the downtrodden race of which you are a member" (Lewis 1988: 60). Among the activities that Garvey would embark upon through the agency of UNIA included, extensive publishing activities; political solidarity work with other anticolonial movements, such as that of Mahatma Gandhi's in India; and practical large-scale commercial projects.[32] During the period up to 1927, UNIA would establish some 700 branches (or "divisions" as they were called) in the United States, and about 270 abroad in as far-flung places as Cuba, Panama, Nigeria, Trinidad, South Africa, Costa Rica, Sierra Leone, Jamaica, Dominican Re-public, Guatemala, British Guyana, Barbados, Nicaragua, Mexico, Ghana (then known as the Gold Coast), and England. In many other countries, because of repression by the authorities UNIA would establish its presence under disguised fronts, such as welfare societies.[33] In its heyday in the 1920s, it has been suggested, the total number of UNIA members and sympathizers across the world num-bered some two million, making it the largest worldwide mass-movement of black nationalism ever known. In geographic terms, however, the impact of Garveyism was probably felt the most in South Africa (that is, outside its homeland of the United States and the Caribbean).

Garveyism in South Africa, 1920s–1930s

Against the backdrop of a number of conjunctural factors—ranging from the ever-escalating segre-gationist oppression of black South Africans by whites to the rise of political consciousness among those Afro-South Africans who had participated in the First World War (in Africa and in Europe) to the presence of a sizeable community of Afro-Caribbean sailors and the like in Cape Town sympa-thetic to Garveyism—it would not be long before black South Africa would join the ranks of other UNIA-hosting communities in the black world.[34] This development was particularly fitting because, as Vinson (2001) points out, the racially oppressive circumstances of black South Africans had been among the original motivating factors behind Garvey's founding of UNIA in 1914 (p. 24).[35]

In one sense, it can be argued that Pan-Africanism—or "Garveyism" as the U.S. version has come to be called—already had its antecedent in South Africa, in the form of the Ethiopianism of the AME. What this meant is that there was preexisting fertile ground for the acceptance of the Garveyite Pan-Africanist ideology. Moreover, as Vinson demonstrates, the positive view that Afri-cans generally held of U.S. African Americans—as a result initially of exposure to the McAdoo Singers and later the work of the AME missionaries—made Garveyism that much more acceptable. This view, especially among the uneducated, even went so far as to include millenarian notions of redemption of black South Africa through the direct agency of their Ethiopian brethren in the

United States. Thus describing this sentiment, African historian W. D. Cingo in a letter to the *Kokstad Advertiser* observed:

> Large numbers of uneducated Africans now came to regard the voice of America as that of a mighty race of black people overseas, dreaded by all European nations. These people, our unfortunate friends, imagine in their confusion, manufacture for their own purposes, engines, locomotives, ships, motor cars, aeroplanes, and mighty weapons of war. The mad dreams and literature of Marcus Garvey[,] a black American Negro, were broadcast on the winds. Hopes for political and economical emancipation were revived and today the word America (i Melika) is a household world symbolic of nothing else but Bantu National Freedom and liberty. (published in the September 30, 1927 issue of the paper and reproduced in MGP10, p. 407)

The manifestation of the mythology of redemption from the United States was also recorded by South African Police, who, reporting on a meeting held in Durban in October 1920 by the Natal Native Congress (where approximately a thousand African dignitaries were in attendance), stated that at one point the meeting was introduced to a U.S. African American speaker from New York by the name of Moses. The speaker then proceeded to inform the meeting that U.S. African Americans had come to the conclusion that Africans needed to be freed from the oppressive rule of the Euro-South Africans, and therefore to this end, Marcus Garvey was dispatching a fleet. He assured the meeting that Marcus Garvey would assist in freeing Africa (Hill and Pirio 1987: 212; see also Bradford 1987).

It appears, however, that one of the most important events that facilitated transmission of the Pan-Africanist ideology among many sectors of the African population, according to Hill and Pirio (1987: 212), was the historic address by Garvey on the occasion of the opening of the First International Convention of Negro Peoples of the World, in August 1920, organized by UNIA. Pronouncements such as "the bloodiest of all wars is yet to come, when Europe will match her strength against Asia, and that will be the Negro's opportunity to draw the sword for Africa's redemption," were taken note of by both Africans and Euro-South Africans—though the latter passed them off as not worthy of according much attention, except to warn that amusing though the pronouncements were, they could mislead the African population. Hence, for example, the Euro-South African newspaper, *The Diamond Fields Advertiser*, commenting on the speech, wrote that the issue of a black-ruled Republic of Africa was "not one lightly to be ignored or passed by, for the measure of success of the movement in America is bound to sooner or later to open the door to the propagandist in South Africa and with our native policy, benign as it is, still leaving something to be desired, the propagandist would find his seed fall on fruitful soil" (Hill and Pirio 1987: 212). Similarly, the European mineowners' newspaper, *Umteteli Wa Bantu* (circulated mainly among the African mine-workers), in a lengthy editorial commented, among other things, that for Africans it was "as wise to work in harmony with the [Euro-South Africans] in our midst as it is lunatic to be influenced by the impossible ideal of an 'All-Black Africa'" (1987: 212). Later this same newspaper, in a context where the notion of the "the coming of American Negroes" had become fairly widespread among Africans, would editorialize that "the American Negro is a force to reckon with—which may well affect the destiny of South Africa through its effect upon South Africa's black population" (p. 214).

Garveyism in Cape Town. Perhaps the most fertile ground for the Pan-Africanist ideology of Marcus Garvey was to be found, initially, in Cape Town (to be followed later by the Transkei and Kimberley regions), where officials and members of the highly influential Industrial and Commercial Workers Union of South Africa (ICU)—an African trade union—found much hope in the ideology.[36] Thus Clements Kadalie, a prominent leader within the ICU, writing his colleague and union co-founder S. M. Bennett Ncwana, stated "[m]y essential object is to be the great African Marcus Garvey and I don't mind of how much I shall pay for that education" (1987: 215). Not surprisingly ICU leaders came to be viewed by many as deputies of Marcus Garvey, and in rural Natal Africans often confused the ICU leaders with U.S. African Americans—who, they thought, had come to deliver them from European oppression. An important consequence of the increasing popularity of Garvey's Pan-Africanist ideology in Cape Town was that it helped to displace, at least among the emerging petit bourgeois Africans (teachers, clerks, and so on), the misguided liberal ideology, espoused by most of the older generation of African leaders, of loyalty to Britain—which was seen to be the ultimate protector of the interests of Africans in the struggle against the Euro-South Africans. More specifically, as Hill and Pirio observe, "the "American Negro" had come to symbolize a radical black consciousness which rested on a multitude of organizational and political linkages between the ICU and UNIA and their respective leaders in Cape Town" (p. 216). Sentiments such as

the following expressed by Kadalie at a UNIA meeting in Cape Town were shared by many African leaders in the Cape: "This is a movement which assures every man and woman of his or her salvation. We must therefore unite with racial pride that at least Africans will be redeemed and all her sons returned where nature first put them" (p. 216). Similarly, at the same meeting, Ncwana the ICU co-founder (and editor of the African publication the *Black Man*—which also served as a vehicle for transmitting the Garveyite ideology), stressed the commonalty of interests of UNIA and the ICU: "We should ourselves set a great example by acknowledging the community of interest, and, above all, that community of sacrifice on which alone the Negro movement can permanently rest. It will therefore depend upon how we treat this movement. It is not a movement inaugurated by us, but one that comes to us from our children abroad. Our faith and determination is being weighed in the scale. Liberty and freedom calls upon you Africans to respond" (p. 217).[37]

The Garveyite movement, while strongest in Cape Town and closely linked to the ICU, was also visible from time to time in other parts of South Africa, forging links with other organizations such as some of the Ethiopianist and other independent churches. The latter included the Universal African Bible Students Association, the Universal Temple of Africa, the Universal African Missionary Convention, the Old Apostolic Church of America, the African Orthodox Church, and Afro-Athlican Constructive Gaathly. Two other geographic areas, besides Cape Town and environs, that are worthy of consideration are the Transkei and Kimberley because each would develop semi-autonomous movements of their own—one associated with an opportunist flamboyant character, and the other with U.S.-based black churches steeped in Garveyism.

Garveyism in the Transkei. One place where the Garveyite ideology would find fertile soil when it had diminished in importance elsewhere, including Cape Town, was the Transkei territories, the region with the highest concentration of Africans and serving as a labor reservoir for the European gold mines of the Witwatersrand. In the Transkei the Pan-Africanist ideology would flourish well into the 1930s through the agency of one Elias Washington Butelezi (and later, his fellow ideological travellers).[38] The super exploitation that the migrant workers of the Transkei were subjected to, coupled with other onerous burdens endured by the general populace (such as increased levels of taxation, the pass laws, and the like)—and in the absence of an *authentic* Afro-South African leadership, that is, one that had not compromised itself by either espousing the pseudo-liberal claptrap of the white missionaries and the like or (in the case of the traditional elite, the chiefs) being incorporated into the segregationist white state bureaucracy—ensured that Butelezi's work of spreading his particular version of the Garveyite Pan-Africanist ideology by organizing a "welfare" movement for his followers in the spirit of the traditional UNIA was made that much easier.

One of Butelezi's chief weapons in the battle for the hearts and minds of the Transkeians, amazingly, was the embellishment of his identity with a new and entirely self-manufactured identity of the "American Negro," complete with the new name of Dr. Butler Hansford Wellington.[39] While to his detractors he may have been nothing more than a self-aggrandizing charlatan, which in a sense he was, drawing upon a historically-rooted wellspring of goodwill among many Afro-South Africans toward U.S. African Americans, thanks to residual influences of such intermediaries as the McAdoo Singers and the AME, he was able to parlay his new self-made identity, together with his chiliastic notion of Garveyite blacks from the United States coming to liberate (in airplanes no less) Afro-South Africans from white rule, into a relatively powerful Garveyite peasant-based movement, but outside the organizational mainstream of UNIA—that would include the founding of numerous local schools and churches—to the deep chagrin and alarm of local white missionaries, government officials, members of the emerging black petit bourgeois elite (as well as some members of the traditional elite, the chiefs).[40] Commenting on the rise of the movement and its activities, one observer (an Afro-South African court interpreter), for example, noted: Wellingtonites "firmly believe in all Dr. Wellington says and no argument will convince them that he is not an American Negro but a Zulu." He continued, "[t]hey believe he has great magic powers and that the white men fear him and they say that is why he has not been arrested and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment." Another observer (a Euro-American businessman) would relate: "[i]n the evenings concerts are held and the proceeds go to Dr. Wellington and the people have to pay for the Teachers at these [UNIA] schools and on Sundays the children do a route march carrying Banners with the Stars and Stripes of America on the banners and they now call themselves Americans" (from Vinson 2001: 150, 189). Similarly, one of the prominent members of the nascent black petite bourgeoisie writing in 1922, D.

D. T. Jabavu, complaining about the rise of this particular brand of South African Garveyism, observed:

> It promises among other things the expulsion of the white man and his yoke of misrule from their midst; Negro autonomy ("I Afrika mayi buye"=Let Africa be restored to us) with Garvey himself as Lord High Potentate; a black star fleet with powerful black armies bringing salvation, and bags of grain to relieve Africans from the economic pinch. This because of its attractiveness had made a deep impression on our illiterate people, so that even backwood hamlets rings the magic motto of "Ama Melika ayeza" (The Americans are coming). (From the introduction to MGP10, p. lix)[41]

Not surprisingly, the "Wellington Movement" became a major thorn in the side of the European authorities, so much so that the secretary for native affairs, D. L. Smit, was moved to recommend in 1940 the establishment of an internment camp for those espousing this particular incarnation of the Garveyite ideology. The prevailing sentiment was best expressed by Smit in a memo to the chief control officer in Pretoria that "To the raw Native… there is little distinction between pro-Nazi propaganda and American Negro propaganda. Both allege that the present rulers of the country will be driven out and that the new regime will confer multifarious advantages on the Natives" (Hill and Pirio 1987: 241–42). The South African minister of the interior eventually decided that the threat posed by the Butelezi Garveyites was not severe enough to warrant such a drastic measure. Instead, he advised in October 1940 that activities and statements of the UNIA league deemed to be subversive "should be dealt with under the Emergency Regulations and the culprits brought before the criminal courts" (p. 242).

In the end, Butelezi's enemies—the white citizenry and SAMING officials, some local chiefs, white missionaries, and some ANC and UNIA leaders—were able to unmask him as a fraud and banish him from the Transkei (the order was issued by the Governor-General on March 12, 1927) to eventually disappear, by the early 1950s, from the pages of history in unknown circumstances. Even the U.S. UNIA was moved to print a notice in the *Negro World* that Butelezi was not a UNIA officer (and therefore Butelezi had no authority to establish chapters or raise funds).[42] However, this is not to say that the movement itself disappeared immediately upon his banishment; it continued for a number of more years, at least for another decade or so—kept alive by some of his former followers, such as Elias Mfaxa and Enoch Mbinjana, as well as others. In fact, the Transkeian Garveyites moved their movement toward greater authenticity—now that Butelezi was more or less out of the picture—by opening up communications with other Garveyites, both in Cape Town and in the United States (see Vinson 2001). Whatever judgement we may pass on Butelezi's role in sullying the intent of the Garveyist movement as Garvey envisioned it, this much cannot be denied: he single-handedly mobilized the part of the population notoriously difficult to organize, the peasantry. Further, while personal gain undoubtedly was tied up with his activities, he did appear to sincerely believe in the basic message of Garveyism: independence from white hegemony in thought and deed. At the same time, unlike in the case of people like James S. Thaele and S. M. Bennett Ncwana, he did not (as far as we can tell) renounce Garveyism or turn government informer.

Garveyism in Kimberly. As we have already indicated earlier in this work, the Kimberly diamond rush had attracted a variety of peoples from across South Africa and from across the planet; they would include Afro-South Africans as well as diasporic Africans from North America and elsewhere. Further, that by the early 1920s the free-for-all mining situation had given way to orderly white-controlled monopolistic diamond mining where many of the black workers directly involved in mining were "imprisoned" in the labor camps (the compounds). However, what is of interest here is that at the same time a significant number of blacks, specifically the nascent petite bourgeoisie (small property owners, office workers, storekeepers, court interpreters, teachers, clerics, and the like), were free to work outside the mines, living in segregated shanty towns of Kimberly known as "locations." It is the greatly disaffected among this latter group—buffeted by racial discrimination and indignities of all kinds against the backdrop, at the material level, of overcrowding and other similar structural disabilities imposed on them by their racially subordinate circumstances and, at the ideological level, a rising disillusionment with white liberalism—who were enamored of Garveyism (but without necessarily to the exclusion of participation in activities of the local branches of the ANC and the ICU). There were two main conduits by which Garveyism was popularized among them in Kimberley: the circulation of the *Negro World*, and the establishment of two U.S.-based black church affiliates: the House of Athlyi (HOA) and the African Orthodox Church (AOC).[43]

A name that appears to have been prominently linked to the distribution of the *Negro World* was a remarkable individual by the name of Joseph Masogha. Masogha's conversion to Garveyism, as Vinson (2001) has shown, was effected through three intermediaries: exposure to the *Negro World*, association with HOA, and exposure to the ideas of the millennial Watchtower Movement. According to police records, Masogha was a member of the SANNC and classified as a "notorious agitator" (MGP10, p. 427). Yet, despite his self-confessed limited formal education he became a zealous adherent of Garveyism, and as the *Negro World* agent in Kimberley (a position he assumed at considerable personal cost as he was forced to endure, when picking up bulk shipments of the paper and other related UNIA publications, insults and physical assaults from the white employees of the post office, including threats to his life) he went to great lengths to distribute the *Negro World* to its subscribers.

Vinson surmises that it is possibly through this channel, as an agent of the *Negro World*, that he came to know of the House of Athlyi and moved to establish on August 3, 1924 his Ethiopianist church by the name of Afro-Athlican Constructive Gaathly Mamatic Church. The church was an affiliate of the black U.S.-based Garveyite church, House of Athlyi, founded by the Caribbean spiritualist Richard Athlyi Rogers and based in Newark, New Jersey. Rogers, who had moved to the United States in 1917, not only developed close ties with Garvey, enjoining his congregation to become members of the UNIA, but he was perhaps even more radically "Afrocentric" than the master: he went so far as to revise and publish a new Bible, in order to make it a "Black Man's Bible."[44] Although Masogha was able to acquire a sizeable congregation for his new church, it appears that it did not last long beyond a few more years—thanks, probably, to the intransigence of the white authorities who refused to recognize the church, seeing it as nothing more than a Garveyite front masquerading as a church (see MGP10, pp. 427-428).

Masogha had been a student for a couple of years at a theological school in Cape Town run by the millennial Watch Tower Movement; which brings us to the third ideological source, going by Vinson, of Masogha's Garveyite thinking. The Watchtower Movement (whose members go by the name of Jehovah's Witnesses) was founded in Allegheny, Pennsylvania in the United States by Charles Taze Russell sometime in the early 1870s—out of a loosely organized Bible study group—The Movement found its way to Africa, especially Southern Africa, through the agency of an extraordinary English missionary by the name of Joseph Booth who, in 1896, had founded the African Christian Union, a Pan-Africanist organization.[45] Seeking to establish linkages between southern African Christians and U.S. African Americans, the objectives of the organization were similar to those of UNIA, including the principle embodied in the slogan "Africa for Africans." Booth had established the theological school in Cape Town in 1907, and among his millennialist teachings was the idea of emancipation from colonial rule through the agency of U.S. African Americans. In other words, to the black Jehovah's Witnesses of the time, Garveyism made a lot of sense.

A serendipitous outcome of Masogha's work (of zealously distributing the *Negro World*) was that among the paper's wide readership there happened to be one Daniel William Alexander, a Colored and a Garveyite—he would even dedicate a poem to Garvey—who was once a cleric for the Ethiopianist church led by Bishop J. M. Kanyane Napo (the African Church), but who in 1924 led his own breakaway church.[46] One day an item in the paper had caught Alexander's attention; specifically, a radical sermon in the *Negro World* by Bishop George Alexander McGuire, the founder of the U.S.-based African Orthodox Church (AOC), that greatly intrigued Alexander. Seeking to legitimate his church, and given his Garveyite leanings, he felt the AOC to be an ideal vehicle for the purpose. He therefore wrote McGuire (in a letter dated September 24, 1924) asking to affiliate his fledgling church with the AOC. Soon Alexander's church became an AOC affiliate thereby facilitating for blacks in Kimberley (and later elsewhere) another conduit to Garveyism—for the AOC was closely allied to Garveyism as McGuire, a Caribbean, had once been UNIA's Chaplain-General. McGuire's dedication to Garveyism was matched by a reputation for fiery rhetoric—consider, for example, this quote from a sermon he delivered at the 1920 UNIA Annual Convention: "The Uncle Tom Nigger has got to go and his place must be taken by the new leader of the Negro race. That man will not be a white man with a black heart, nor a black man with a white heart, but a black man with a black heart" (from Vinson 2001: 235). It is this sermon, reproduced in the *Negro World*, that had caught the eye of Alexander in far away Kimberley, South Africa. As perhaps may be surmised, the request from Alexander for affiliation was greatly welcomed by McGuire because he strongly felt that his

church needed to be a worldwide church in order to spread the message of an "Afrocentric" Garveyite-influenced Christianity—the only authentic Christianity for black people in his opinion. Alexander too shared this sentiment, stating that his vision of the AOC was of a church engaged in:

> Worldwide expansion, to promote missionary endeavor, to stimulate welfare and uplift movements to liberate Black men from the influence of white missionaries, to set forth our cause by proper press propaganda, to establish a central Seminary and College under competent teacher where our future clergy may be trained for the whole church, and also, to seek full communion with the Ancient African Church of Abyssinia. (From Vinson, p. 241)

Alexander proved to be an able leader of the South African AOC; his congregation of some 450 members in 1924 (states Vinson, p. 242) would expand to more than fourteen hundred by 1927. In the same year, Alexander was invited by the AOC to visit the United States where a grateful Synod of the AOC consecrated him as Archbishop and Primate of the South African AOC. Alexander proved to be an indefatigable AOC champion, even expanding the church to East Africa and West Africa as Garveyites learning of the church through the pages of the *Negro World* sought to establish their own AOC branches in their countries.[47]

In recounting the enduring presence of Garveyism in its various guises for almost two decades in various parts of the country, a perplexing question that we must address is why SAMING tolerated it to the extent it did. For it is quite clear that in not going all out to eradicate this Pan Africanist ideology (by completely banning all Garveyite-related political activity) the authorities were, in part, responsible for the strength of the Garveyite ideology among a sizeable number of Afro-South Africans—depending of course upon time and place. The answer, very simply, was a racially-inspired miscalculation. The feeling within government circles about Garveyism was best captured in a memo to the governor-general by Prime Minister Jan C. Smuts wherein he, erroneously, stated that even though UNIA had tried to do propaganda work in South Africa, mainly in Cape Town and Johannesburg, it had met with little success.[48] He further stated: "No repressive action has been taken against the agents of this organization although its activities are being carefully watched. No immediate trouble is anticipated, the organization being without moral or financial stability. That a certain amount of mischief is being done by misleading ignorant and credulous persons is beyond doubt and to this extent Ministers regard the organization with disfavor" (MGP10, p. 37).[49] This, however, is not to say that SAMING took no action at all against Garveyism. In fact, when Garvey announced in January 1923 that he would embark on a world tour which would include a visit to Africa, SAMING was thrown into a state close to panic! Garvey did not explicitly state that he would visit South Africa; none the less, the European authorities were sufficiently alarmed to formally pronounce Garvey a prohibited immigrant under Section 4(1)(d) of Act 22, the *Immigrants Regulation Act* of 1913 (see MGP10, pp. 66, 76, 84 for the relevant documents). This action was, of course, somewhat premature given that the world tour never did materialize. Even prior to this action the government, as early as 1920, had begun to initiate action to prevent entry into South Africa of "persons from the United States of America engaged in propaganda work on behalf of certain Negro organizations," which invariably meant "any person with a touch of 'color'." Ironically, this action was prompted by a dissident UNIA leader in the United States who had broken away from Garvey, Samuel Augustus Duncan. Duncan had written the South African governor-general, warning him of the "destructive and pernicious propaganda" of the Pan-Africanists aimed at creating "disturbances between white and colored people in the British possessions." He further stated:

> I venture to suggest that your Excellency would be serving well the cause of the Empire and contributing in no small way to the promotion of Peace and good-feeling between the White and Colored people in the British Empire, should you cause to be carefully scrutinized and precautionary measures taken in the case of all Colored persons coming into the Union of South Africa, from the United States and the Panama Canal with the view of ascertaining whether such persons are members of the Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Communities League, subscribers to and readers of the *Negro World*, Stockholders of or in any way connected with the Black Star Line. And upon affirmatively establishing any of these facts to exercise your official discretion as to their admission into the Union of South Africa (from Hill and Pirio 1987: 223).

The net effect of Duncan's snake-in-the-grass alarmist letter was not only to alert the minority government about Garveyism but to also reinforce the government's dislike of U.S. African Americans in general acquired a decade and a half earlier. Now, here they made a tactical error. Not all U.S. African Americans were Pan-Africanists. Hence whereas members of the AME Church in the United States may have been expected to support the Pan-Africanist ideology, given their support of

the original "Africa for the Africans" idea at the turn of the century, in the 1920s they found Garveyism threatening. Consequently, by being against all U.S. African Americans in general, the European authorities denied themselves assistance—at least initially—from the AME Church missionaries, who themselves were very willing to do everything they could to stop the spread of Garveyism. The general sentiment held by the authorities regarding this matter was best expressed by the governor general of South Africa in his report to the colonial secretary in England: "many of these native agitators" (referring to the deputation that met with Prime Minister Jan C. Smuts on another issue, the discriminatory Native Urban Areas Bill), are American Negro ministers who imagine that they have been selected by Providence to bring about the emancipation of the African native" (Hill and Pirio, p. 225).

It is not surprising, under the circumstances, that the newly appointed head of the AME Church in South Africa, Bishop William T. Vernon, upon arriving in South Africa from the United States, ran into considerable harassment from the authorities, and it was only after much persuasive effort was he finally allowed in. He was able to convince them that he was on their side in the fight against Garveyism. As the police commissioner would later report to the secretary of justice concerning "the American (Negro) Bishop Vernon": "It would seem his views are that the natives of this country are being wrongly led into political rather than Christian paths, and his objective is to correct this. In his speeches, he has laid great emphasis on the necessity for natives to loyally obey the laws of the government, and it is believed that his influence will be all to the good in sobering the minds of those who regard the European only in the light of an oppressor" (p. 225). Under the circumstances, little love was lost between the AME and the ICU leadership; Ncwana, for example, mounted a virulent attack on Reverend Francis M. Gow of the Cape Town diocese accusing him of betraying the past illustrious history of the AME as an independent black body and instead aligning it to the British Crown, Gow's "big white master." (Vinson 2001: 64).

Hill and Pirio observe that they found only one instance where a missionary from the United States displayed any sympathy with the later incarnation of "the Africa for the Africans" idea that Garveyism really represented. (The person in question was a Pentecostal Holiness Church missionary of West Indian origin, by the name of Reverend Kenneth E. M. Spooner, who arrived in January 1915 to establish, in time, a successful mission station in Rustenberg, Transvaal.) More typical was the position taken by the South African delegation, led by the AME Church missionary Reverend Francis M. Gow, to the General Conference of the AME Church in the United States in October of 1920. It issued a sharply worded denunciation of Garveyism in South Africa. The denunciation, it may be noted, in turn provoked an equally sharp rebuttal from Ncwana:

> No sane leader of any nation will ever allow himself to be the useful instrument of the enemies of his race, like Reverend Gow and Co., only those who have made it a practice to court the favor of the White man at the expense of their poor people. We would like to know how many of the members of this denomination are in favor of Africa, our only hope, being made a White man's country? If not, why then allow those divine gentlemen, who purport to represent you and who, 35 years ago, championed the cause of severing relations with the White man's Church, to publish in the White man's paper such low and disgraceful statements to the detriment of the general welfare of our race here and abroad? We say the leadership of such men must come to an end. They are not at all fit to guide the sentiments and aspirations of the new Black man. … (From Hill and Pirio 1987: 224–25)

It was not just the Euro-South Africans and the AME Church missionaries who were opposed to the Garveyite movement. There were some Africans too, especially among the emerging petit bourgeois elites (both in the cities and in the countryside), who viewed it with both alarm and disdain. There was, for example, James E. Kwegyir Aggrey, an African from Ghana who had done well for himself in the United States. He arrived in South Africa in March 1921 as part of the Phelps-Stokes African Education Commission and immediately busied himself opposing the Pan-Africanist movement. UNIA members and sympathizers did not take to him kindly. Ncwana's *Black Man* labeled him "a slippery tongued liar," while James S. Thaele, a leading pro-Garvey ANC official in Cape Town, who himself had studied in the United States, described Aggrey as "that theologian whom, in the American terminology, we simply dismiss as "a me-too-boss-hat-in-hand nigger" and called him a parasite (MGP10, p. 40).[50] Thaele recognized, as many others did, that Aggrey represented that branch of U.S. African American opinion characterized by Booker T. Washington's principles of deferential interracial cooperation, circumscribed self-improvement, whiteness-inspired Christian ethics, and so on—that is, principles that in their net effect were accommodating of white

hegemony rather than confrontational. In South Africa, specifically, Aggrey wanted to try to prevent Garveyism from undermining the traditional African liberal ideology of placing faith in the British as the ultimate protectors of African interests. Hence Aggrey called upon Africans to declare Marcus Garvey "their greatest enemy" if they truly loved their race. (Hill and Pirio, p. 228) He would further, in a typical liberal vein, declare: "In this year of 1921, the spirit of the union, of British justice, is in this land; it is being felt now as never before because of the war and because of the restlessness. What we need is some great messiah of the Anglo-Saxon race to rise up and give fair play and reciprocity. I have dedicated my life to see that we work for co-operation. I pray that before long South Africa will be the best place on earth for white and black; so that Great Britain may lead the whole world; that the lion and the lamb shall lie down together, and a little child may lead them" (p. 229).

These sentiments were, of course, also shared by other members of the emerging African petite bourgeoisie, such as the well-known Afro-South African, D. D. T. Jabavu. Once in an address to Africans regarding "The Black Man's Place in South Africa," it was reported that in the course of discussing the respective merits of Booker T. Washington, Marcus Garvey and W. E. B. Du Bois, Jabavu dismissed Garvey as a Negro Bolshevist with wild, impractical, and extremist ideas. He went on to say that the path to African redemption was not war, but education (p. 249). Oppression, however, can do strange things: so even Ncwana would later renounce Garveyism and approach the European authorities for assistance with his paper, the *Black Man*, in order, he told them, to combat the influence of foreign movements such as that represented by Garveyism (p. 247, endnote 26).

One of the most important African political organizations in South Africa at the time the ideology of Garveyism hit South African shores was undoubtedly the ANC. Did this organization have any contact with Garveyism? It did, via the agency of James S. Thaele, among others. Thaele was once described by the South African police as "intensely anti-white in sentiment, an active member of UNIA, and a devoted follower of Marcus Garvey, whose slogan is "Africa for the Africans." While the ANC, say Hill and Pirio (1987: 232–33), was already infused with some Garveyite thought, Thaele helped to increase this infusion via the adoption of Garveyite symbols and exhortation. For example: the headquarters of the ANC in the Cape, where Thaele was one of the leaders was referred to as "Liberty Hall"—named after UNIA's "Liberty Hall" in New York. Their official journal, the *African World*, carried the slogan: "Africa for the Africans and Europe for Europeans." In this journal, Thaele exhorted its readers to read Garvey's *Negro World* avidly so that they could learn from its pages Gandhi's strategy of nonviolent civil disobedience. (See also Vinson 2001 for more on Thaele.)

To mention two other examples of Garveyite influence on the ANC: In a lengthy review, in 1926, of the second volume of Amy Jacques Garvey's *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, readers of the newspaper *Abantu Batho* (published by the ANC's Johannesburg branch) were told of the great significance of this work and informed that: "(A)bove all else, both the compiler and her husband have exposed more than anyone before them the hypocrisy, color-prejudice, injustice and discrimination of the white race against the black man. More important still is the warning of the Negro leader that the only avenue through and by which the Negro will win the respect of the world is by self-exertion and contribution in the founding of a Black Government by black men for black men in Africa, the home of the black man" (from Hill and Pirio 1987: 236). Even the official letterhead of the ANC, in 1927, would carry the UNIA slogan: "One God, One Aim, One Destiny." That same year, in June, Josiah T. Gumede was elected president-general of the ANC. Gumede, by the time of his election, would become an enthusiastic supporter of Garvey; his newspaper would later describe Garvey "as a dangerous man for all the great powers that are exploiting Africa" (p. 237). We should also note, as Vinson (2001) has pointed out, that depending upon time and place it was not unusual for Garveyites to hold dual memberships: one in their own organization and the other in the ANC.

By the time of the First World War, then, the positive influence exerted by U.S. African Americans among Afro-South Africans, via the agency of AME Church missionaries, on the growth of African nationalism had diminished considerably as their numbers dwindled. However, in the interwar period a new type of influence would come from the United States in the form of the Pan-Africanist ideology of Garveyism that, quite unconsciously perhaps, married issues of both race (white oppression) and class (black petit bourgeois betrayals) of relevance to the lived experience of the masses. Against the backdrop, on one hand, of a whiteness-inspired Social Darwinist ideological

world view shared by South African white liberals as diverse as Lovedale's Institute's James Stewart and the prime minister of South Africa Jan C. Smuts—captured by that oft-repeated Social Darwinist line to the effect that since it took the white man 2000 years to attain civilization, there was absolutely no possibility of the black man achieving civilization in a mere 200 years—and on the other, the steady institutionalization of oppressive racially-determined segregationist measures and practices, many of the black working classes and peasants (primarily Afro-South Africans—aided and abetted by resident blacks of the North American diaspora and an enlightened section of the black petit bourgeois intellectuals) in the 1920s and 30s took to Garveyism like ducks to water. Its attraction to them rested on a potently heady combination of a number of factors; chiefly: their perception that it promised economic independence (vide the shipping line) and dignity (vide the UNIA's diplomatic, albeit unsuccessful, representations to the League of Nations in the matter of injustices perpetrated on blacks in Southern Africa and elsewhere[51]); its legitimacy in their view as an ideology that was "made in America" by their diasporic brethren; its vision and objective of building an independent African empire that promised freedom from white racist oppression; its emphasis on the message of "Africa for the Africans" that called into question the gradualist and accommodationist approach of most of the nascent black petite bourgeoisie mesmerized by the blandishments of the pseudoliberal whites; and its association with a millenarian Garveyite-influenced Christianity. Though developed by a Caribbean person (but of African descent), and while this working-class-oriented Pan-Africanist ideology would find succor among the masses of U.S. African Americans in the United States who had not succumbed to the "kiss-the-white-man's-toes" ideology first propounded (not in so many words, but in practical terms) by Booker T. Washington and his petit bourgeois allies, it would also, to varying degrees, reverberate around almost the entire black world by hastening, and at times even precipitating, the transformation of the consciousness of all peoples colonized and oppressed by whites—most especially among the working classes and the peasantry. In South Africa, specifically (and even in other parts of Southern Africa, such as Namibia), to quote Hill and Pirio (1987: 242–43):

> Contrary to what has hitherto been written, South Africans—with help from resident West Indians and assorted American Negroes in the Union—"engineered" the Garvey phenomenon into a general national movement. The legacy of these years would play an active role, moreover, in shaping the historical consciousness of resistance.… In undermining the hold among the popular classes and the African petite bourgeoisie of the idea of imperial Britain as the real political overlord of South Africa, an idea that had circumscribed African political protest since well before the turn of the century, the Garvey movement scored an important achievement that led to the liberation of African political consciousness in the inter-war period.[52]

What is more, Garvey's message of "Africa for the Africans" survived his travails in the United States, not only because Garveyites in South Africa (and elsewhere on the continent) saw them as merely a plot by his enemies to fabricate evidence in order to discredit him and his movement, but because, in the final analysis, it was a slogan that made *material* sense against the backdrop of the Natural Law of Prior Claim. While Garveyism per se would recede into the background by the time of the outbreak of the Second World War, the kernel of his message would be taken up by a new generation of nationalists.

Clearly then, what we have seen from the foregoing pages is that in the rise of modern black nationalism in postwar (World War II) South Africa—the denouement of which would be the eventual collapse of apartheid itself some four and a half decades later—the often inadvertent hand of influences coming from the North American African diaspora (represented not only by the more easily discernible influences of the U.S. version of Ethiopianism, and Garveyism, but also such intangible influences as visits from the McAdoo singers and foreign study at U.S. black institutions by black South Africans) unquestionably looms large.[53]

NOTES

1. This long history is paradoxical, at least on the surface, because South Africa was a racially-oppressive white-ruled country (in many ways not unlike the Jim Crow U.S. South) and therefore U.S. African Americans would have been logically expected to give it a wide berth.

2. This chapter, dear reader, should be read in conjunction with Chapter 14.

3. Similarly, but referring to the contemporary period, one African observer, the Nigerian academic Adekeye Adebajo, would comment:

> The idealized vision of Africa held by many of [W. E. B.] Du Bois's descendants was a nostalgic longing for a return to an invented past, a therapeutic balm to soothe the pains of racism and powerlessness in their adopted homeland. In [U.S.] American popular culture, comedian Eddie Murphy demonstrated the more absurd side of this perception of Africa in his movie Coming to America, which depicted an African prince living a palatial existence in an Africa complete with giraffes, lions, and elephants roaming free in his backyard as pets. Barbershop, a hit movie in 2002, produced by and starring [U.S.] U.S. African Americans provided the other extreme view of the continent: a negative caricature of a stereotypical African character, a buffoon as inarticulate as he was inelegant. (Adebajo 2004: 96–97)

4. Among the sources used, this chapter draws heavily from these excellent studies: Campbell (1995), Chirenje (1976), Hill and Pirio (1987), Lewis (1988), MGP10 (2006), Noer (1978), Redkey (1969), Vinson (2001, 2006), and Williams (1982). The study by Sundkler (2004 [1948]), though dated, is also useful. Note: MGP10 refers to Volume 10 (titled "Africa for the Africans, 1923–1945") of that remarkably comprehensive collection of Garvey's papers edited by Robert A. Hill and his associates, *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers* (published by University of California Press in 2006).

5. The depth of feeling among U.S. African Americans regarding the antiapartheid struggle in South Africa was perhaps at no time as clearly manifest as when Nelson Mandela paid his official visit to the United States in the summer of 1990. Everywhere he went U.S. African Americans claimed him as their own. For a graphic portrayal of this phenomenon see the documentary produced by Global Vision titled *Mandela in America* (1990—distributed by A-Vision Entertainment).

6. Sporadic U.S. African American contact with South Africa can be dated as far back as the days when U.S. whaling ships visited the coast of South West Africa (Namibia) as they also had among their crews U.S. African Americans. Mention may also be made of various U.S. African American business people who visited or lived in South Africa from time to time—an example is Captain Harry Foster Dean. It appears that among the objectives of this one time U.S. African American businessperson and ship-owner (he once owned the ship *Pedro Gorino* which he lost in dubious circumstances to some unscrupulous English businesspersons in South Africa), who went to South Africa in 1900, was the location of land that could be colonized by U.S. African Americans to form a black-ruled nation (see Burger [1976] for more on Dean).

7. See Chirenje (1976) and Campbell (1995). The African choir group, it may be noted, was brought to the United States to sing at the 1893 Chicago World Fair. It was after they had begun a tour of a number of U.S. cities following their engagement at the fair that they ran into difficulties.

8. In the literature she is also known Charlotte Manye Maxeke or Charlotte Maxeke; this is because Manye was her maiden name and Maxeke her married name. She was married to a fellow Afro-South African who, like her, had studied in the United States and who was a minister in the AME in South Africa, Marshall Maxeke.

9. Charlotte Maxeke herself graduated from Wilberforce University in 1901 to become the first black South African woman to have a university degree. Returning to South Africa upon her graduation, she quickly became active as an educator and missionary; she helped set up AME 's Wilberforce Institute in the Transvaal which in time would become a leading secondary school, as well as a number of other educational institutions. Given her interest in political activism (she had been much enamored with the ideas of W. E. B. Du Bois and the Niagara Movement [the precursor of the NAACP]), she would also be a founding member of the South African Native National Congress in 1912. By all accounts, Charlotte matured into an exemplary person playing a prominent role in the struggle to better the conditions of Afro-South Africans as an educator, feminist, nationalist, and AME missionary. As Campbell (1995), in his evaluation of her life's work, concludes:

> By the mid-1920s, Charlotte Maxeke had established herself as one of the half dozen most respected and influential black leaders in South Africa.… In her consciousness and character, she represented the finest flower of South Africa's nineteenth-century mission culture.… Faithful to her calling, she lifted hundreds of people, mostly women and children, from the wretchedness to which a casually brutal [racist] society had otherwise consigned them. Her determine efforts to bridge black and white worlds, however flawed and seemingly ineffectual, helped sustain a fragile tradition of nonracialism in South Africa, a tradition that, against all odds, survives today. Perhaps most important, Maxeke's example of dignity, service, and simple humanity remains to inspire another generation of South Africans, who struggle in their own way to redeem their nation from the darkness of its history. (pp. 291–94)

10. Named after references in the Bible, such as "Princes shall come out Egypt; Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God" (*Psalms* 68: 31, King James version), Ethiopianist churches were African secessionist churches that broke away from the white-dominated Christian missionary churches for "political" rather than scriptural reasons.

11. The idea that had it not been for the white man, black people would still be backward has been a popular one, appearing in various guises throughout recent human history—specifically, ever since the Europeans left Europe on their rapine journey to PQD lands—and it is one that is, ironically, accepted by many among blacks themselves. Yet even a cursory study of human history suggests that this is not true at all. Human societies have never been really static in their socio-economic development. In some parts of Africa, for example, African societies were much more advanced politically than contemporary Europe, possessing democratic forms of government that would have been the envy of many a European peasant and merchant. In fact, Europe was considered to be a backward land of primitive and uncivilized peoples, even as late as the tenth century, by many of those living outside Europe. For example: here is the view of a Muslim geographer writing in the tenth century:

As regards the people of the northern quadrant, they are the ones for whom the sun is distant from the zenith, as they penetrate to the north, such as the Slavs, the Franks, and those nations that are their neighbors.… The power of the sun is weakened among them, because of its distance from them; cold and damp prevail in their regions.… The warm humor is lacking among them; their bodies are large, their natures gross, their manners harsh, their understanding dull, and their tongues heavy.… Their religious beliefs lack solidity, and this is because of the nature of cold and the lack of warmth. The farther they are to the north the more stupid, gross, and brutish they are. These qualities increase in them as they go further northward.… Those who dwell sixty odd miles beyond this latitude are Gog and MaGog. They are in the sixth climate and are reckoned among the beasts (From Lewis 1982: 139).

In fact, there is no question that if one goes far enough back into history one will arrive at a point where Europe was so primitive (compared to many other parts of the world at the time) that Europeans were only a few notches above apes in their way of life. Civilization did not begin in Europe, regardless of the sense in which the word is understood. In truth, even the term "Western Civilization" is a misnomer (unless it is prefixed by the word "modern") because it implies the denial of the extensive Islamic influence on the development of this civilization. What is more, it also denies the enormous debt modern "Western" civilization owes to the intermediary role played by Islamic scholars between this civilization and its other two principal sources of heritage: the Greek and Roman civilizations. Eventually, of course, over a period of hundreds of years, Europe developed and achieved modernity; acquiring in the process two powerful weapons that would prove the undoing of civilizations elsewhere: capitalism and the gun. But even here, there is doubt that Europe could have achieved global supremacy only on the basis of these two factors alone; the critical role played by the European colonization of the Americas in this journey that truly begins in the fifteenth century is the elephant in the room in discussions about this subject. It is either arrogance or ignorance or both that produces such false assertions that Africans and other PQD peoples would be backward today had it not been for European colonization of their lands. Had the Europeans not arrived on their doorstep they would have continued to evolve, in much the same way that Europe had evolved, through different stages of socio-economic and political development. (For more on Islam and the genesis of Western civilization, see, for example, Lewis [2008] and the extended discussion of the fallacies of Eurocentrism in Lulat [2005].)

12. This is not to say that there weren't some lonely voices that warned of foisting U.S. African American cultural imperialism on the Africans (Williams 1982: 37). One Sierra Leone professor, J. Augustus Cole, writing in the AME Church publication, *Church Review*, went so far as to even question the acceptance of Christianity itself. He wrote that not only was it a mistake to embrace this religion because it meant taking on the "white man's vices as well as his virtues," but that Christianity was destructive. "Wherever Christianity goes, licentiousness and ungodliness accompany it… which in their nature, are as heathenish as those [practices] already amongst the heathen tribes." Cole called upon the AME Church to shift its efforts away from missionary activity and instead work on eliminating "all idolatrous imitations, which we have acquired from the white man" (Williams 1982: 38). Similarly, John H. Smyth, who had served as a missionary in Africa, warned those gathered at the "Atlanta Congress on Africa and the American Negro" of subjecting Africans to superiority complexes that often afflicted black and white missionaries (Redkey 1969: 17).

13. For a biography of Turner see Angell (1992) who also provides a measured assessment of the AME venture into Africa under the leadership of Turner—in Chapter 11. One may also point out here that Turner was among the staunchest supporters of the "Back to Africa Movement" that was fashionable in the late 1800s. In fact, in November 1893, Turner would convene a conference in Cincinnati, attended by delegates from all over the United States, to launch a large-scale emigration scheme. Noting that "If this country is to be our home the Negro must be a self-controlling, automatic factor of the body politic or collective life of the nation," but concluding, however, that there was so much prejudice against the U.S. African American that there was no hope for such circumstances to come to pass, Turner called upon the conference to strongly endorse the findings of the Committee on Emigration. The Committee reported to the conference that "we fail to find in any part of the United States, outside the Colored man himself, any considerable influence which encourages African genius and progress.… The oppressed of all ages have had recourse to revolution or emigration.… We recommend the Colored people of the United States to turn their attention to the civilization of Africa as the only hope of the Negro race as a race" (from Redkey, p. 6). Even though, says Redkey (p. 6–7), thousands of penniless U.S. African Americans from the South had become converts to the emigration cause in the face of poverty and hardening racism, the more well-to-do U.S. African Americans, the black middle class, refused to go along with the idea. An opinion poll conducted by the *Indianapolis Freeman*, immediately prior to the convention, clearly reflected this position. Summarizing some of the responses, Redkey (p. 7) observes:

One Philadelphia editor said Turner would do a disservice if he sent thousands of black paupers there. A black bishop would rather have brought thousands of Africans to America. A wealthy Rhode Island businessman said he would rather have contact with civilization than with barbarism. A Chicago editor thought Afro-Americans should start to defend themselves within the United States rather than emigrating. Another thought that talk of emigration would encourage further oppression by whites. Some favored only a limited repatriation of competent, resourceful, skilled people who could help civilize and Christianize Africa. Frederick Douglass summed up the opinion of this latter group: "Every friend of the race will rejoice that Bishop Turner has bravely called the convention.… Nevertheless, I do not believe in any wholesale plan of colonization to Africa. Emigration? Yes. Exodus? No." And Booker T. Washington pooh-poohed the whole idea.

14. It should be pointed out that the AME Church was not the first U.S. African American missionary church to go to South Africa. The AME was preceded by the National Baptist Convention by several years. The U.S. African American Baptists went to South Africa in 1894. However, their missionary effort there was not as extensive as the AME's, consequently their presence had less impact on Africans than did the presence of the AME (Davis 1978). Among the names of U.S. African American missionaries who went to South Africa during the period 1880–1905 (the

heyday of AME Church activity in South Africa) include: J. I. Buchanan, R. A. Jackson, G. F. A. Johns, D. W. Long, G. M. Thomas, H. Tate, I. N. Fitzpatrick, A. A. Morrison, J. Gregg, L. Coppin, J. G. Phillips, Mr. Crutcher, Mr. Boone, A. H. Attaway, C. M. Tanner, and C. S. Smith (Johnson 1979: 30–31).

15. See also Kilson (2000) for an insightful analysis of the ideological differences between the two men, the legacy of which continues to haunt black politics in the United States to the present day.

16. It may be noted here that this was not the first attempt to found the Wilberforce Institute. Some time earlier, Charlotte Manye with her fiancée and fellow U.S. graduate and recently ordained AME minister Marshall Maxeke, had tried to establish one on land donated to the AME by a chief in the northeast Transvaal. It had failed for lack of funds. They would eventually return to take charge of the school in 1912.

17. The term "adapt" (and adaptation) are special concepts (see below).

18. For more on the ebb and flow of the Institute's fortunes, see Campbell (1995).

19. One may note here that the importance of Fort Hare in the history of South African higher education stems not only from the fact that it was the first university college for Africans in South Africa, but that in its early years, it was an incubator for an emerging Afro-South African elite. Among the Fort Hare graduates are a number of persons who would achieve considerable preeminence (or perhaps notoriety); such as Mongosuthu Buthelezi (became head of the Transkei Homeland); Sir Seretse Khama (became president of Botswana); Ntsu Mokhele (became prime minister of Lesotho); Robert Mugabe (became president of Zimbabwe); and Robert Sobukwe (became leader of the South African nationalist organization called the Pan-Africanist Congress). Even Nelson Mandela (became president of South Africa) went to Fort Hare, but he did not survive long there; he was expelled by the institution. This roster certainly vindicates Kerr's prescient comment that "[t]he only real test of the value of a [c]ollege is to be found in the careers of its alumni as they make their way through life."

20. The recognition of this "problem" one may note here, was not unique to South Africa; elsewhere in colonial anglophone Africa the same concern for the supposed pollution of the African mind through overseas study (especially in the United States) was among the factors that impelled the British colonial authorities to move toward providing some form of higher education locally. See Campbell (1995) for an insightful assessment of the role of U.S.-educated Afro-South Africans around the first decades of the preceding century.

21. Poll taxes were a much beloved tool of British colonial authorities for raising funds for the state. This penchant for poll taxes, interestingly, is still present and the reaction of the populace has remained consistent: as recently as April 1990 Britain saw an outbreak of demonstrations and riots against the imposition of a poll tax in that country (to replace the property tax) engineered by the former ultra-conservative government of Margaret Thatcher. (Incidentally, Thatcher's successor agreed to abandon the tax in early 1991.)

22. Of course, it goes without saying, that even the very notion that Africans were in need of "civilizing" by whites was in itself an indication of not only the depth of the racist hubris that characterized the ideology of whiteness (Eurocentrism), but also the extent of the corruption of the thinking of the Washingtonite U.S. African American elite brought about by the hegemony of this ideology. They failed to see the irony of "educated" black leaders looking at the land of their ancestors through Eurocentrist lenses—clearly it was testimony to not only the depth of their ignorance about Africa and its place in world history but also their own inferiority complex that bordered almost on self-hate. Incidentally, Harlan (1983: 269) draws our attention to a little known fact: Washington was invited to visit Southern Africa (specifically Rhodesia) so that he could report to the British South Africa Company (the Cecil Rhodes outfit) on the best way to "raise, educate, and civilize the black man." He declined the invitation, after seriously considering it, because he did not want to be away for too long from Tuskegee, not to mention the leadership of black U.S. America. However, he did venture to provide a response to a number of questions on the same subject sent to him by SAMING's commissioner of education, in 1904; essentially recommending the same diet that he was prescribing for black U.S. America: industrial education, hard work, and deference as the ticket to the upliftment of black people everywhere (and he enjoined SAMING to, in turn, adopt humane policies toward its black subjects).

23. The Bourbons or the Redeemers were a class of emerging white capitalists who came to power in the Southern states following the end of Reconstruction. As is to be expected, their agenda was dominated by programs to create conditions for rapid growth of capitalist businesses, which in part entailed rolling back the gains of the Reconstruction period in order to commandeer and exploit black labor.

24. Later, as will be noted below, the AME Church missionaries would come to play, sadly, a retrogressive political role.

25. Dube, who received his early education at the Congregational American Board Mission station, was sent by the Mission to the United States for further education in 1887. He returned to South Africa in 1892 after spending two years at Oberlin College in Ohio and after working at various jobs elsewhere in the country. Following four years of preaching to his people, the Zulu, Dube returned to the United States to pursue further studies, this time at Union Missionary Training Institute in New York City. Three years later, in 1899, he was ordained as a Congregational minister and returned to South Africa. It was during these years that he struck up a friendship with Booker T. Washington. He was even invited to give the commencement address in 1897 at the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. Dube was very impressed with Washington's ideas on education and shortly after returning to South Africa he helped to set up the Zulu Christian Industrial School, modeled after the Tuskegee Institute. Later, Dube would assist in the founding of the South African Native National Congress (SANNC) in 1912, and of which he became the first president. (In 1923 the name of the organization would be changed to the African National Congress [ANC].) In his presidential acceptance speech before members of the SANNC, Dube would state among other things: "Booker Washington is to be my guiding star (would that he were nigh to give us the help of his wise counsel!). I have chosen this great man, firstly because he is perhaps the most famous and the best living example of our Africa's sons; and, secondly because, like him, I, too, have

my heart centered mainly in the education of my race. Therein, methinks, lies the shortest and best way to their mental, moral, material and political betterment" (from Walshe 1970: 55). Dube was also the founder of the first Zulu newspaper the *Ilanga lase Natal* (in 1903—he would remain at its helm until 1936) which became an important medium for articulating the views of the emergent Afro-South African petite bourgeoisie. Consider, for example, his editorial titled "Leaders and Leaders" in the June 29, 1923 issue of the paper on the relative merits of what he called "Garveyism, Duboism and Washingtonism" in which the editorial, after dismissing both Garvey and Du Bois, argued, inter alia:

> But of the three to our mind the third that is Washingtonism, that is, the principles and methods of the late Dr. Booker T. Washington, seems the best to follow inasmuch as it is the safest and most productive of permanency and lasting good. These are that the power and intellects of the white is fully recognized and faith is put upon Negro or Native ability to help himself and gradually to rise in the scale of civilization.… A Native leader who tells his people that they can by force of arms regain their ancestral land and who claims that the Native is the social equal of the white man must be given a wide berth. The people must be told the truth that the white man has come here to stay and is very strong, very much stronger th[a]n the Native by reason of his trained mind but that the Native in time may reach up to the standard of the white man by the same paths which he trod and not otherwise. It will not help the Native cause a bit to instil into him that he is as good as any white man for this cannot be proved in practice. (From the editorial reprinted in MGP10, pp. 90-91)

26. Having said all this, one must also introduce a word caution here of not waxing too lyrical on the serendipitous (some may say providential) presence of the AME in South Africa. It must always be remembered, as Campbell (1995) for instance reminds us, that the AME missionaries were U.S. African *Americans* and not Africans. In other words, their perception of Africans was always colored subtextually (that is not articulated openly) by their "ethnicist" notion of a "civilizational hierarchy" in which the African was viewed as not yet on par with the achievements of U.S. African Americans. (In practical terms, the subtle and sometimes no so subtle patronizing attitude of some AME church officials sent to South Africa would, in turn, be one of several factors that would lead to the numerous schisms and secessions that plagued the South African AME Church—ably documented by Campbell.) After all, the very fact that the African was in need of "redemption" spoke to this outlook. The implication of this point is profound: it renders hollow the common view (especially among sections of the U.S. African American intelligentsia today) that, "blacks across the diaspora are united by some kind of essential racial consciousness, transcending manifest gulfs in history and culture" (p. xiii).

27. Notice the absence of the issue of class, and the overemphasis on race-related issues. This has always been the Achilles' heel of Pan-Africanism.

28. The general objectives of the organizations were: "To establish a Universal Confraternity among the race; To promote the spirit of race, pride and love; To reclaim the fallen race; To administer to and assist the needy; To assist in civilizing the backward tribes of Africa; To strengthen the Imperialism of independent African States; To establish Commissionaries or Agencies in the principal countries of the world for the protection of all Negroes, irrespective of nationality; To promote a conscientious Christian worship among the native tribes of Africa; To establish Universities, Colleges and Secondary Schools for the further education and culture of the boys and girls of the race; To conduct a worldwide commercial and industrial intercourse" (from Lewis 1988: 50). Observe that the Washingtonian influence is clearly evident in some of these objectives. It ought to be also noted that the organization was, to some extent, a nondenominational quasi-Christian organization—consider its motto: "One God, One Aim, One Destiny."

29. This point bears repeating: there is absolutely no question that perhaps more than anything else (in an age where electronic media was almost unknown, the radio having just been invented) it is the *Negro World* that became the main channel by which Garveyism was relayed across almost the entire black world. In South Africa, for example, its readers not only went through it avidly, but many even corresponded with the paper (sometimes at considerable personal risk given that the authorities kept a close tab on the paper—even taking out their own subscription! [see order in MGP10, p. 200]). As one combs through the pages of MGP10 one gets a sense of the kinds of letters that were sent to the *Negro World*; here are a few sample quotes from them:

> Kindly allow me a letter space in your paper. The very unfair treatment we, as Negroes get from the whites, is so disgusting that the Negro who still has faith in the white man is a "damn fool. "Prejudice and conceit in the whites are such of late years that any confidence or respect the subordinate and so-called inferior races had for them has vanished like thin smoke.… Let me state right here that Mr. [Masogha] got a slap in the face as a matter of compliment and called a d—d nigger in the post office for getting The Negro World, from New York, actually 3,000 miles away, to awaken and enlighten Negroes here. (Z. M. in the September 13, 1924 issue—MGP10, pp. 224–225)

> Please allow me space in your famous newspaper. I am not educated at all. But I can read and write. I have never read so interesting a paper as The Negro World since I have been in Kimberley. (J. C. Diraath in the October 18, 1924 issue—MGP10, p. 271)

> There is a man today called Mahatma Gandhi, who preached the policy of non-co-peration, keep out of the white men's churches. We will approach the chiefs to withdraw our people from the mines and we shall build our own schools. Let us follow the example of President-General Marcus Garvey and the slogan of "Africa for Africans." Let keep the fires burning until the red, the black and the green shall fly on the hill tops of Africa. (F. Mothiba in the November 15, 1924 issue—MGP10, p. 276)

> We know the Negro has been the mainstay of American progress. We know the Negro has made wonderful progress in America. We also know that because of his great freedom his aspirations are great. But let the Negro beware the day he aspires to the Presidency, the most sacred thing in the land. What will he get? If your road leads you up a mountain against a precipice halfway, then you have no road at all. (Z. Masopha in the April 18, 1925 issue—MGP10,

p. 303. (Note of comparative interest: U.S. African American Barak Obama is one of the contenders in the current election campaign [2008] for the U.S. presidency. Now, at the risk of courting a large clutch of eggs on the author's face here is a prediction: Obama is unlikely to win the presidency—confirming Masopha's view [at least for the time being at this point in U.S. history].)

African members and friends of the UNIA were deeply grieved to hear of the arrest of Mr. Garvey and the ruthless way in which he was treated. We realize that he is today suffering in Atlanta prison for the redemption of Africa. … Enemies think that they have demoralized the organization by imprisoning its leader. But they are making a great blunder. The organization is gaining strength each day. They can kill or imprison the body, but they can do nothing with the spirit. (L. L. Loate in the May 30, 1925 issue—MGP10, p. 311)

30. Other serial publications that Garvey would edit and publish at one time or another included the *Daily Negro Times* (later published in Harlem, from 1922–24); the *Black Man* newspaper (published in Jamaica, from 1929–31); the *New Jamaican* (published from 1932–33); and the *Black Man* magazine (founded in Kingston in 1933, and later published in London until 1939).

31. An important event for UNIA and Garveyism in general was the betrothal of Garvey to his second wife, 26-year-old Amy Jacques Garvey, on July 27, 1922. This remarkable woman would become an indispensable ally of Garvey and an unwavering Pan-Africanist in her own right. "Her main attributes," says Lewis (1988: 193), with respect to UNIA "were her discipline, her sense of administrative organization, and her flair for methodical record-keeping." But, she was much more than that: she was a person of integrity, highly motivated, and unwaveringly loyal to Garvey and Garveyism even in those moments when everything seemed to have been lost, as when Garvey was imprisoned on the basis of trumped-up charges. Despite great financial difficulties she was able to put together and publish, while Garvey was in prison, *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (volume 1 came out in 1923, and two years later, volume 2). The significance of this work stems not only from the enormous service done to posterity but also from the fact it has inspired generations of anti-racist and anti-imperialist activists. What did Garvey himself think of? The following, written by Garvey, after being sentenced to five years imprisonment (see below) gives one an idea: "I commend to your care and attention, my wife, who has been my helpmate and inspiration for years. She has suffered with me in the cause of service to my race, and if I have any sorrow, it is only on her account, that I cannot be alongside of her at all times to protect her from the evil designs of the enemy.… Her tale of woe has not been told, but in my belief that truth will triumph over wrong, I feel sure that a day will come when the whole world will know the story of her noble sacrifice for the cause that I love so much" (from Lewis 1988: 194). Even after Garvey's death in 1940, she continued the task of preserving the historical legacy of Marcus Garvey until her own death in 1973. (Note: the recent biography of Amy Jacques Garvey by Taylor [2002], regrettably, does not shed appreciably much new light on her life, leaving a lot to be desired—that is, in terms of a biographical work of such an important person.)

32. The last included: the *Black Star Line*, a steamship company (established in 1919) to be owned and operated by black people for the purpose of linking Africa and the diaspora in commercial and industrial undertakings; the Negro Factories Corporation designed to establish and develop commercial enterprises; and the Liberian Scheme. (For a stringent, but valid, critique of Garvey's economic program, see Cruse 1967: 330–34.) The Liberian Scheme mistakenly came to be referred to as the "Back to Africa Movement," whereas in reality it was a scheme for assisting in the development of Liberia via assistance from the qualified among the diaspora. Therefore, as Lewis (1988) observes, although much emphasis has been placed on Garvey's ideas of emigration of peoples of the African diaspora back to Africa, in truth, Garvey was less concerned with emigration than with the emancipation of Africans and those of the diaspora. For Garvey, the liberation of Africa was the key to the liberation of U.S. African Americans, and other peoples of African descent living elsewhere. Hence describing the rationale behind the Liberian Scheme, Garvey would explain: "It does not mean that all Negroes must leave America and the West Indies and go to Africa to build up a government. It did not take all the white people of Europe to come over to America to lay the foundation of the great republic; therefore, those who write disparagingly of the grand program of Africa are doing so without paying attention to history" (from Lewis, p. 72). None of these schemes ever really succeeded because of a host of negative factors: opposition from racist authorities, internal dissension within UNIA, mismanagement, and even lack of support from those who were supposed to benefit from the projects. Hence, for example, in 1921 a team of UNIA technicians were deported from Monrovia immediately upon arrival and forced to leave behind $50,000 worth of equipment. The Liberians were under pressure from U.S., English, and French commercial interests to cut previously agreed-upon arrangements with UNIA, and to oppose Garveyism generally—added to this was the compradorial Liberian ruling elites' own emerging fear of Garveyism. In fact, Liberia, a black-governed nation, would declare that anyone associated with Garveyism would not be permitted to enter Liberia. Under the circumstances, this was not surprising. In a confidential report to Garvey, Ellie Garcia, had described the ruling Americo-Liberians as constituting: "The most despicable element in Liberia. Because of their very education, they are self-conceited and believe that the only honorable way for them to make a living is by having a 'government job.' The men of this class having been most of them educated in England or other European places, are used to life which the salaries paid by the government do not suffice to maintain. Therefore, dishonesty is prevalent. To any man who can write and read there is but one goal, a government office, where he can graft" (from Lewis, p. 73).

33. Given the uncompromising anti-racist and anti-imperialist stand of Garvey, he attracted much hostility from the colonial powers, as well the U.S. authorities. As early as 1919, plans were under way to have Garvey arrested and deported by none other than that FBI despotic bureaucrat, J. Edgar Hoover, whose racist machinations would also dog, more than four decades later, Martin Luther King, Jr. and others in the civil rights movement (and who five different

presidents would fail to dislodge from the directorship of the FBI). Thus in a memorandum, to FBI special agent Ridgely, of October 11, 1919, Hoover wrote:

> Transmitting herewith a communication which has come to my attention from the Panama Canal, Washington office, relative to the activities of Marcus Garvey. Garvey is a West-Indian Negro and in addition to his activities in endeavoring to establish the Black Star Line Steamship Corporation, he has also been particularly active among the radical elements in New York City in agitating the Negro movement. Unfortunately, however, he has not yet violated any federal law whereby he could be proceeded against on the grounds of being an undesirable alien, from the point of view of deportation. It occurs to me, however, from the attached clipping that there might be some proceeding against him for fraud in connection with his Black Star Line propaganda.… (From Lewis 1988: 182)

Among the series of activities that would be unleashed against Garvey from then on included an attempt on his life in the same month and year; a hired assassin, an unemployed U.S. African American from the South, would fire three shots at him, fortunately none of them fatal. (The assassin, a few days later, would commit "suicide" under questionable circumstances after confessing that he had been hired to murder Garvey, and that he would reveal the names of his sponsors if efforts were made to convict him.) However, the forces arraigned against him were indefatigable. In 1920, Garvey would be tried for criminal libel as the first UNIA convention was about to begin, while a year later there would be efforts to deny him a visa to return to the United States. In 1923, he would be indicted on false charges of mail fraud in connection with the *Black Star Line* project, and initially he would be refused bail—Hoover's dream had, at last, come true. Interestingly, Lewis notes that while Garvey was waiting for trial in the Tombs Prison in New York City, eight prominent U.S. African Americans, including some members of the NAACP, would write the U.S. Attorney General to speed up Garvey's trial, deport him and get rid of UNIA. In fact, even a "Garvey Must Go" movement was started. (Thus once again demonstrating, as numerous other examples in history have shown, that prolonged large-scale oppression of a people is only possible with the compliance of the elite among the oppressed who will exchange the freedom of their people for the occasional crumbs that fall—or are allowed to fall—from the oppressor's table.) Among the people involved in this movement was none other than W. E. B. Du Bois. Once describing Garvey as "a little fat black man, ugly, but with intelligent eyes and a big head" (Jacques Garvey 1963: 76), Du Bois saw Garvey as his rival for the leadership of U.S. African Americans; at the same time, he was unable to relate to Garveyism during this particular period of his life because he felt it was too uncompromisingly nationalist. He charged Garveyism with race-baiting and declared it not suitable for an America where "Races are living together. They are buying and selling, marrying and rearing children, laughing and crying" (Jacques Garvey 1963: 77). This position by Du Bois, which was clearly reminiscent of the ideology of Booker T. Washington, was not surprising during this early period of his life. It would be some time before he would undergo a radical change in his political consciousness, so much so that lore would have it that he eventually renounced his U.S. citizenship in frustration at the racism and right wing conservatism of the country of his birth and emigrated to Ghana, in 1961. In truth, according to Aptheker (1993), and corroborated by Lewis (2000), Du Bois became a Ghanaian citizen in 1963—while working on a project dear to his heart, an Africana encyclopedia, in Ghana (having gone there in 1961 at the invitation of its president, Kwame Nkrumah)—because the U.S. embassy refused to renew his U.S. passport under the ignominious McCarran Act. He died in Ghana in the same year and on the eve of that the famed civil rights event, the March on Washington, on August 27, with the status of a dual citizen. Garvey's trial turned out to be essentially a kangaroo court, as Lewis (1988: 182) observes: "Garvey's trial took place in a court charged with malicious hysteria. Garvey was indicted on the assumption that an empty envelope with a rubber-stamped return address of the *Black Star Line* contained either a letter or a handbill from him. No other officer of the UNIA was convicted." He was sentenced to five years imprisonment and fined one thousand dollars. Two years later his appeal was dismissed, and he was sent to do time in the Federal prison in Atlanta. In 1927 he was permanently deported to Jamaica where the English colonial authorities would subject him to further harassment. The imprisonment of Garvey marked the beginning of the end of UNIA as it was then constituted. Factionalism broke out leading to the establishment of two UNIAs after 1929, one headed by U.S.-based Garveyites (such as Henrietta Vinton Davis, William Ware, George McGuire and Lionel A. Francis) and the other by Garvey, and based in Jamaica. This split would cost the wing headed by Garvey an estate worth $300,000 bequeathed by a Garveyite from British Honduras, Isaiah Morter. Other financial setbacks, as well as legal harassments, eventually drove Garvey and his UNIA headquarters out of Jamaica to England in November 1934. (One of the paradoxes of English imperialism in its heyday was the customary provision, in England, of refuge from political persecution to prominent leaders of anti-colonial movements in its colonies.) Until his death six years later, Garvey would continue with the work of the now much diminished (in size) UNIA, leaving behind a legacy that in terms of its full historical significance, for the work of all concerned with the human rights of the downtrodden, has only recently begun to be comprehended—as research helps to tear asunder the image of chicanery and buffoonery that his racist enemies (including their unwitting black stooges), had created of him. Before concluding this note, one other point: Garvey was an ardent nationalist, but he was by no means a racist—like many enlightened victims of racism he was staunchly opposed to it. Once, in a speech in 1928 in Royal Albert Hall in London, he would say to the English:

> We want to be friends of the English people; we want to be friends of the white race the world over; because neither the black race nor the white race nor the brown race nor the yellow race can achieve anything in the world lastingly except through peaceful methods.… Our attitude and our acts prove conclusively that we are not inclined to disturb the peace of the world. All we want is justice; and we are appealing to the ears of you Englishmen at home and abroad to listen to the plea of bleeding Africa. (From Lewis 1988: 201)

Here, Garvey was sounding the same type of themes that he had developed five years earlier, in his "Appeal to the Soul of White America" written for the *Negro World* in October 1923, and wherein he would say:

Surely the Soul of liberal, philanthropic, liberty-loving, white America is not dead. It is true that the glamour of materialism, to a great extent destroyed the innocence and purity of the national conscience, but still, beyond our Soul-less industrialism, beyond our politics, there is a deep feeling of human sympathy that touches the Soul of white America, upon which the unfortunate and sorrowful can always depend for sympathy, help and action. It is that feeling that I appeal for four hundred million Negroes of the world, and fifteen millions of America in particular. (From Jacques Garvey 1963: 16)

Further on, in the same piece, he would write: "And why shouldn't Africa and America travel down the ages as protectors of human rights and guardians of democracy? Why shouldn't black men help white men secure and establish universal peace? We can only have peace when we are just to all mankind; and for that peace, and for that reign of universal love, I now appeal to the Soul of white America." (from Jacques Garvey, p. 20). Needless to say, these were calls to the deaf. However, more importantly, they reveal a certain degree of naïveté on Garvey's part. Like many others, before him and after, he was in error in assuming that racism could be eliminated simply by an appeal to the "goodwill" of racists. In North America in particular (as in South Africa) racism was (and remains) structurally built into the very fabric of society as a whole. (For more on Garvey's life and work see also the two-volume work by Harlan [1972 and 1983] and Grant [2008]; similarly, for more on W. E. B. Du Bois see the two-volume monumental biography by Lewis [1993 and 2000].)

34. Among the actively pro-Garvey Afro-Caribbeans, going by Vinson (2001), who would be instrumental in the spread of Garveyism in South Africa—usually through their unionizing activities and/or the founding of UNIA branches—names that surface include J. Ceaser Allen, James Gumbs, William Jackson, Emannuel Johnson, A. James King, James Lyner, Timothy Robertson, and Emile Wattlington. These men, and often actively supported by their black South African spouses (many of whom were Coloreds), developed a vibrant Garvey-infused political culture in the Cape and elsewhere that thrived on camaraderie and shared diasporic roots, but which was nurtured within the soil of a black South African political and trade unionist milieu. How did the Afro-Caribbeans come to be a presence in South Africa? They, together with a number of U.S. African Americans, were part of diasporic Africans involved with the shipping trade (sailors and the like) who found themselves in Cape Town and other South African ports as either voluntary or *involuntary* immigrants. About involuntary immigration: it arose because of racist discrimination on the part of ship captains (and sometimes white ship crews) where either through intimidation or subterfuge black crew members were forced off their ships or abandoned—usually in circumstances of overstaffing of ship hands (an added benefit to the ship captain was that they didn't have to be paid their wages). Interestingly, the presence of this group of black seafarers in South African ports was noticeable enough to have earned them the racist appellation of "Sea Kaffirs" from whites. Note also: Since Garvey never visited South Africa, the explanation of how Garveyism was so forcefully transmitted to that country now becomes clearer. In an age when electronic media was nonexistent, it is through the medium of ships, print and overseas study that Afro-South Africans made their connections with the African diaspora, including the North American one. (Note too that in this matter language of course looms large; without a common language, in this case English, these connections would have been that much harder to achieve).

35. This section on Garveyism in South Africa relies heavily on Bradford (1987), Edgar (1976), Hill and Pirio (1987), MGP10 (2006), and Vinson (2001, 2006).

36. The "W" in the abbreviation was usually omitted, making for an easier articulation of the abbreviation as well as, perhaps (this is pure conjecture here), its simultaneous representation of the words "I see you" (and therefore, by implication, watch out).

37. The ICU's official organ, the *Black Man*, achieved sufficient popularity as the dominant vehicle for the transmission of Garveyism in South Africa, observes Vinson (2001: 64), as to come to the notice of even Garvey himself who would declare it "the *Negro World* of South Africa"—he even borrowed this name for two of his future periodicals. The paper also included a special column devoted to UNIA affairs titled "American Notes." At the same time, it also garnered the attention of local publications. For example, the Afro-South African newspaper based in Johannesburg, *Umteteli wa Bantu*, would complain that the ICU organ was nothing more than a UNIA mouthpiece (p. 65). Later, with the expansion of the ICU to other centers in the country, the *Black Man* was succeeded by *Workers Herald,* though even with this incarnation it did not shed its Garveyite leanings. Note: despite the relatively low level of literacy among blacks in many parts of the black world under the sway of white rule, the *Negro World* would become an important conduit for Garveyism—even in places where it was officially banned.

38. Going by Vinson (2001), Butelezi, a Zulu, was born in Natal and there appears to have been nothing extraordinary in his early life to distinguish him from others of his station (aspirant petite bourgeoisie) who had had an opportunity to receive some formal missionary-provided schooling (in his case at the Lutheran-sponsored Mpumulo Training College, and very briefly at Lovedale). His professional career included working as a salesman for an insurance company, as a teacher for a Presbyterian mission school, and as a herbalist. The first outward manifestation of his transformation that would eventually propel him onto the path toward a Garveyite "prophet" of sorts came with his declaration in 1923 that he was a "Homeopathic Medical Practitioner and Specialist in Pediatric Diseases," and that his real name was Dr. Butler Hansford Wellington. After an unsuccessful application for a passport to study medicine at Oxford (despite his lack of appropriate qualifications) he began to toy with Garveyism following his introduction to it by James Thaele (who had supported Butelezi's passport application with the requisite letter of reference) and one Ernest Wallace, a Caribbean-born UNIA organizer. Butelezi, it appears, found Wallace's exhortation of "Pan-Africanism, racial unity, self-help and a liberationist Christianity" (p. 130), as the basic guiding principles of Garveyism, much to his liking. He soon started his own organizing under the UNIA banner, finding the greatest receptivity to his message in the Transkei and the fact the movement he was now creating soon became a source of material self-aggrandizement, of course, did not hurt.

39. The "battle" for the hearts and minds of the working class and the peasantry in the Transkei and elsewhere in the country was fought by Butelezi (and other staunch Garveyites) against opponents comprising four main groups: the white missionaries, white government officials and their white allies, sections of the emerging black petite bourgeoisie, and sections of the traditional elite (the chiefs). Note: Exactly how widespread and deep was the challenge to these forces by the literate and the semiliterate like Butelezi and others (and who were the chief dramatis personae involved) remains an understudied phenomenon in South African history. As the editors of the MGP10 (2006) comment in their introduction: "The challenge to the educated elite from the postwar [World War I] emergence of a large, alienated stratum of literate and semiliterate Africans, galvanized by soaring food prices, stagnant wages, and a heightened sense of European racism, is still one of the least understood and most understudied social phenomena in African history. It was this newly radicalized group that provided the main social foundation for the reception of Garveyism in Africa" (p. liv).

40. These sources considered together provide a good overview of Butelezi and the "Wellington [UNIA] Movement": Bradford (1987), Hill and Pirio (1987), MGP10 (2006), and Vinson (2001).

41. An idea of what the radicals thought of people like Jabavu can be had from this quote from an article, titled "A Voice from Cape Town: The Chicanery of Negrophobist Publications—Garveyism Not a Bolshevistic Propaganda" by James Thaele published in the *Negro World*: "I can account for 'Me-too-boss' attitude of Professor Jabavu of Fort Hare [College] to underrailroad [sic] the other natives by advising them in his infamous article, 'The Native Unrest,' to contin[u]e worshipping at the shrine of Whiteaucracy. Mr Jabavu has (unfortunately) received his education in England, not in America, where in the words of De Waal, Boer administrator of the Cape educ[at]ion, 'natives come back with dangerous ideas'" (MGP10, p. 40).

42. The notice read: "NEGROES OF SOUTH AFRICA TAKE NOTICE! You are warned against an individual who calls himself Dr. Wellington and claims to represent us. This man is an imposter. Our only agent in South Africa is Mr. Jack Bernard.…" (MGP10, p. 414)

43. This is not to say that black Kimberly had never heard of Garvey prior to the appearance of the HOA and the AOC. Recall the 1920-1921 fund-raising trip to the United States by the highly respected and well-known SANNC official and journalist (and a Kimberley resident) Sol Plaatje who not only met Marcus Garvey on that trip, but also shared a platform with him on more than one occasion at UNIA meetings.

44. Published in January 1924, he called his Bible the *Holy Piby*. The flavor of Rogers' new Bible can be assessed from its preface wherein he tells readers that Shepherd Rogers and the apostle Marcus Garvey "were anointed and sent forth by the Almighty God to lay the foundation of industry, liberty, and justice unto the generations of Ethiopia that they prove themselves a power among the nations and in the glory of their God" (from Vinson, p. 227). Or consider how he turned on its head this oft-repeated Biblical commandment: "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you (Matthew 6:33, King James version); his version now read: "Verily I say unto you first seek ye righteousness towards men and all things will be added unto you, even the Kingdom of God" (from Vinson, p. 229). Incidentally, Rogers' Bible would also become the sacred text of Jamaica's Rastafarian religion (Vinson 2001).

45. The official title of the organization behind the Watchtower Movement is Watchtower Bible and Tract Society—it continues to have a presence to this day in Southern Africa, including South Africa. For an introduction to Booth's work in southern Africa see Langworthy (1986).

46. Alexander's poem is part of a letter he wrote to Garvey and published in the February 7, 1925 issue of the *Negro World* (see letter in MGP10, pp. 282–83).

47. The AOC continues to exist to this day, both in the United States and South Africa (and elsewhere). For more on the AOC, besides Vinson (2001) and MGP10 (2006), see Johnson (1999). As for work on the HOA, Vison (2001) is the only source worth consulting.

48. Interestingly the memo itself had been prompted by an opportunist request for financial assistance from one Sotho M. Mokote Manoedi, the son of an African headman in Leribe district of South Africa, who claimed that he was waging an anti-Garvey campaign in the United States in order to prevent, in his words, "impressing the American people with the idea that the British African is dissatisfied with British rule" (p. 228).

49. Similarly, a request by SAMING's acting postmaster general to confiscate the *Negro World* was turned down because there was no legal provision to do so. This is despite the fact that postmaster general had warned secretary of the interior:

> The Postmaster of Kimberley has reported that thousands of copies of the American Negro paper 'The Negro World"… are being received every week addressed to a native [Joseph Masogha] in the Kimberley location. These copies are then distributed throughout Griqualand West and other territories.… There seems to be no doubt that the propaganda carried on by this paper is most destructive and pernicious and designed to create disturbance between white and colored people in the Union especially when it is borne in mind that the paper is being distributed amongst semi-civilized natives in districts where the Government has been obliged to suppress risings by force of arms. (MGP10, p. 184-85; see also the SAMING memorandum on UNIA on p. 274)

50. Thaele was a graduate of the Lovedale Mission Institute (matriculated from there in 1906), and he was one of some three hundred Afro-South African students who went to study abroad (mainly the United States and Britain) during the period 1890–1914. Thaele studied at a Presbyterian liberal arts institution for blacks, Lincoln University, where he received two degrees, a Bachelor of Arts degree (in 1917) and a Bachelor of Theology degree in (1921). In other words, unlike a number of other Afro-South Africans who had studied in the United States, he was shielded from the influence of Booker T. Washington-inspired ideas. He returned to South Africa in 1922 and soon became an ardent spokesman for Garveyism, even as the head of the revived Cape branch of the ANC (Cape African National Congress)—until some years later when under pressure from the white authorities he would buckle and do a complete

about face. A hint of his firebrand rhetoric can be had from this quote from an article titled "Christianity, Basis of Native Policy?" he wrote for the ICU's Workers' Herald (in the December 21, 1923 issue, and reproduced in its entirety in Volume 1 of Karis, Carter, and Gerhart 1972–1997: 214–216), of which he was the editor:

> 'Thy vengeance, oh God, is too slow!' We are fed-up with the white man's camouflage, his hypocrisy, his policy of pin-pricks in 'the land of our forefathers.' I am appealing to the racial consciousness of the radical aboriginal to use all the means to rouse the African race to wake from their long sleep of many decades…. Law and authority must be respected, even as we did before the aliens came here; but when those in authority become so unreasonably notorious at your expense, disregard that authority, be blind and 'damn the consequences.' It is a fact that our present Prime Minister [Jan C. Smuts], now at the head of the Union Government, made a speech devoid of all common sense and unbecoming of any Christian, at the Savoy Hotel, when he said that "the early Christians made a mistake in putting into practice the principles of brotherhood." In the light of these foregoing statements, how in the name of God and all that is holy can 'Christianity be made the basis of Native policy' by the South African white man who has countenanced it already as 'impracticable for statesmanship'…? (p. 215).

Later, after the ICU transferred its headquarters from Cape Town to Johannesburg, Thaele would become president in 1923 of the almost defunct Western Province branch of the ANC. Under his leadership, the organization would be revived and thoroughly radicalized with the Garveyite spirit. His radical phase, however, would come to an abrupt end in September 1930 when SAMING threatened him with deportation to Basutoland (today's Lesotho)—a stint in jail also appears to have softened him. In fact, he even became a government informer. For more on Thaele see MGP10 and Vinson (2001).

51. See the petition titled "Renewal of UNIA and ACL Petition to the League of Nations" reproduced in MGP10, pp. 438–58.

52. We must register a word of caution here: following on both Walshe (1970) and Bradford (1987), it would be incorrect to suggest that the radicalism that was necessary to free African consciousness from dependence upon the European liberal for political guidance, inspiration, etc. (which was the hallmark of those African petit bourgeois intellectuals who had been influenced by Washington's ideas) was entirely attributable to Garveyism, in the 1920s. The formation of the ICU in 1919 would also facilitate the spread of socialist-inspired ideas among the African masses via its informal association with the Communist Party of South Africa (founded in 1921); most especially after 1924 when the Communist Party's membership was drawn predominantly from among blacks. Later, at the insistence of the Communist International (a worldwide Soviet-led Communist organization), says Walshe (1970: 68), the Communist Party began to advocate in 1928 the revolutionary idea already embodied in Garveyism of an "independent native republic" (or black republic) to replace the white minority-ruled South Africa. However, by this time the power and influence of the ICU among Africans was already on the wane and that of the ANC was on the rise. After 1930 the ANC would be dominated by a conservative African leadership and this, together with the demise of the ICU, ensured that the concept of a black republic received little support from the African petite bourgeoisie; it died a natural death even within the Communist Party by the late 1930s. See also Vinson (2001: 84–86) who notes, for example, that the formation of the radical National Liberation League in 1935 by "preeminent Colored activist intellectuals such as Cissie Gool, James La Guma, Christian Ziervogel, and John Gomas," permitted interracial cross-fertilization of ideas and mulling of strategies between black Garveyite sympathizers and white Communists ("such as Ray Alexander, William Andrews, Harry Snitcher, and Sam Kahn"). He also points out that the treasurer and Trustee of the League was the one-time 1920s UNIA Advisory Board member Arthur Emile Wattlington.

53. Here, one would do well to consult Campbell (1995) for a more closer look at the impact of the AME mediated U.S. African American presence in South Africa, including the role of the U.S.-educated Afro-South Africans in the struggle to build a democratic society.

16

U.S. African Americans and South Africa, 1949–2008

As we continue from the preceding chapter our examination of U.S. African American relations with South Africa, it is necessary to begin this chapter with this preamble: It will be evident in the pages to follow that in the post-World War II era, the most salient dimension of these relations (given the rise of the apartheid state on the heels of the conclusion of the war) would be the participation of U.S. African Americans in the antiapartheid struggle. However, in considering this participation one can get a better sense of it if, at the outset, it is pointed out that behind the participation was a palpable motivational "rope" that had been serendipitously woven (for the purpose of scaling the "wall" of the U.S. foreign-policy-making process, in both civil society and the governmental arena, that marginalized all black U.S. Americans from the process, and which had been built on a hubristic foundation of the ideology of whiteness) by the progressive section of the U.S. African American elite. And this rope was braided out of several strands of historically-rooted impulses, namely: the perception of a shared sense of white racial oppression plaguing both communities (black U.S. Americans and South Africans); sentiments of a diasporic pan-Africanist connection with black South Africa; a history of civil rights activism that would help enlarge the domain of U.S. civil society, thereby engendering the perception of an ability, through activism, to render what appeared to be politically impossible, possible; a general aversion—rooted in the sufferings of black peoples in the United States set against the backdrop of an authentic (non-racist)/prophetic reading of the Bible—to policies of oppression being foisted on other peoples anywhere in the world by the United States; the sense that as legitimate members of the U.S. polity, they had as much right as anyone else to participate in the foreign-policy-making process; the understanding that as tax-paying members of the U.S. citizenry whose taxes were used to finance foreign policy agendas that favored other ethnicities, they had a right and an obligation to call for reciprocity in this regard; and a general aversion to "symbolic patriotism" in favor of "iconoclastic patriotism."[1] At the same time, it is also necessary to indicate that U.S. African American participation in the antiapartheid struggle was, not unexpectedly, marked by ebbs and flows, depending upon circumstances—of both their own position within a racially-marked U.S. polity and the extant foreign policy agenda of USGs vis-à-vis South Africa.

Perhaps one of the most important steps the world community ever took upon the conclusion of the Second World War was the founding of the United Nations on October 24, 1945.[2] And even though it would become fashionable for the white right wing ignorantsia in U.S. society at large, as well as at the highest levels of government, to scapegoat and malign this institution at every turn by the 1980s—a most ironic and bizarre development that characteristically betrayed a stupendously deep level of ignorance exemplified by not only the failure to appreciate the great honor the United States had been accorded by the international community in being allowed to host the institution's headquarters, but a wilful ignorance of the fact that the United States was among those that had the

power of a permanent veto in the institution's highest governing body, the Security Council (meaning nothing of consequence can be undertaken by the United Nations without U.S. consent)—and even though there a number of things it could have done (and can do) better over the period of now more than a half a century of its existence, it remains the only global institution with the potential to do genuine good for all of humankind. It should not be surprising then that very early on from the time of its formation, the United Nations facilitated a demonstration of the symbiotic ties between U.S. African Americans and blacks in South Africa in the quest by both groups for freedom from juridical racial oppression. This is how it unfolded: India complained to the United Nations in 1946 about South Africa's racist treatment of people of East Indian origin in specific and its treatment of all black peoples in general. It stated that South Africa was in violation of the human rights principles of the U.N. Charter to which South Africa was a signatory. Through its representative, Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit (sister of India's first prime minister, Jawaharal Nehru), in reply to the vitriolic response of South Africa (and its Western allies) to the effect that South Africa's racist policies were an internal South African matter and not the business of the United Nations, India would state: "Millions of voiceless people, who because of their creed or color, have been relegated to positions of inferiority, are looking to us for justice, and it is only on the foundations of justice that we can create a new world order.… We must remember that, in the present case, the minds of millions of people in India and in other parts of Asia and Africa have been moved to intense indignation at all forms of racial discrimination which stand focused on the problem of South Africa. This is a test case" (from Lauren 1988: 170). When eventually a mildly worded resolution on the matter, in favor generally of India's position, was put to a vote it was passed, but with greatest difficulty. Yet it was an important first step—even if only a symbolic one in terms of practical significance. For the first time in the history of international diplomacy, as Lauren (1988: 170) observes, the issue of racism was placed openly and squarely on the agenda despite opposition from those who were among the chief perpetrators of it.[3]

The apartheid issue, brought before the United Nations for the first time by, ironically, India (which itself to this day has been unable to eradicate discrimination based on religious and linguistic differences, i.e., ethnicity[4]) was of special significance to U.S. African Americans. It motivated them, a year later in October, to bring their own predicament to the attention of the United Nations too. Thus Du Bois, now close to eighty years of age, but untiringly active as ever, began the process by directing the production of a special 155-page report by the NAACP in which the history of white racist discrimination to which U.S. African Americans had long been subjected was carefully documented. At the same time, the report drew the implications of this situation within the context of the human rights principles of the U.N. Charter. The report proved to be a bombshell provoking considerable worldwide publicity.[5] As the PQD nations seized it as their own, the Truman Administration saw in it, not unexpectedly, a considerable source of embarrassment and which the communist nations were not averse to exploiting. Not surprisingly, given the powerful position of the United States at the United Nations, U.N. officials treated the document gingerly and quickly sidelined it by forwarding it to the newly formed United Nations Commission on Human Rights. What is of significance to note about the report, however, is that the NAACP in producing it was all the time conscious of the international dimension of the issue it was raising. The authors felt that their action would give hope "to oppressed Africans and Colored people throughout the world." They further observed: "Without doubt, the publicity it has commanded, the significant questions the petition raises, and the dynamic problem of racial discrimination with which it deals are sure to motivate some sort of alleviating action on the part of the United Nations and its member governments. The eyes and ears of the chancelleries of the world will be focused and attuned to this petition" (from Lauren 1988: 173–74). Significantly, and with great prescience, they would conclude: "For depending upon what stand the United Nations takes in this appeal, will be determined, in part, the policy to be followed and the measures to be adopted by the colonial powers in their future relations with their wards, and the procedures to be put into practice by countries who practice some form of discrimination. While on the part of the submerged and underprivileged groups, it is likely to inspire and stimulate them to carry their cases directly to the world body in the hope of redress" (from Lauren 1988: 174).

However, this awareness of the dialectical relationship between the antiracist struggle in South Africa and the antiracist struggle in the United States would take a back seat, for all intents and pur-

poses, as the decade of 1950s began to unfold. For, sadly, political relations between U.S. African Americans and Africans in South Africa would enter a phase of prolonged doldrums—relatively speaking (see Chapter 10)—that would last well into the 1960s (White 1971). There were a number of factors that would account for this situation: One, the end of the Second World War brought in its wake the beginning of the "cold war" between the Soviet Union and the United States (and their respective Allies). The initial effect of the cold war, as noted elsewhere in this work, was to force U.S. African American leaders to dampen any attacks against European colonialism (and the emerging U.S. neoimperialism) that they may have wished to mount lest they be branded communists, especially given the backdrop of the ongoing activities of the U.S. Communist Party, which had a tradition of opposing colonialism and imperialism (coupled with the rise of McCarthyism). In other words, active involvement by U.S. African American leaders on behalf of African independence and freedom ran the risk of bringing upon themselves charges from white conservatives of consorting with communists and lacking patriotism. Such charges were seen by U.S. African American leaders to be inimical to the national domestic struggle for civil rights that they were beginning to be concerned with on a more intense and broader scale. This is not to say that some of the leading U.S. African Americans, such as Paul Robeson and Max Yergan (who together founded the Council on African Affairs in 1937), remained aloof from what was going on in Africa. They, for example, as the following excerpt from one of their editorials written in 1952 shows, were not afraid to speak out forcefully on the deteriorating racial situation for blacks following the victory of the ultra-right-wing Nationalists and the defeat of the slightly moderate United Party in South Africa (a victory that within a short time would herald the intensification of racism on a scale hitherto unknown in South Africa): "South Africa is part of President Truman's 'free world.' Yes, dozens of America's biggest auto, oil, mining and other trusts have highly profitable holdings in that country. Hence it is clear that in raising our voices against the Malan regime we simultaneously strike a blow at reactionary forces in our own land who seek to preserve here, in South Africa, and everywhere else the super profits they harvest from racial and national oppression. United support for our brothers' struggles in Africa is an integral part of our task in achieving freedom for all Americans and peace for the world" (from Danaher 1985: 60).[6] Yet the fate that befell leaders like Robeson—of constant FBI harassment—was ample warning. (By 1955, that is within seven years of being placed on the U.S. Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, the Council on African Affairs would collapse, never having had any tangible impact on official U.S. policy toward South Africa.[7])

Two, the strategic involvement of white liberals in the emerging civil rights movement—which initially and throughout its life would take the form of a political web of black organizations and churches and "white trade unions, liberal-minded political organizations, some predominantly white churches, and civil liberties groups" (White 1981: 84)—combined with the cold war McCarthyite hysteria that the liberals also got sucked into, meant that pressure was exerted on U.S. African American leaders to demonstrate loyalty to the United States by shunning Pan-Africanist causes, such as that of African independence and freedom, which in the 1950s the United States was loathe to support even verbally (see Kornegay 1975).[8]

Three, U.S. African American leaders did not want to appear to bite the hand that was feeding them by opposing President Truman's cold war foreign policies in respect of Africa and other PQD regions (which in effect entailed U.S. support of European colonialism), considering that President Truman had begun a modest program of civil rights reform in behalf of black people: "empowering the President's Committee on Civil Rights to report on the forms and costs of racial discrimination; abolishing racial segregation in the armed forces; supporting the civil-rights plank in the Democratic Party platform for the 1948 election; strengthening the civil-rights division in the department of justice; and calling for the abolition of poll taxes and the enactment of federal anti-lynching legislation" (White 1981: 84). In other words, given the perception that up to this point in U.S. history Truman in all probability had done more for black people than any other president since the time of Abraham Lincoln, many U.S. African American leaders appeared unwilling to antagonize him by attempting to undermine his foreign policy objectives (Roark 1971). The irony here of course was that even while there was pressure on the U.S. African American leadership to sacrifice its "internationalism" on the altar of cold war priorities, the cold war itself was beginning to emerge as an important factor in motivating Truman in the direction of ameliorating white racism within the country—in this sense the cold war was of considerable help to those engaged in the struggle for

civil rights for blacks. Just as the war against the Nazis, which in part was a war against racism, had brought home to thinking citizens the issue of domestic U.S. racism, so too the cold war would help to refocus attention on it. As Lauren (1988: 186–96) explains, the Soviet Union was able to exploit the issue of domestic racism every time the United States made pious statements about being the champion of freedom, democracy and human rights throughout the world. Soviet newspapers would carry accounts of lynchings of U.S. African Americans, and point out to their readers that while the U.S. constitution was color-blind, the United States in practice was not. Consequently, says Lauren, the Truman Administration was not long in realizing that if it was to win the hearts and minds of people around the world in its global struggle against the Soviet Union, it would have to begin dealing with one of its major Achilles' heels: domestic racism. Thus Secretary of State George C. Marshall would observe: "The foreign policy of a nation depends for most of its effectiveness, particularly a nation which does not rely upon possible military aggression as a dominant influence, on the moral influence which that nation exerts throughout the world. The moral influence of the United States is weakened to the extent that the civil rights proclaimed by our Constitution are not fully confirmed in actual practice" (from Lauren 1988: 190). Similarly, Eleanor Roosevelt, one of the foremost champions of human rights in the United States, would note: "Anyone who has worked in the international field knows well that our failure in race relations in this country, and our open discrimination against various groups, injures our leadership in the world. It is the one point which can be attacked and to which the representatives of the United States have no answer" (from Lauren 1988: 194).[9] Similarly, the report issued by the President's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947, *To Secure These Rights*, would also draw attention to the fact that "throughout the Pacific, Latin America, Africa, the Near, Middle, and Far East, the treatment which our Negroes receive is taken as a reflection of our attitude toward all dark-skinned peoples [and plays] into the hands of Communist propagandists" (Lauren 1988: 190). The committee, it appears, had become aware that sentiments such as the following expressed by a newspaper in Bombay, were influencing thinking among peoples all over the PQD world: "The epic milestone in the march toward full freedom will never be reached as long as whites in Africa, America, and all over the world in fact do not cast off their color prejudices and treat all human beings, irrespective of their color, as members of the same human family." It further stated "a few million whites should not be allowed to dominate and rule the teeming Colored millions who form the bulk of the world's population" (from Lauren 1988: 188).

Anyhow, the decade of the fifties was one of *relatively* little initiative on the part of U.S. African Americans regarding African affairs in general, not to mention South Africa in particular. Much of the activities regarding Africa during this decade were primarily undertaken by white liberal organizations, such as the U.S. African American Institute (founded in 1952 initially by both blacks and whites and called the Institute of U.S. African American Relations, but later becoming the preserve of mainly white liberals as the organization expanded by developing links with multinational corporations, the CIA, etc.); the American Committee on Africa (founded in 1953); and the African Studies Association (founded in 1957, comprising then mainly white academic liberals). There was one organization that had a largely black membership, the American Society of African Culture (founded in 1957), but it fell into disrepute by the end of the fifties after revelations of a financial link with the CIA. Against this backdrop, then, it is little wonder, says Kornegay (1975: 140), that W. E. B. Du Bois would be moved to complain in 1955 about the lack of Pan-Africanist interest among the U.S. African American elite: "Today the American interest in Africa is almost confined to whites. African history is pursued in white institutions and white writers produce books on Africa while Negro authors and scholars have shied away from the subject which in the twenties and thirties was their preserve."

RESURGENT INTEREST

It is in the sixties that interest among U.S. African Americans begins to perk up again with respect to African affairs in general and Southern Africa in particular The cause of this reemergent interest was a combination of a number of both welcome and unwelcome events taking place in Africa.

At long last the fruit of African nationalist struggles would begin to be harvested. Hence in 1957 Ghana would achieve independence, with one of Africa's staunchest Pan-Africanists, Kwame Nkrumah, at the helm.[10] Not surprisingly, Nkrumah called upon the people of the African diaspora to partake of the rebirth of Africa, for, shortly after Ghana's independence many other African countries became rapidly independent too.[11] The achievement of political independence in many

African countries and the consequent formation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had a significant positive effect on the civil rights struggle in the United States; it put pressure on the John F. Kennedy Administration to move faster on the civil rights issue—much for the same reasons that the Truman Administration had made some civil rights concessions to blacks at an earlier period: the demands of the cold war. The political platform upon which Kennedy had based his presidential campaign had included the call to make Africa (hitherto neglected by previous U.S. administrations) an important part of U.S. foreign policy focus in order to combat, what he felt, was a potential for large-scale Soviet involvement in that continent. This interest in Africa meant that the Kennedy Administration had to be more responsive to diplomatic pressure from African nations to do something about the increasing violence against blacks in the Southern states in the early 1960s. The administration was fearful of the damage that this violence was doing to U.S. foreign policy among the newly independent African nations. One manifestation of this concern, says Noer (1985), was its efforts to get African nations to avoid linking the United States with countries such as South Africa and Portugal in their foreign policy pronouncements, as well as discouraging U.S. African Americans from linking their civil rights struggle with the issue of apartheid in South Africa. Hence it is not surprising, for example, that the Kennedy Administration became alarmed when it heard that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had been invited to testify before the U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid in 1962, and it tried to see if he could be persuaded to cancel his visit to the United Nations (Noer 1985: 143). As it turned out, King decided not to testify in order to devote time to preparations for the famous civil rights march on Washington held in August of 1962. King's interest in South Africa was also highlighted in that year by his joint statement with the Nobel laureate Chief Albert Luthuli, president of the African National Congress, calling for the international boycott of South Africa. And as King moved toward a greater appreciation of the international dimensions of the civil rights struggle, his interest in South Africa, as already indicated, deepened.

In the 1960s two major (but negative) events helped to further rekindle interest in African affairs generally among U.S. African Americans: the CIA-abetted murder of Zaire's Patrice Lumumba—albeit never proven conclusively, though it is on record that President Dwight D. Eisenhower had ordered on August 18, 1960, Lumumba's assassination (see Kalb 1982 and Weissman 1981)—as Zaire began to slide into an imperialist-engineered civil war, and disintegrate; and the Sharpeville Massacre in South Africa on March 30, 1960. The result of these events was to motivate U.S. African American leaders to form a loosely knit "organization" in 1962, called the American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa, loosely modeled on the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (as the name suggested), with the hope of influencing U.S. foreign policy on Africa—such as it was.

The American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa (ANLCA)

Given its membership, the ANLCA was hardly a radical group: it consisted of such leading figures within the civil-rights and other U.S. African American organizations as "Martin Luther King, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League; A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL-CIO; and Dorothy Height, president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People" (White 1981: 86). Hence before the organization withered away toward the end of the sixties it was able to issue polite resolutions on a number of important matters affecting Africa, but that was about all. Among these resolutions were: a call, in 1962, directed at the U.S. government and private U.S. organizations for greater opportunities for U.S. African Americans to be heard in the foreign policy decision-influencing/making arenas, as well as opportunities for service in Africa, and a resolution against the fragmentation of Zaire desired by the pro-imperialist lobby. Similarly, in 1964, it issued a call to extend personal and institutional hospitality to Africans visiting the United States,[12] and adopted resolutions on the need to impose strong U.S. pressure on South Africa via measures such as "prohibition of future investment, discouragement of the continuance of subsidiaries or plants owned by Americans, American support for U.N.-sponsored economic sanctions, imposition of an oil embargo, and abandonment of the practice of excluding blacks from the U.S. diplomatic mission to South Africa" (White 1981: 87). The ANLCA held its last biennial meeting in 1967, reiterating pronouncements it had issued at its 1964 conference. Incidentally, the 1964 conference saw in attendance, at one point or another, a number of officials from the Johnson Administration, including: "Adlai E. Stevenson, chief American representative to the United Nations; G. Men-

nen Williams, assistant secretary of state for African affairs; W. Avril Harriman, undersecretary of state for political affairs; and Dean Rusk, secretary of state" (White 1981: 87). This suggests that while the ANLCA in all probability did not have as much impact on U.S. foreign policy as its members may have desired, it was, at least, noticed.

The fact that the organization did not survive beyond the sixties was a result of a number of factors, acting in concert; among them was its neglect of the need to raise the political consciousness of U.S. African Americans in general regarding African issues via activities that could have led to the development of a grass-roots-level Africa-centered organizational base (even though some of the resolutions indicated its awareness of the dialectical connections between the struggle for civil-rights in the United States and the anti-imperialist struggle in Africa); and its implicit but misguided faith in the liberal cold war strategy (regionalism) of the Kennedy/Johnson Administrations which had spawned some semblance of concern for African interests vis-à-vis those of the colonial powers. At the same time, the ANLCA became trapped in the "politics of irrelevancy" in the face of a rising militancy among urban U.S. African Americans as they began to perceive the limitations of existing polite (don't-rock-the-boat-too-hard) strategies for gaining civil rights—which threw up newer more radical leaders with a higher level of political consciousness (as manifest by a resurgence of pan-Africanist sentiment). Examples of such radical leaders were Malcolm X (el-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz), Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael), and Angela Davis. Thus the donning of garments patterned on traditional African attire, the adoption of African hair styles and African names, and the hurling of slogans of "black power" evident during the latter half of the sixties were all surface manifestations of this resurgent sentiment that many of these leaders helped to revive. Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity, which patterned its name not coincidentally on the Organization of African Unity, went so far as to ask that the latter raise at the United Nations (echoing the NAACP efforts of an earlier era) the issue of the racist treatment of U.S. African Americans in the United States. Consequently, as people such as Malcolm X pushed for a recognition of the dialectical relationship between the antiracist struggle at home and the anti-imperialist struggle in Africa (and elsewhere in the PQD world) within the U.S. African American community, the old-line politics of the ANLCA became increasingly marginalized as too mild for the needs of the times. It has to be remembered too that this was the time when there was a general movement upward in the political consciousness of the young in the United States—both black and white—as a result of the escalating war in Vietnam which would create a political climate conducive to appreciation of the international links between issues at home and those abroad. With respect to Africa, for the new generation of radical U.S. African Americans an issue that increasingly drew their attention toward the end of the decade of the sixties was, not surprisingly, the emerging nationalist armed liberation struggles in Africa prompted by the continued existence of Portuguese colonialism, coupled with the ongoing presence of the white minority regimes of Zimbabwe, South Africa, and Namibia. At the same time, the liberation movements, always conscious of the international character of their struggle, sought support abroad for their cause, including in the United States. In turn, U.S. African Americans found in their support of these movements succor for their Pan-Africanist sentiments, as well as intensification of their commitment to carry on with the civil rights struggle in the United States.

Two events at the close of the sixties would have a lasting impact on U.S. African American participation in the U.S. antiapartheid movement: First, was the passage in 1969 of the leadership of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa to the U.S. African American Congressperson Charles C. Diggs, Jr., and who, significantly, two years later would also be the founding chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus.[13] The result of this development was that Congressional interest in Southern Africa would no longer remain passive. More importantly, it would mark a beginning of renewed organizational initiative on the part of U.S. African Americans regarding African issues—an area that white liberal organizations, such as the American Committee on Africa, had dominated for so long. Hence, for example, with the able assistance of a U.S. African American female lawyer, Goler Butcher, Diggs scheduled in 1971/72 a number of widely publicized Congressional hearings on issues concerning Southern Africa in general and South Africa in particular. Also during this same period Diggs undertook a special study mission to Africa.[14] Second, was the formation of the predominantly black organization called the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers' Movement, in 1970, to campaign for the disinvestment of Polaroid Corporation investments in South Africa.

The Polaroid "Experiment"

Although black (and white) college students in the 1960s had campaigned for divestment of college funds invested in corporations doing business in South Africa, it was the entry of the Workers' Movement into the debate concerning U.S. corporations' involvement in that country that would bring to the nation's and world's attention, in a forceful way, the fact that U.S. African Americans were not unconcerned about apartheid (Kornegay 1975: 155). In terms of its genesis, the seed of the Movement, it appears, was planted in 1968 when a U.S. African American employee of Polaroid, a photographer by the name of Kenneth Williams, innocently asked why there were no black faces among the International Sales Department personnel he had been asked to photograph. They told him that in South Africa black sales representatives would not be tolerated. Against the backdrop of a now heightened consciousness, two years later in September, in one of those serendipitous moments, Williams and a number of his co-workers chanced upon a passage in the corporation's report stating to the effect that Polaroid, as an equal opportunity employer, was in the forefront of fighting racism, even while elsewhere in the report's pages it proclaimed that sales of Polaroid products in South Africa were booming. They, outraged, decided to research what appeared to be, quite clearly, and instance of egregious hypocrisy. They discovered that Polaroid had been doing business in South Africa since 1938 (one year after it was incorporated in the United States), and that over time, as the company invented new photographic products, it had become an important supplier of photo identification equipment to SAAG for use in documenting Africans in order to control their movement under its totalitarian pass system—one of the pillars upon which the apartheid system rested.

The workers decided that they had to take action. They distributed anonymous leaflets throughout the Polaroid plants, including the executive men's room at headquarters, that on a play of a Polaroid commercial read "Polaroid Imprisons Black People—In Just 60 Seconds." Soon thereafter, in October, the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement was born.[15] The Movement called upon Polaroid in the fall of 1970 to end sales of all its products in South Africa and to donate its South African profits to the liberation movements. The Corporation responded at first by announcing the elimination of sales of its photographic equipment and related products that could be used in the production of pass books (identity documents for Africans) necessary for the enforcement of the pass system. The Movement was not satisfied with this limited response; it organized a picket at Polaroid headquarters, and at the same time called for the worldwide boycott of the Corporation. Polaroid again responded, this time by appointing a fourteen-member committee of black and white employees to look at the whole issue of Polaroid's role in South Africa. The company also sent four members of the committee (two blacks and two whites) to South Africa on a study tour.

The recommendations that the committee came up with were published in a full-page advertisement on January 18, 1971, titled "An Experiment in South Africa," that the company took out in a number of major U.S. newspapers as well as in some U.S. African American news weeklies. Among the recommendations was one that called for continuation of business involvement by Polaroid in South Africa but "on a new basis which blacks there… see as supportive to their hopes and plans for the future." The ad further went on to state: "We believe education for the blacks, in combination with the opportunities now being afforded by the expanding economy, is a key to change in South Africa. We will commit a portion of our profits earned there to encourage black education." This plan was defined as a one-year experiment (Hoagland 1972: 354). The Movement, however, was still not satisfied even with this response. Subsequently, two of its prominent members, Caroline Hunter and Kenneth Williams (both U.S. African Americans and former Polaroid employees) became the first persons to go before the Anti-Apartheid Committee at the United Nations, in February 1971, to testify against a private U.S. corporation. The Polaroid corporation would eventually come to the conclusion that the costs of fighting the Movement's campaign were in excess of profits derived from South Africa, and it would decide to leave that country.[16] For the Movement and many U.S. African Americans in general this was an important victory. More significantly, the Polaroid disinvestment campaign brought into prominence three important issues: it showed that where U.S. African Americans made themselves knowledgeable about African issues they could provide credible support for African interests that could not be matched by white liberals—given that the latter could be brushed aside as "bleeding hearts" responding to their guilt complexes. As Hoagland (1972: 358–59) astutely put it at the time:

One of the weaknesses of the antiapartheid movement in Britain and in the United States has been that whites have played most of the leadership roles. In most cases, the criticism that white American or English liberals are working out guilt complexes about their country's own situations by becoming deeply involved in fighting the battle for South Africa's blacks may be an overstatement. But it contains enough appearance of truth, it seems to me, to damage their credibility on the issue, especially when the target is the profits-eager business-man looking for reasons to ignore a challenge. "Another bleeding heart" is pretty easy to shake off along Wall Street, but a black American starts with an automatic credibility.

The Polaroid Corporation's experiment challenged a long-stated position of western capitalists that business and morality did not mix, even in the case of apartheid South Africa.[17] Polaroid, how-ever, argued that with respect to the apartheid issue business could not remain neutral. Thus Polar-oid would say "How can we presume to concern ourselves with the problems of another country? Whatever the practices are elsewhere, South Africa alone articulates a policy contrary to everything we feel our company stands for. We cannot participate passively in such a political system. Nor can we ignore it" (from Hoagland 1972: 354).

The experiment raised the question of the role of U.S. corporations in South Africa; could it ever really be a positive one? The debate that ensued on this matter led to sharp divisions among not only white liberals but also U.S. African Americans themselves. For example, Ulrich Haynes (who would later, in the Carter Administration, serve as U.S. ambassador to Algeria) strongly criticized, in the *New York Times* of March 28, 1971, the decision by the Episcopal Church to campaign for the with-drawal of General Motors from South Africa. This comment, in turn, provoked a rebuke from a number of U.S. African Americans, including Congressperson Diggs; Robert Browne, head of the Black Economic Research Center; and Percy Sutton, the black borough president of Manhattan. In-terestingly, considering his later position, opposition to Haynes' comment was also expressed by Reverend Leon Sullivan, a civil rights activist and the first U.S. African American to be appointed (in 1971) to the board of directors of a major U.S. corporation—General Motors. Sullivan, however, did not hold onto this initial position for long: succumbing (not surprisingly) to the logic of his ob-jective circumstance (a corporate board member), he suggested that the U.S. government and U.S. corporations should not withdraw from South Africa after all because, in his view, they could play a positive role in that country.[18]

Sullivan Principles

Taking his cue from the earlier position of Polaroid that U.S. corporations could play a positive role, in 1977 he devised a voluntary socially responsible employment code for U.S. corporations to follow which, he suggested, would help to ameliorate the discriminatory employment conditions of black South African workers.[19] Many U.S. corporations operating in South Africa latched onto the Sullivan Principles, as the code came be to called, and by October 1984 nearly half of all U.S. corporations had signed a commitment to follow the principles.[20] Thus after years of relentless and unashamed super-exploitation of black labor made possible by the apartheid system, U.S. corporations would suddenly "discover," with the assistance of a U.S. African American, that they were in South Africa for the good of black South Africans! Needless to say, the Principles provided U.S. businesses with an excuse to continue exploiting blacks while all the time telling the world that they were helping them!

In a stringent critique of these principles, the proclamation of which (regardless of the well-meaning intentions of Reverend Leon Sullivan), constituted no less than a major setback in the struggle against apartheid, a white antiapartheid activist, Elizabeth Schmidt, in her *Decoding Corporate Camouflage: U.S. Business Support for Apartheid* would demonstrate that the net effect of the Principles was to bolster apartheid by helping to put a human face on it, and thereby deflecting external oppo-sition. More than ten years after the Sullivan Principles were first announced, writing in 1985, she would observe that many of those corporations that had become signatories to the Principles were not only failing to adhere to their spirit (apparently, for a number of corporations, the greed engen-dered by large profits could not brook even a modicum of interference in its slaking), but that their very presence in South Africa was helping to underwrite the apartheid system. As she explained:

> Even more serious than their discriminatory employment practices and the irrelevance of their work-place "re-forms," is the complicity of U.S. corporations in the overall subjugation of South Africa's black population. U.S. companies literally grease the wheels of the apartheid machine. It is the model Sullivan signatories—usually those corporations with the largest assets and annual sales—that are bolstering the most strategic sec-tors of the South African economy. Such companies have the resources to spend on upgraded cafeterias and

recreation areas. They have also the most to lose if they are forced to withdraw from South Africa, and hence, the most to gain from a well-orchestrated public relations campaign (Schmidt 1985: 395).

As for the South African blacks themselves, they were not fooled. From prominent African leaders such as Nobel laureate, Anglican Bishop Desmond Tutu (who would characterize the supposed progressive role of U.S. corporations as an exercise in deception), to black trade unionists, there would be opposition to such ploys and palliatives as represented by the Principles. Thus for example, Fikki Ashene (leader of a union representing workers at some of the large U.S. investors—Ford, General Motors, Goodyear, etc.—and affiliated to the largest federation of black unions at the time, the Federation of South African Trade Unions), would state: "[w]e don't accept the Sullivan Principles," adding: "[i]f Sullivan wanted a big change in South Africa, he would have asked the workers what they wanted. Corporate priorities are not the workers' priorities.... The desegregation of eating facilities is not important to us. The Sullivan Principles are just a means of taking pressure off the American multinationals" (from Schmidt 1987: 399).[21]

Other events that testified (especially in the 1970s) to the renewed U.S. African American interest in Southern African affairs included the resignation of Congressperson Diggs from the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in December 1971. It was prompted by his disgust at the hypocrisy evident in the Nixon Administration's stance on Southern Africa, where at the verbal level it condemned apartheid yet, in practice, did everything possible to shield SAAG and other white minority regimes from any actions that the United Nations tried to take against them. At the same time, as White (1981: 91) explains, new organizations dominated and/or supported by U.S. African Americans emerged to help focus attention on Southern African issues: "The African Liberation Day Coordinating Committee (later, the African Liberation Support Committee) sought to raise awareness among U.S. African Americans about the liberation struggles in Southern Africa, and Africa Information Service used films to portray the realities of the struggle in Mozambique. The quasi-official U.S. African American Scholars Council was formed in 1971 to give blacks entry into the African economic development research area long dominated by North American whites. The African Heritage Studies Association's Positive Action Committee became increasingly involved in encouraging a boycott of the Gulf Oil Corporation for its support of the Portuguese in Angola."

In May 1972, the Congressional Black Caucus sponsored the African American National Conference on Africa to explore ways of assisting blacks in Southern Africa in their effort to bring majority-rule to their countries. The conference (held at the predominantly black Howard University in Washington, D. C.), brought together two sets of opinion makers within the U.S. African American community: people such as Congressperson Diggs representing the growing number of black elected officials, and the African Liberation Day Coordinating Committee's Owusu Sadaukai, representing the nonelected black activists, many of whom comprised nationalists, Pan-Africanists, Marxists, and other assorted radicals. While the two-day conference itself was well-attended by a large cross-section of people—"ambassadors to the United States from several African nations, representatives from liberation movements, leaders from U.S. community-based organizations and Pan-Africanists, spokesmen from the Caribbean, and professional Africanists from the federal bureaucracy and academia" (White 1981: 92)—it was unable to emerge with a united multiracial lobby on Africa under the leadership of the Caucus. The problem was that the differences that existed between the two groups of opinion makers (the elected and the non-elected) remained insurmountable regarding the control and direction of the U.S. African American constituency on Southern Africa— a problem that ultimately was rooted in ideological differences dating back to the sixties where one was viewed by the other as either too conservative or too radical. This schism within the U.S. African American community would dog even the Sixth Pan African Congress meeting in Dar-es-Salaam from June 19–27, in 1974. The planners of the Congress were reluctant to include in the North American delegation (which, together with representatives from the Caribbean, was the chief architect of the Congress) elected U.S. African American officials. Yet the Tanzanians (and other African government representatives too) would have preferred to have interacted with the elected officials instead of the Pan-Africanists and the Marxists—viewing the latter, perhaps correctly, as not representative enough of the African diaspora in North America. Consequently, the Congress did not help much in the development of a much-needed unified U.S. African American constituency, especially at a time when the military coup in Lisbon offered the prospects of a new balance of power

between whites and blacks in Southern Africa, depending upon how the United States and other Western nations responded to the coup.

Among other developments in the seventies, 1973 was the year when there was a concerted U.S. African American opposition to that trenchant cold war fanatic and pseudointellectual, Henry Kissinger—long a thorn in the side of Africans in general and many other PQD peoples. U.S. African American groups testified before Congress against his nomination as secretary of state, albeit to no avail. Given the leak, shortly thereafter, of the infamous *National Security Study Memorandum 39* their fears had not been groundless. Three years later, the extant U.S. policies toward Southern Africa that this man helped to author became an issue in the 1976 presidential campaign as U.S. African Americans and other pro-African sympathizers denounced the Ford-Kissinger policies. For example, the Black Leadership Conference on Southern Africa (comprising more than a hundred representatives from a variety of U.S. African American organizations: NAACP, Operation PUSH, the National Council of Negro Women, and so on), convened by the Congressional Black Caucus on September 25 of that year produced the "U.S. African American Manifesto on Southern Africa" which not only criticized existing U.S. policy on Southern Africa, but went so far as to state that if armed struggle was the only way to bring down the apartheid system, then so be it. Therefore, to this end, it accepted that liberation movements would have to seek assistance from whoever was willing to give it (which implied including the Soviet Bloc countries.) It opposed any U.S. policies aimed at compromising the freedom of Africans in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and vigorously condemned pro-SAAG U.S. policies. Without question, the Manifesto was one of the most powerfully progressive documents ever produced by a conference of U.S. African American leaders.[22]

Perhaps of even greater significance (in practical terms) was that the Conference gave birth to a new organization called TransAfrica, which in time would come to play an important role in organizing support for the antiapartheid struggle. Incorporated the following year under the able leadership of Randall Robinson (a lawyer and former administrative assistant to Congressperson Diggs), this organization would become the foremost U.S. African American lobbying group on matters concerning Africa and the Caribbean (Jackson 1984). Formed at the time when the Carter Administration was in power, the organization was quickly able to establish contacts with key officials in the administration responsible for African affairs. It will be recalled that the Carter Administration's ideological position regarding U.S. foreign policy was similar to that of John F. Kennedy's administration—termed "regionalism" or "cold war liberalism"—and hence was more amenable, comparatively, to contacts with U.S. African American leaders.[23] Another significant development at the close of the decade of the seventies was the formation by the NAACP of a Task Force on Africa "to study and develop a meaningful and lasting policy on Africa for the guidance of [our] members and the nation" (from White 1981: 95). Working from October 1976 to June 1977 the Task Force visited Africa and subsequently produced a 500-page report accompanied by a list of recommendations. Besides recommending the formation of a Committee on International Affairs on the NAACP board of directors and the establishment of a national level organizational structure on African affairs, it also had a number of specific recommendations on South Africa including a call to support disinvestment activities as well as the imposition of economic sanctions on South Africa. The NAACP, on the Report's recommendation, also went on to establish the Committee on International Affairs under the chairmanship of Broadus N. Butler, who in testimony before a Congressional committee concerning bills relating to U.S. corporations in South Africa would articulate a reversal of the position that the NAACP had taken following Roy Wilkins' visit to South Africa in 1972. That is, he would inform the committee that the NAACP strongly supported disinvestment by U.S. corporations in South Africa (White 1981: 96).

Vigorous support for disinvestment, and a rejection of the gradualism that lay behind the Sullivan Principles, would also come in April 1979 from a summit conference of U.S. African American religious leaders. The conference, which became part of the ongoing International Freedom Mobilization against Apartheid in New York, would also pass a resolution stating "its unequivocal support of the national liberation struggle waged by the South African people under the leadership of the African National Congress" (from White 1981: 96). The enlightened tone of the conference was evident from remarks made by people such as Wyatt Tee Walker (secretary general of the Freedom Mobilization and pastor of the Canaan Baptist Church in Harlem) and Reverend William A. Jones, Jr., president of the Progressive National Baptist Convention and pastor of the Bethany Baptist

Church in Brooklyn. "Two things," Reverend Walker observed, "are necessary to keep in mind: first, the apartheid system is in a state of profound crisis resulting from international pressure and the militancy of the liberation movement in South Africa; and, second, the Black Church, at this moment in history, has the challenge and the opportunity to bring the Afro-American community into the struggle as a visible force in the national and world antiapartheid movement." (from White 1981: 96). For his part, Reverend Jones would address the very touchy subject—for most whites in general—of black revolutionary violence and the antiapartheid struggle in South Africa. Speaking on the theme: "A Theological Basis for Armed Struggle" he would correctly observe: "The question in South Africa is essentially one of self-defense against a systematic violence that is pervasive and unceasing. Genocide, on a massive scale, is being practiced in South Africa. To be nonviolent in the context of genocide is to affirm violence and is tantamount to alliance with the adversary. To resist, by whatever means necessary, is the only sane and spiritual response of one who calls himself a Christian. Non-cooperation with evil is righteous and redemptive. The task of a darker peoples the world around is to tune in to God's judgment already in process against that wicked and nefarious system" (p. 96). At that same conference, civil rights activist and gadfly Reverend Jesse Jackson suggested that U.S. African American ministers speak on matters concerning Africa to their congregations every Sunday; and he called for such other actions as: bringing political and economic pressure against those in the United States who are on the side of apartheid; working toward prevention of South African participation in international sporting events; the sale of bonds among U.S. African Americans to raise money for African projects; and that church ministers assist in the effort to eliminate the sale of Krugerrands in United States (White 1981: 97).

In 1986, against the backdrop of, on one hand, an escalating SAAG-inspired violence within South Africa, and in Southern Africa as a whole as it tried to undermine the resolve of the Frontline States to support the antiapartheid struggle, and on the other Reagan's racially-inspired pro-SAAG policy of "constructive engagement" (as well as Jackson's desire to deepen his international credentials in light of his desire to repeat his bid for the U.S. presidency two years hence), he would lead a large interracial delegation on a study tour of Southern Africa. [24] The idea for the tour had been mooted at the United Nations-sponsored International Seminar for Sanctions against South Africa in Paris earlier in the year where Jackson had been invited to be among the key speakers. The African representatives attending the seminar, aware of Jackson's rising political profile as, among other things, a self-appointed "citizen diplomat," extended the invitation to Jackson to visit Southern Africa in the hope that the region's plight could be publicized in United States with the aim of persuading the Reagan Administration to abandon its highly destructive and immoral pro-SAAG policy; and Nigeria offered to sponsor the study tour. In mid-August, Jackson, together with a large interracial delegation comprising antiapartheid activists, trade unionists, university-based Southern Africa experts, think tank foreign policy experts, elected African American officials, the black press, and so on, arrived for a seventeen-day tour that took them to Angola, Botswana, Congo, Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. South Africa and Namibia were not included in the study tour because SAAG refused to provide visas to the delegation. What the delegation heard and saw must have proved sobering; and while the Reagan Administration refused to accord legitimacy to Jackson's citizen diplomacy by altering its foreign policy on Southern Africa, in the end it did bend to Jackson's call for abandonment of constructive engagement—*but circuitously.* To explain: Jackson was able to lend weight to the ongoing efforts by TransAfrica, the Congressional Black Caucus, and many others in the U.S. antiapartheid movement to have Congress pass a veto-proof legislation imposing economic sanctions on South Africa that all previous administration had resisted up to this point. Congress, a couple of months later, in October, did pass such a legislation in the shape of the landmark *Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act* of 1986.

From a different perspective, Jackson's tour was symbolic of not only the practical dimension of Pan-Africanism but also of the significance of what is sometimes referred to as "citizen diplomacy"—the unofficial diplomacy that ordinary citizens engage in with or without the blessings of the state.[25] As Stanford's (1997) study of Jackson's citizen diplomacy has shown, Jackson helped to not only *effectively* demonstrate an alternative route for marginalized groups into the foreign-policy making process (to the chagrin of the U.S. right wing, as well as the foreign-policy-making establishment), but he also helped to reinforce the idea that morality did have a place in foreign policy and at the same time he lent credibility to concept that in a democracy foreign policy can not be allowed

to be the preserve simply of the antidemocratic hubristically-corrupt foreign-policy-making establishment. To the champions of citizen diplomacy, such as Jackson (or ex-president Jimmy Carter, to give another example), it is nothing less than an antidote to the kind of danger that James Marshall of the United States National Commission for UNESCO (an advisory body to the U.S. State Department), writing as long as 1949, in an appropriately titled article, "International Affairs: Citizen Diplomacy," warned against:

> Professional pride, professional defensiveness, tends in every field to discount the layman. It tends to build up a cult of expertness, an almost mystical cloud-throne guarded by the cherubim of a special technical language. In the field of politics, in its extreme form, this separatism of technicians leads to the police state with its NKVDs [KGB] and its Gestapos to liquidate presumptuous laymen. In its more moderate expression, the political technician and the bureaucrat simply treat the layman as one who lives on the wrong side of the tracks of wisdom. (Marshall 1949: 84–85)

U.S. AFRICAN AMERICANS, U.S. JEWISH-AMERICANS AND SOUTH AFRICA

As just hinted, Jackson's interest in South Africa would be of some significance for the antiapartheid struggle in the United States because of the high political stature he would achieve when he would twice be a contender for nomination as the Democratic Party's candidate in the 1984 and 1988 U.S. presidential elections—albeit unsuccessfully. While it is not quite certain whether Jackson really believed deep inside himself that the white population would ever seriously nominate him, let alone elect him as president, he did make a very serious effort at his bid for the nomination, and in the 1988 elections he made an impressive showing, in relative terms, even among white voters. But even if the white electorate had been willing to cast a color-blind vote in favor of a black candidate, Jackson, however, would not have been their choice—for most of them he was simply too liberal.[26]

One factor, though by no means the only one, that worked against Jackson in both the 1984 and the 1988 elections was the Jewish factor. Jackson stupidly made an anti-Semitic remark (calling New York City "hymie town"), thereby unleashing a furor within the Jewish-American community, not unexpectedly.[27] The remark was, of course, inexcusable. However, even though Jackson did apologize to the Jewish-American community it was not enough to allay their fears. They campaigned vigorously against his nomination, perhaps justifiably.[28] Still, the virulence of the anti-Jackson campaign led by the U.S. Jewish-American New York City mayor Ed Koch was a testimony to how far relations between these two important minority groups in the U.S. body politic had deteriorated by the end of the 1980s.

This is not to suggest by any means that the historical relationship between U.S. African Americans and Jewish-Americans has been one of mutual support, respect and conviviality. On the contrary the reverse has quite often been true. To be sure there was some cooperation between U.S. African American leaders such as A. Philip Randolph and Jewish-American leaders such as David Dubinsky in their struggles for trade union and other work rights in the 1930s and 1940s, and Jewish-American students were also involved in voter registration drives in the South in the 1950s.[29] At the same time, as Weisbord and Kazarian (1985: 7–28) demonstrate, many of the old guard U.S. African American leadership (such as Booker T. Washington, W. E. B. Du Bois, Walter White and Nobel laureate Ralph J. Bunche) were sympathetic to the Zionist cause and in fact saw much in it worthy of emulation by U.S. African Americans. Bunche (in many other respects a reactionary) was even awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950 for his peace mediation efforts in the first Arab-Israeli war that resulted in cessation of armed hostilities between King Farouk's Egypt (together with other Arab countries) and Israel in 1949. (Bunche, at that time, was the acting mediator for the U.N.'s peace-keeping Palestine Commission.)

However, the general thrust of relations between the two communities has quite often been in the direction of distrust and hostility, or as Weisbord (1970) has labeled it: "bitter sweet." Toll (1987: 89–92), for example, points out that not only did the Jews remain by and large neutral with respect to the abolitionist movement but that "in seventy-five years after emancipation, nothing suggests that Blacks and Jews came closer together." He further observes that in most northern cities U.S. African Americans were not welcomed as neighbors, and Jews fought hard, as in Chicago in 1917, to keep U.S. African Americans out of their neighborhoods. As Jewish-Americans became better off economically, and increasingly became indistinguishable from the rest of the white middle class, their hostility toward U.S. African Americans increased proportionately says Toll (1987). This became evi-

dent over such issues as bussing of U.S. African American school children to Jewish neighborhoods, fair housing policies, and affirmative action programs in employment and education. Even with respect to the 1930s and 1940s, when there was considerable cooperation between U.S. African American intellectuals and Jewish intellectuals within the Communist movement, Harold Cruse (1967: 147), in his highly perceptive classic, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, explaining the effect of the rise of Jewish dominance within the movement on U.S. African American intellectuals, says that the Jews "assumed the mantle of spokesmanship on Negro affairs, thus burying the Negro radical potential deeper and deeper in the slough of white intellectual paternalism." He continues: "There were some who became more Negro than the Negroes, never mentioning their Jewish background. These Jewish Communists were often more arrogant and paternalistic than the Anglo-Saxons [who had dominated the movement in an earlier phase], more self-righteous and intellectually supercilious about their Marxist line on America, than any other minority group striving for an ideal standard of radical Americanism." Cruse then rhetorically asks: "One wonders how it was possible for Negroes (both Americans and West Indians) to remain in the Party and accept such demeaning subordination. Nothing could account for this but the mesmerizing appeal of the Marxist doctrine which had seduced away the ability of their minds to think independently."[30] Having said all this, where then does the notion that Jewish-Americans and U.S. African Americans are natural allies come from? It arises from a sense of logic (rather than actual historical relations): since both groups have suffered greatly from the racism of Europeans (more so in Europe than in the United States in the case of Jewish-Americans) it is assumed that as each group has struggled against racism they may have developed a commonalty of interests. Sadly, logic and common sense are not always present in human affairs. Discussing this very point Cruse (1967: 476) noted nearly four decades ago:

> For many years, certain Negro intellectuals have been unable to face the Jews realistically. Among the many myths life and history have imposed on Negroes (such as that of Lincoln's "freeing" the slaves) is the myth that the Negro's best friend is the Jew. Far more accurately, certain Jews have been the best friends of certain Negroes—which, in any case, is nothing very unusual. This idea of Jewish friendship seems to have been born and given currency in the twentieth century. There is little evidence that the Jewish group was much interested in the Negro's plight for "social uplift" reasons prior to the age of Booker T. Washington and the NAACP era that followed.

He goes on to explain that in their headlong rush to become part of the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) mainstream, "Like the pre-Hitler German Jews who were 'more German than the Germans,' some assimilated American Jews become more American than the WASPs in their response to Negro uprisings and more conservative than the editorial board of the *National Review*."[31]

The Jackson episode, interestingly, had already been rehearsed a few years earlier: the same Jewish-American factor had led to the downfall of another prominent U.S. African American leader, by the name of Andrew Young or at least that is how U.S. African Americans perceived it (Walters 1981). Leaving aside the fact that Young (together with other black middle-class beneficiaries of the civil rights struggle), has been described by some as a "sellout" in the tradition of Booker T. Washington, the fact still remains that many among the U.S. African American community were outraged at what they perceived as unwarranted Jewish pressure on the Carter Administration that led to Young's resignation from his post as the first U.S. African American ambassador to the United Nations on August 15, 1979, following his unauthorized meeting with a representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Zehdi Labib Terzi on July 26, 1979. (Newsum and Abegunrin 1987; Weisbord and Kazarian 1985) [32]

In fact, it was Israeli intelligence in the first place that had tipped *Newsweek* magazine on the meeting, which then published an account of it on August 13, 1979. The meeting caused a furor within the Carter Administration and among Jewish-Americans because the United States had promised Israel that it would never negotiate with the PLO unless it first recognized the right of Israel to exist. What motivated Young to undertake this hazardous clandestine meeting with the PLO could only be his naïveté: his lack of understanding of the degree to which Israel and Jewish-Americans hated the PLO. Young, like many other U.S. African Americans, did not see Israel as the only wronged party in the Middle Eastern question. In fact many U.S. African Americans, purely on the grounds of justice, sympathize with the Palestinian cause as well (Walters 1981)—this is especially so in the case of those U.S. African Americans who are members of the Muslim faith, for obvious reasons. To many U.S. African Americans biblical history is not a sufficient justification to dispossess a people of their land. After all, they feel, all peoples can claim spiritual and ancestral ownership of a

given portion of the earth. The spiritual reverence in which, for example, Africans in South Africa, native Australians in Australia, black people in New Caledonia, and native Americans in North and South America hold their land—so much so that land could not even be bought or sold or owned by a single individual in these communities, before the arrival of the white man—would imply on the basis of the principle of Israeli claims that all people of European ancestry living in these countries (who after all stole the land from them through brutal and/or deceptive means) should be asked to go back to Europe. Similarly, to take another example, the present argument of the Iraqis that once upon a time Kuwait was part of Iraq should be considered as a justifiable basis for their annexation of Kuwait.

Hence, while most U.S. African Americans would unhesitatingly support Israel's right to exist—especially since they know that its creation was in part a result of both Hitlerism and post-War European anti-Semitism (the Europeans, including the United States, did not want to be saddled with taking care of the thousands of Jews displaced by the Nazi inferno)—they feel that there has been too much one-sided support of them in the Middle Eastern crisis by the United States (Weisbord and Kazarian 1985: 172–73).[33] In fact, as Young himself stated: "Black leaders remain steadfast in their support of Israel's survival and their concern for its security. But that backing does not exclude their being concerned about justice for Palestinians" (from Miller 1981: 49). Other U.S. African Americans have been even more forthright, for example Gilliam (1983: 89) states "Afro-Americans should stand on principle with all those people, among them American and Israeli Jews, who know it is not right for a person born and raised in Brooklyn to have more rights in the land of Israel than a Palestinian Arab whose forefathers and mothers owned and worked that land. We should support those U.S. Jews who call upon Israel to acknowledge its Third World identity and give up its role of being a mouthpiece and a hit man for the West." In fact knowledgeable U.S. African Americans feel that the intransigence and arrogance that Israelis have demonstrated toward the Palestinians are a direct result of the unhealthy dialectic that has been set up in the aid relation between the United States and Israel, which takes the following form:

(a) Initially U.S. aid is critical to the survival of Israel as a country; in exchange for unquestioning support of U.S. foreign policy in all parts of the world, the United States pours billions of U.S. tax-dollars into Israel in the form of loans and in many cases outright grants.[34] (b) This aid in turn not only helps to ensure Israel's survival at a time when the need for such aid is crucial but over the long run also creates a hand-out dependent economy.[35](c) This in turn requires Israel to engage in activities that undermines all possibility of peace (as long as the human cost is tolerable—made possible by the fact that no Arab state has the capacity to realistically attack Israel—since to attack Israel is to attack the United States), so as to allow the continuation of aid from the U.S. government and U.S. Jews, even when such aid is no longer necessary from a security standpoint (especially in the post-Camp David era), as it was in the earlier days. To put the matter differently: while the economic achievements of Israel are unparalleled within the Middle East, they are a result of a massive flow of Western aid (in terms of money and technology) upon which Israel is not yet in a position—if ever—to do without (see Rabie 1988).

Halevi (1987) would suggest that there is an even more compelling reason for Israeli intransigence on the matter of peace: the permanence of conflict, where Palestinian resistance can be presented to the World, especially the West, in the guise of driving the Jews into the sea, facilitates the territorial expansion of the Israeli state. This is a strategy, says Halevi, that the original founders of Israel such as Ben Gurion, were well-versed in, as they began their project of emptying Palestine of Palestinians.[36] There were other sources of tension too between Jewish-Americans and U.S. African Americans, of which the Young and Jackson episodes were but symptoms, which in essence boiled down to an issue of class rather than race, though this is not how the matter was usually perceived by either group.[37] Most Jewish-Americans constitute a middle class in the United States, whereas U.S. African Americans do not, because of the differing historical experiences. As a result of anti-Semitism in Europe, entrenched over many centuries, Jews were usually never allowed to have access to the principal means of production in pre-industrial Europe, land but instead were forced to make a living through commerce. (The process actually began during the period of Islamic rule of eastern Europe, at the time of the Abbassid revolution [Halevi 1987].) This enabled Jews to develop those skills that would be most essential in a free, tolerant (relatively) capitalist economic system, such as the one that emerged in the United States: middle-class entrepreneurial skills. At the same

time, because they were not allowed to integrate with the host communities in which they lived, Jews were able to retain their cultural/religious homogeneity and integrity—necessary for maintaining self-pride and dignity in the face of harsh oppressive conditions. Given a combination of these two historically rooted factors, the success of Jews in the United States was assured, that is as a middle class. Ironic though it is, the reason why Jews have done so well in the United States is precisely because of the anti-Semitic discrimination they were subjected to in Europe centuries before.

Jewish-Americans, unaware of these sociological factors in their past, have tended to view themselves as somehow superior—usually expressed privately and in subtle public forms—because they have made it in the United States, even in the face of initial discrimination (albeit relatively low-level), while U.S. African Americans on the other hand have been unable to overcome the pervasive discrimination against them and propel themselves (as a group) into the economic mainstream. Here there is a different type of ignorance at work as well among many (though not all) Jewish-Americans: ignorance of the deleterious sociological consequences on U.S. African Americans of a history of nearly two centuries of enslavement which in its brutality did not only entail the usurpation of the freedom of physical movement but everything else associated with being a human person: family life, human dignity, history, culture, religion and even language. Jews, like many of the newer immigrants from Asia, do not seem to understand that historically the U.S. African American was never given the chance to acquire the wherewithal to compete equally for the American dream, the attainment of which depends upon possession of a specific set of cultural and economic skills: petit bourgeois entrepreneurial skills.

Thus while all visible minority groups have had to face discrimination from whites in the United States, it is only those equipped, by reason of history, to deal with the discrimination—e.g., by creating an alternative enclave economy, something that the Jews did, the Chinese did, and now the Vietnamese and Koreans are doing—have been able to trace the "Horatio Alger" path. Many among Jewish Americans, and many among other recent minority immigrants (Vietnamese, Koreans, and so on) do not seem to comprehend this fact, giving them unwarranted airs of superiority vis-à-vis U.S. African Americans, as they look around at their own achievements. How dangerous these airs can get is testified by the following written by Weitz (1983), a Jewish-American: "It is not a mere coincidence that many of the men who have created the great changes and advancements of Western civilization.... Perhaps it is time for the scientific community, and particularly its Jewish members, to search for the possible genetic reasons why there has been a preeminence of Jews among philosophers, writers and scientists, teachers and Nobel laureates, as well as among the ranks of business and professional leaders." This kind of drivel that nakedly preaches the myth of Jewish racial superiority is no different from the myth of the superiority of the Aryan race preached by the Nazis.

Of what significance, however, is this seemingly long digression on relations between Jewish-Americans and U.S. African Americans to the issue of U.S. African Americans and apartheid? It is that it constitutes a backdrop against which must be viewed the increasing resentment U.S. African Americans began to have over Israeli relations with South Africa, which intensified dramatically following the termination of relations with Israel by some African countries in the aftermath of 1967 Arab-Israeli Six-Day War, and by many more in the aftermath of the 1973 Arab-Israeli October War.[38] For example, both the NAACP (under Benjamin L. Hooks) and TransAfrica had been very critical of these relations, and in fact Reverend Jesse Jackson went so far as to state that these relations were a "declaration of war on the blacks" (Weisbord and Kazarian 1985: 94).[39] In a sense this was true given that the efficiency of the South African security police in intelligence gathering, interrogation, and other operations was, in part, a direct result of the permanent presence in South Africa, since 1976, of Israeli experts as advisers (Goldfield and Obenzinger 1986). This is not to mention, of course, the military and nuclear aid that the Israelis had been giving to SAAG. Yet, U.S. African Americans knew that Jewish-Americans expected (and continue to expect) U.S. African Americans to support the Israeli cause by, at the minimum, not supporting the PLO. U.S. African Americans in turn, however, expected Jewish-Americans to support the antiapartheid cause. For Jewish-Americans this presented a problem because it required that they criticize Israel—which for most of them was (and still is) taboo. Yet to U.S. African Americans this constituted, unquestionably, a double standard. Jewish-Americans have solicited sympathy from the United States and the world, and rightly so, for the horrors that the Jewish people were subjected to by the Nazis as they proceeded to create for the Jews (and many others too) their special brand of "hell on earth." Yet many

Jewish-Americans (though of course not all) wished to turn a blind eye to the awful conditions that the Euro-South Africans had created for blacks in South Africa.

Why did the Israelis develop such strong ties with a racist state like South Africa? For, as Joseph (1988) so well demonstrates, the two countries did not just view themselves as "reluctant and strange bedfellows," but on the contrary their relations were characterized by much "amity, admiration and empathy."[40] Harris (1984), beginning by observing that in the areas of diamonds, nuclear-weapons testing, military technology, and energy resource development, the Israelis and South Africa had a long history of clandestine relations, says that the answer lay in the commonalty of their historical experiences as well as their political predicament. Among the characteristics that both countries shared, according to Harris (1984) included the following: the monopoly of power in all spheres: political, economic, social, and military, by descendants of immigrant settlers (who in South Africa still constitute a minority) by means of denial of democratic rights to the indigenous inhabitants; bifurcation of the immigrant settler community into two distinct linguistic and cultural groups, one of which tends to be more liberal than the other, and hence is often unable to win elections; growing opposition to the ruling groups from ultra-right conservatives from within their own ranks which discourages the ruling groups from moving in a liberal direction (a case in point was the opposition faced by the de Klerk government from the ultra-right Euro-South Africans, and the difficulty that the Labor Party in Israel had in forming a government in April 1990); almost total segregation, either by means of law and/or tradition and practice, in terms of lifestyle, social interaction, education, health, housing, and so on, of the indigenous inhabitants from the immigrants, which results in a superior standard of living for the immigrants and an inferior one for the indigenous; creation of large reserves euphemistically termed "homelands" or "administered territories" in which reside the indigenous, to be called upon when needed to provide cheap labor and other resources to the immigrant-dominated economy; creation of religious mythologies and revisions of history by immigrant intellectuals to sustain and justify immigrant domination of the indigenous; respect for democratic rights of all, but only within the immigrant communities, and only as long as none of them challenge the status quo; increasing isolation with respect to the international community—not counting the United States and a number of Western nations which have helped to underwrite the continued monopoly of power by the immigrants; (h) the loss of those among the most talented and resourceful within the immigrant communities to the West through emigration; and the historical displacement of the indigenous through violence and/or subterfuge as a result of their inability to combat the immigrants—given the immigrants' technological, economic and military superiority relative to the indigenous peoples.[41]

The difference between South Africa and Israel, however, was that while both considered themselves as outposts of civilization in a sea of savagery and terrorism—hence the justification for the recurrent flagrant violations of international law on their part through activities such as invading neighboring countries and master-minding murders and assassinations of people they considered as their enemies—Israel, unlike South Africa, prided itself in being a nation founded on the principle of combating racism by providing sanctuary to its victims, the Jewish people. As Harris (1984) explains:

> Israel is unique because it prides itself as a refuge for a particular ethno-religious group, which itself has been the victim of prejudice, persecution, and massacre. That this long-suffering Jewish people has established a national homeland of its own is frequently heralded as a "good thing," but the reality that another people had to be subordinated, repressed, or driven out is ignored or rationalized. Hence the suggestion that there are increasing internal similarities between South Africa and Israel may horrify the friends of the Jewish state because it challenges the popular wisdom of Israel as a peaceful democratic society threatened by terrorists and aggressors.

There are two other examples that illustrate this national amnesia, among Jews, concerning the usurpation of the birth rights of others. Stevens (1973: 35) in a lengthy article that documents the development of a personal friendship between Jan Christian Smuts, the well-known prime minister of South Africa, and Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader and first president of Israel, observes that during the entire thirty-three years of this friendship, "extending from 1917 to Smuts' death in 1950, both men took for granted the moral legitimacy of each other's respective position."[42] He explains:

> Thus not a word is to be found in Weizmann's correspondence or writing questioning the racial basis of the South African state on which Zionism was so dependent or Smuts' own role in upholding its racist system. Similarly, Smuts assumed without question "the right" of Jewish settlers to occupy Palestine without regard to

the rights of the indigenous Palestinian Arabs. In both cases, Smuts and Weizmann projected at the highest level the capacity of western civilization to rationalize domination and exploitation, conquest and control as Christian civilizing mission or ethnocentric Judeo-Christian fulfillment.

In a book written not too long ago, Lewis Feuer (1986), presenting his case for the principle of the "white man's burden" (of "civilizing" the black people of the world)—albeit, not surprisingly, that is not what he calls it, he prefers the term "progressive imperialism"—he talks of the important role that Jews have played in South Africa on behalf of "progressive imperialism." Hence he mentions with unreserved approval Jews such as the following as constituting "among the greatest, the most enterprising, and the most constructive of the South African imperialists": Alfred Beit, George Albu, Lionel Phillips, Barney Barnato, T. B. Kisch, Harry Mosenthal, Nathaniel Isaacs, Isaac Baumann, Sigmund Hammerschlag, Solly Wolf, Jack Moel, Morris Marcus, Alfred Mosley, Sigmund Neumann, Ezrael Lazarus, and so on. (See also Hotz 1976.) To Feuer (1987: 74–80) these men, who were among the leading diamond and gold mineowners, industrialists, farmers, and merchants in South Africa toward the end of the nineteenth century, were not usurpers of African rights or racist exploiters of Africans, but harbingers of progressive imperialism in South Africa, which he defined as "one in which energies are liberated for the advancement of civilization and creative activity."[43] That Africans became the victims of this imperialism, losing their land of birth and their rights wholesale to foreign invaders in exchange for untold suffering, misery and pain that continued well into the 1980s was of no consequence to him.

THE ANTIAPARTHEID STRUGGLE IN THE 1980S

The Israeli alliance with South Africa received a boost of strength with the election of Ronald Reagan to the U.S. presidency in 1980. For both the Israelis and South Africa his election was a very welcome development because it meant that they could engage in such brazen activities as invading neighboring countries without the fear of provoking U.S. condemnation. For, unlike Jimmy Carter, Reagan was no supporter of international human rights or even international law for that matter (Kochler 1984; Stohl 1988). And sure enough it is during the presidency of Reagan that both the Israelis and SAAG undertook some of their most well-publicized, large-scale, but highly illegal foreign military adventures: for example, the invasion of Lebanon by the Israelis, and the invasion of Mozambique and Angola by SAAG, with the consequent loss of thousands of innocent lives and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property in the countries that were invaded. Yet, paradoxically, it is during the presidency of Ronald Reagan that some of the most severe external pressure was put on South Africa, as a result of activities such as those organized under the banner of what came to be known as the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM) by the leadership of TransAfrica.

Why was there this pronounced resurgence of U.S. African American interest in South Africa in the 1980s? It was, in a large measure, due to the ability of U.S. African Americans to respond to events within South Africa in a highly organized way—thanks to the election of many U.S. African Americans to public offices in the government and the legislature at both state and federal levels. What were these events? Specifically, the well-publicized rebellion in African townships in 1985 which would lead to the declaration of a state of emergency by SAAG and yet another round of brutal repression. The rebellion, and the corresponding state terror unleashed by the Botha government, helped to galvanize antiapartheid activities in the United States and elsewhere.

The rebellion itself was part of a now well-established endemic pattern of a new type of African resistance to apartheid that began around the mid-seventies. For, during the period between the mounting of passive resistance by Africans, culminating in the brutal Sharpeville Massacre on March 21, 1960 and the mid-1970s, it would appear that the repressive machinery of the apartheid state had managed to eliminate African resistance once and for all. In a sense they had because the older generation of Africans, who had seen the antiapartheid struggle they had mounted in their younger days crushed with the proscription of the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress in 1960, coupled with the life imprisonment of their prominent leaders (such as Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu) in 1964, had almost come to terms with their defeat.[44] As a prominent and influential young black leader, who would later be beaten to death by the South African police, while in their custody, by the name of Steve Biko, observed: "the type of black man we have today has lost his manhood. Reduced to an obliging shell, he looks with awe at the white power structure. … In the

privacy of his toilet his face twists in silent condemnation of white society but brightens up in sheepish obedience as he comes out hurrying in response to his master's impatient call. … His heart yearns for the comfort of white society and makes him blame himself for not having been "educated" enough to warrant such luxury" (From Lodge 1983: 325)It is during this period that South Africa saw a massive transfusion of capital and technology from the West, including the United States, and a consequent massive outflow of profits derived from the exploitation of apartheid determined super-cheap black labor. It was as if an open season had been declared by Western transnational corporations on exploiting the black person in South Africa. In reaping the benefits of its repression, the apartheid state, however, had overlooked the black younger generation, much in the same way that the Israeli state had overlooked the Palestinian youths who would also launch their own rebellion, the *Intifada.*

Hence, in 1976 the Euro-South Africans were given a rude awakening with the explosion of the Soweto Uprising heralding a new phase in the antiapartheid struggle: a phase in which the young would recklessly, but courageously, be willing to fight enemy bullets with stones—thereby begin paving the path to freedom with their very lives, much in the same way that others before them had done in history all over the world in their own struggles for freedom. What had produced this courage among the young, especially considering that, at least on the surface, they had been shielded from politicization given that all organized black political activities had long been banned by the apartheid state? In a significant measure it was due to the military coup in Portugal in 1974, which itself had come about as a result of the armed liberation struggles in Africa.[45] One consequence of the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire was the politicization of the African youth in South Africa. They were witness to a momentous victory of African peoples right on their doorstep. What the white man for centuries had said was impossible for Africans to achieve had become possible by means of their own struggle. This politicization created among them a resolve to confront the apartheid regime, each time an opportunity arose. One such opportunity was the confrontation between them and the regime over the issue of the language of instruction in schools. African students did not want to be taught in the language (Afrikaans) of the much-disliked ruling white segment, the Afrikaners; instead they wished to continue to be taught in English. The result was a rebellion that left many school children dead but helped to raise the political consciousness of African youths and helped prepare the way for subsequent rebellions, including the one in 1985/86.[46] It is these endemic rebellions by the young that helped to focus world attention once again on South Africa and at the same time motivated progressive U.S. African Americans in the United States to organize the FSAM.

The movement, explains Nesbitt (2004) in his well-researched study of the role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. antiapartheid movement, began on November 22, 1984 when, following an invitation the day before by the SAAG ambassador to the United States, Bernadus G. Fourie, to four prominent U.S. African American leaders (Mary Frances Berry, Walter Fauntroy, Eleanor Holmes Norton, and Randall Robinson), for discussions about the state of U.S. relations with South Africa, Berry, Fauntroy, and Robinson announced the formation of FSAM.[47] The four had accepted the invitation, gone to the consulate, and a little later staged a sit-in that led to the arrest and a night in jail for the three who announced the Movement. Norton escaped arrest because she had gone out to brief the press on the sit-in, explaining that until the apartheid system was dismantled and all political prisoners freed, the sit-in by the three inside the consulate would continue. The FSAM soon mushroomed beyond Washington; daily demonstrations and sit-ins were organized in a number of major U.S. cities across the country, targeting SAAG consulates, and businesses with prominent connections with South Africa (including even coin shops that sold Krugerrands) in which well-known leaders and opinion-makers, including many Euro-Americans, became involved.

If there is one major tangible achievement that one could point to as a result of the antiapartheid activities of the FSAM, then it was, undoubtedly, the passage of the *Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act* in 1986 by Congress. For, while the origins of the Act itself had a history that was much longer than that of the FSAM, the crucial point is that without the movement it is doubtful that Congress would have had the resolve to override Reagan's presidential veto of the Act when it was initially passed. Within less than four years of the passage of the Act, Nelson Mandela and his colleagues would be released from imprisonment, the ANC and other proscribed organizations would be allowed to come out of the shadows as legal entities, and negotiations would commence for a free and democratic South Africa. Among this whirlwind set of events in 1990, the triumphant tour of the United

States by Nelson Mandela would undoubtedly represent for U.S. African Americans a tangible proof that radical change toward freedom was, at last, under way in South Africa; Bishop Henry McNeal Turner would have been pleased.

Mandela and his entourage arrived at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York on June 20, 1990 to begin his eleven-day tour of the United States that would take him to eight cities across the country (six of which, as Nesbitt reminds us, were headed by black mayors) and it would be filled with speeches, meetings, fund-raisers and media interviews. The city of New York, home to one of the largest populations of U.S. African Americans in the United States, and with a U.S. African American mayor, David N. Dinkins, at the helm, was especially vociferous in its welcome; to quote Nesbitt (2004: 160): "Seven hundred and fifty thousand New Yorkers lined Broadway for a ticker-tape parade, usually reserved for returning war heroes and sports teams.… That night a hundred thousand people jammed Harlem's Africa Square to hear Mandela speak at the same podium where Malcolm X had called on the South African government to release him two decades before." He continues, "New York also honored the ANC leader with a rally, attended by eighty thousand, at Yankee stadium. … Introducing Mandela, the equally legendary Harry Belafonte said that there had never been a voice more identified with freedom." Whether the jubilant U.S. African American crowds that greeted Mandela at every stop on his tour were conscious of it or not, in a sense, Mandela's visit represented a fitting tribute to the words of Amilcar Cabral, one of Africa's brilliant theoreticians and revolutionary strategist of the twentieth century, who in a quiet and informal talk with U.S. African Americans on his last trip to the United States (shortly before his dastardly assassination by the Portuguese secret police), would state:

> I am bringing to you—our African brothers and sisters of the United States—the fraternal salutations of our people in assuring you we are very conscious that all in this life concerning you also concerns us. If we do not pronounce words that clearly show this, it doesn't mean that we are not conscious of it. … We try to understand your situation in this country. You can be sure that we realize the difficulties you face, the problems you have and your feelings, your revolts, and also your hopes. We think that our fighting for Africa against colonialism and imperialism is a proof of understanding of your problem and also a contribution for the solution of your problems in this continent. Naturally the inverse is also true. All the achievements toward the solution of your problems here are real contributions to our own struggle. (Africa Information Service 1973: 76)

It is now over a decade and a half since Mandela's first visit to the United States, and South Africa is well into the post-apartheid era. Anecdotal evidence suggests that South Africa today is fast becoming for U.S. African Americans, after Ghana, the next most popular African country to visit. But contradictions abound; as Johnson (2004: vii) has observed, many visiting U.S. African Americans unaware of the realities of post-apartheid South Africa, return home thinking that they had indeed visited the promised land; to use his words: "a place much like [the United States] but where Martin Luther King had become president." Of course, it would be unfair to suggest that all are taken in by some of the superficial resemblances. One such indication is the philanthropic work by the Oprah Winfrey Foundation (an organization founded by the highly popular U.S. African American TV show host Oprah Winfrey), which, among its projects in South Africa, opened on January 2, 2007 the newly built *Oprah Winfrey Leadership Academy for Girls*—a 450-student all-girl boarding high school for academically gifted students from low-income families. Yet, even here there is some aura of unrealism; in her commendable bid to offer the resident students the best that money could buy (indicated by the mild controversy over providing 300-thread-count bedding sheets), a simple fact slipped by: that, in a country of mass poverty, if it hadn't been for this extravagant lavishness perhaps two schools could have been built for the same amount of money. Instead, the argument became one of whether black girls deserve as much pampering as white girls would presumably get. Clearly, the various strands that represent the Pan-Africanist sentiment in the United States, continue to have their work cut out for them as we look past the first decade of the twenty-first century.

EPILOGUE: THE POLITICS OF THE AFRICAN DIASPORA

Over the past two decades or so, indicative of the progress toward greater maturity of the field of U.S. African American Studies (U.S.), the traditional focus on a compartmentalized and geographically parochial approach to the field (U.S. African American literature, U.S. African American history, U.S. African American music, and so on) is increasingly giving way to consideration of specific issues/themes with a broader geographic focus in which the researcher's palette is the entire African diaspora itself and where a comparative approach emphasizing transgeographic interconnectedness

is a constant drumbeat.[48] In one sense, this is not an entirely new approach in that it is an echo of the Pan-Africanist leanings of the precursors of the field: Marcus Garvey, W. E. B. Du Bois, C. L. R. James, and so on. Be that as it may, it is a welcome development, not because it may pander (at least in the minds of some) to a renewed romanticization of Pan-Africanism but because it affords one with the kind of originality, cogency, clarity, and vibrancy of issues and questions that the traditional parochially focused approach has been palpably lacking (symptomatic of which has been its increasing marginalization in academe—albeit hastened, no doubt, by residual white racism—to a variant of "ethnic studies" of questionable scholarly merit, and equally questionable academic value).

Taking the cue, then, from this major ongoing transformation in the field, it behooves one to explicitly bring together—albeit summarily, given the space limitations of what is already a fairly lengthy work—as a "package" the theoretical insights that emerge from the historical record as presented in the pages of this work (most, though not all, of which have already been hinted at along the way) on the matter of the Diasporic relations between peoples of African ancestry in the United States and in Southern Africa. As has been indicated, though only implicitly, what the record demonstrates is that any comprehensive and cogent study of this subject will perforce run up against the daunting challenge of comprehending these relations in the *totality* of their immense complexity—as manifest by, at the very least, two interrelated sets of theoretical considerations: one concerning perceptions, and the other concerning the U.S. foreign-policy-making process generally, as well as in relation to Africa, specifically:

- The perception of Africa by U.S. African Americans as a function of historical nostalgia—in part engendered by the racially determined torment of U.S. African Americans as second-class citizens (both de jure and de facto) by U.S. white society.
- The perception of Africa by U.S. African Americans as a function of the perception of Africa in the broader U.S. society (and the world generally).
- The perception of U.S. African Americans from the other side; that is by Africans on the continent.
- The role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process as a function of the degree of integration of U.S. African Americans (and other minorities) into the U.S. polity (e.g., representation in the U.S. Congress).
- The role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process as a function of the degree of white racism permeating U.S. foreign policy generally vis-à-vis the PQD world.
- The role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process as a function of the degree of general acceptability of ethnic-based pressure-group politics in the foreign-policy-making arena.
- The role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process as a function of the white-determined U.S. foreign policy agenda central to a given period (e.g., the First World War, the Second World War, the cold war, the Vietnam War, and the ongoing so-called "war on terror.")
- The role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process as a function of their relations with other ethnic groups in U.S. society (e.g., Cuban Americans, Irish Americans, Jewish Americans, U.S. Latino Americans).
- The role of U.S. African Americans in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process as a function of class differences within the U.S. African American community (e.g., interests represented by Jesse Jackson versus interests represented by Condoleezza Rice).

There is another issue we must also raise here: that to the degree that one may discern a "national identity" among the African diaspora in the United States (itself a debatable point), it is, it appears, a subtextual function of the marginality of Africa and the diaspora both globally and locally (United States). To explain by means of a thought experiment: imagine that the largest contingent of the diaspora in the world, that resident in the United States, was fully and genuinely integrated into U.S. society (at all levels, economic, political, etc.) what then would be the nature of the diasporic consciousness and what would that mean for the national identity of the U.S. African diaspora. Compare here the diaspora in South America (e.g., Brazil)—it appears to lack the kind of diasporic consciousness that exists in the United States. In other words, to quote Patterson and Kelley (2000: 19), "we must always keep in mind that diasporic identities are socially and historically constituted, reconstituted, and reproduced; and that any sense of a collective identity among black peoples in the New World [sic], Europe, and Africa is contingent and constantly shifting." What is even more telling is their conclusion in the same breath that, "[n]either the fact of blackness nor shared experiences under racism nor the historical process of their dispersal makes for community or even a common identity."[49] What this point also implies is that in recounting in the preceding pages the extent and significance of U.S. African American involvement in the U.S. antiapartheid movement, as well as in efforts to shape U.S. foreign policy toward South Africa during the apartheid era, it is im-

portant to stress the danger of romanticizing this involvement as a durable expression of a vibrant Pan-Africanism among U.S. African Americans.

The sad truth is that except for South Africa (and Liberia in the past) it has been notoriously difficult, historically and up to the present, to excite the vast majority of the rank and file to take an even passing interest in other parts of Africa, even though the continent has been racked, in the postindependence era, by a host of newsworthy tragedies—consider, for example: the kleptocratic and brutal warlordism in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Uganda; the disintegration of Somalia; the genocide in Rwanda; the civil wars in Angola, Algeria, and southern Sudan; and most recently the genocidal ethnic cleansing in the Darfur region of Sudan and the slowly unfolding implosion in Zimbabwe (and to add to all this the HIV/AIDS pandemic that is ravaging large parts of the continent). Moreover, anecdotal evidence suggests that the level of ignorance of basic geographical, historical, and political facts about Africa—of the order that one would expect even children at the primary school level to know—is nothing less than shocking. Should it be surprising then that even when U.S. African Americans have managed to break into the U.S. foreign-policy-making machine at the highest levels (reference here is, for example, to the Secretaries of State Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice) Africa has remained essentially a sideshow in U.S. foreign policy calculations (in fact, now even more so than during the cold war era).[50] Against this backdrop, whether it is the circumscribed Du Boisan "double-consciousness" project of Paul Gilroy (1993) or the more expansive Pan-Africanism of Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael) and others will always remain, most sadly, a mirage. Yet, on the other hand, one must not be dismissive of the silver lining in the dark clouds that their thinking represents: the dream is not dead (and without dreams, one cannot conceive of alternative futures).

NOTES

1. See Shaw (2004) on what these concepts imply.

2. Among the sources that have proved particularly helpful in preparing this first half of the chapter, which the reader is strongly encouraged to consult for more on the issues and events covered here, are: Anthony (2006), Culverson (1999), Hostetter (2006), Lauren (1988), Massie (1997), Nesbitt (2004), and White (1981). Note also that this chapter is best read in conjunction with Chapters 10 and 14.

3. See also Brits (2005) who looks at the even more forthright effort by India, in 1952, to force the United Nations to deal squarely with the matter of apartheid and unsuccesfully relied on the United States for support in this effort.

4. Tragically, despite the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi, India continues to perpetrate massive human rights violations against its ethnic and religious minorities—thanks to the recent rise of such super-jingoistic political parties as the Bharatiya Janata Party that champions Hindu nationalism (Hindutva) above all else. (See, for example, Andersen [1998], and Human Rights Watch [2002, 2007].)

5. The report (Du Bois 1947) was titled *An Appeal to the World: A Statement on the Denial of Human Rights to Minorities in the Case of Citizens of Negro Descent in the United States of America and an Appeal to the United Nations for Redress.*

6. Similarly, consider also this powerful (and prophetic) message that Robeson sent to the ANC on the occasion of its 42nd Annual Conference:

> There should be, and must be, much closer and stronger bonds between us because of the very nature of our common struggle for human decency and dignity, for the welfare and freedom of all men, and for an enduring peace based upon democratic cooperation among all peoples. I shall continue to do all that I can toward the strengthening of these bonds and toward the final achievement of these goals. …
> I know that I am ever by your side, that I am deeply proud that you are my brothers and sisters and nephews and nieces - that I sprang from your forebears. We come from a mighty, courageous people, creators of great civilizations in the past, creators of new ways of life in our own time and in the future. We shall win our freedoms together. Our folk will have their place in the ranks of those shaping human destiny. (From "Paul Robeson's Message to the Conference of the African National Congress" published in the *New Age* [Cape Town, December 23, 1954] and available at the ANC website, www. anc.org.za)

7. Yergan, would (beginning around 1947), sadly, undergo a public reversal in political beliefs and consequently he would come to play a very reactionary role on issues relating to freedom of the African peoples. See Anthony's very revealing biography (2006) of him in which he documents this reversal while apologetically suggesting that, perhaps, it was an outcome of irresistible pressures accompanying the onset of McCarthyism exerted on him by "the CIA, the FBI, and the weight of McCarthy and McCarran." He explains:

> It is likely that by then Yergan feared not only for himself but also for his children, and for them he was willing to sacrifice anything and everything, even if it meant denouncing and being denounced by progressive Africa. His junkets from then on, on behalf of the AFL-CIO, the South Africa Foundation, the Belgian Congo, and later the Portuguese, Rhodesian, and

again South African governments, were all related to this campaign to protect by drawing fire as a "point man" for counterrevolution.… Because of the covert nature of the federal campaign against him, however, it is difficult to determine just what made Yergan leave the struggle to which he had dedicated his life. (pp. 275, 276).

8. A common strategy of ultra-conservatives and conservative liberals throughout the post-World War II U.S. history had been to brand all legitimate liberation movements in the PQD countries as the work of the then Soviet Union. Given the racist inclinations of many of these people this perhaps made sense. In their eyes black people were too dumb to realize on their own that they were victims of racist oppression, or to determine for themselves how to do deal with it; hence they needed a country such as the Soviet Union to expose them to their oppression and show them how to fight it.

It should be noted that many liberals (and many among the white Left as well), even while loudly professing to be against racism, were (and even today are) unable to outgrow their racist upbringing. If not intellectually, politically and socially at least their actions often betrayed the racism that had been ingrained into their psyche through a process of lifelong socialization by a deeply racist society. To put it differently: these people could be best described as "anti-racist racists." It is with reference to this type of people that Garvey once stated that the Southern white was to be preferred because he was at least candid about his racism. As Garvey explained: "I would rather be awakened to face a danger by a slap in the face than lulled to sleep by being told that I am secure from harm" (from Garvey 1963: 167). In other words, Garvey was suggesting, and correctly so as blacks in the North have found out, that most white liberals, when push comes to shove, are quite likely to slit your throat while at the same time singing you a lullaby. (See also, along this line of reasoning, the work by Bonilla-Silva [2006] on the subject of what he calls "color-blind racism.")

9. Since the publication of Lauren's work, several others have emerged with more detailed documentation of what one of them (Dudziak 2000) has termed as "cold war civil rights." See, for example, Borstelmann (2001), Plummer (1996), Rosenberg (2006), and Von Eschen (1997).

10. Nkrumah, once commenting on the significance to him of Garvey's work, would observe: "I think that of all the literature I studied the book that did more than any other to fire my enthusiasm was the *Philosophy of Marcus Garvey* published by his wife" (from Lewis 1988: 194).

11. Ghana is often presented as the first African country to achieve independence from colonial rule, and certainly Nkrumah and others (including those in the African diaspora saw it that way too). Yet, at least four other African countries had achieved independence before Ghana: Libya (in 1951), Morocco (in 1956), Sudan (in 1956), and Tunisia (in 1956). The problem however was that then (as today) there was reluctance to see these countries as authentically African, given their historic connections with the so-called Middle East. The roots of this kind of essentialist perception lay in much of Western writing on Africa that divided the continent into North Africa and Sub-Saharan (or black) Africa, even in the absence of a geographic division, and then proceeded to deny that North Africa could be legitimately considered as part of the African continent; instead, they asserted that it was part of the Middle East. The most obvious example of this approach had been, until very recently, the highly unwarranted excision of the Egyptian civilization from African history. However, it is not only Westerners who succumbed to this view; many within Africa itself (both north of the Sahara and south of the Sahara) also concurred—and continue to do so—with this artificial bifurcation of the continent. The truth is that just as Eastern Europe is both part of Asia and part of Europe, North Africa too belongs to both sides, the African side and the Middle Eastern Side. It is not simply that geography dictates that North Africa be considered part of Africa, but culture and history as well. For if modern African culture is a fusion of Western and African cultures, then the only differentiating factor that separates modern North African culture from modern sub-Saharan African culture is that modern North African culture incorporates a third culture: Arabic Islamic culture. Yes, it is true that Arabic is not an indigenous African language, any more than English, French, or Portuguese is, even though its arrival in Africa precedes the others by over 1,000 years—a long enough period to shed its tramontane status. On the other hand, one could challenge this statement by suggesting, as Mazrui (1986) does, that from a geographic point of view the Arabic peninsula ought to be considered part of Africa; and therefore from this perspective Arabic is not a foreign language. However, the fact that this is not how the peninsula is usually seen today is a function of Western engineering (the Suez Canal) and Western domination of world cartography.

Of course, at the heart of the definitional problem is the matter of race, not geography; that is, the racism of the West—which has always sought to create racial hierarchies (positing peoples defined as black at the bottom and those defined as white at the top and the rest in between)—combined with the mutual racism of the Afro-Arabs and Africans themselves is at the root of the matter. To elaborate, racism in any society creates hierarchies within which there is a struggle among the subordinates to identify with the dominant (even though they are all victimized, albeit to varying degrees, by the racism of the dominant group); moreover, it is a struggle that is encouraged by the dominant group—representing a divide-and-rule strategy. Classic examples of this phenomenon at work can be found in the United States; consider, for instance, that in that country North African Arabs are classified "white," or the fact that lighter complexioned blacks have, historically, tended to fare (relatively) better than their darker-skinned brethren. However, what is true of individual societies is also true at the global level. See, for instance, the discussion by Hawkins (2003) on how Tunisians see themselves, relative to Sub-Saharan Africa (which can be summarized in one sentence: they are in Africa but they are not of Africa), and one suspects that the Tunisian perspective is replicated all over Afro-Arab Islamic Africa, including, ironically, Sudan—a country where more than anywhere else in Afro-Arab Islamic Africa most of its Arab population had long merged genetically with the indigenous African population (notwithstanding the insistence by the ruling classes in Khartoum that they are Arabs and not Africans). In fact, with reference to the Sudan, the situation there has become so bizarre, that "peoples who have virtually no Arab 'blood' call themselves Arab by virtue of an adopted lineage that they trace symbolically to the family of the Prophet or to important Arab dynasties and tribes" in order to gain a higher social status (Lesch 1998: 211). (From this perspective, the current conflict in Darfur,

perpetrated by so-called "Arabs" on co-religionist Afro-Africans [for want of a better term] is most bizarre indeed—unless one sees it as a conflict involving ethnicity and not race.) There is probably no Afro-Arab leader today, with the exception, perhaps, of Libya's Muammar al-Qaddhafi, who shares Nasser's vision of being both Pan-Arab and Pan-African at one and the same time. To complicate matters even further, in Afro-Arab Islamic Africa, the more than thousand year presence of Arabs in that region has led to considerable intermingling with original populations (e.g., Berbers and Afro-Africans). Consequently, from a purely phenotypical perspective, Arabs (like African Americans in the United States, for instance) range across a diverse hue, so much so that in some parts, they are completely indistinguishable from either black Africans or Berbers.

12. See, for example, Massie (1997) on the kinds of racially-inspired difficulties that diplomats from the newly independent African nations faced in the United States.

13. Charles Coles Diggs, Jr. was a remarkable individual by all counts who at the age of thirty-one became (in 1954) the first U.S. African American to represent Michigan in the history of that state in the U.S. Congress. Following his appointment to the chairship of the House subcommittee on Africa he used his authority to do everything he could to influence U.S. policy on South Africa by holding hearings, organizing study trips, commissioning studies, and so on. Most regrettably, his illustrious career would come to an end when he had to resign from Congress in June 1980, following a conviction for financial malfeasance. Fortunately, there were others among the Congressional Black Caucus, such as Representative William H. Gray III, who would continue to push for change in U.S. foreign policy. (See Massie [1997] for more on the role of both in the U.S. antiapartheid effort.)

14. Among the congressional publications that emerged out of these activities include the following two: *The Faces of Africa: Diversity and Progress; Repression and Struggle—Report of Special Study Missions to Africa.* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printer 1972); and *U.S. Business Involvement in Southern Africa—Hearings before the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Third Congress, First Session.* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printer 1973)

15. See Schecter (1971) and Massie (1997), for more on the Movement.

16. It may be noted here that the Polaroid business was channeled through an independent distributor in South Africa, Frank and Hirsch, and it was worth approximately $1.5 million annually, constituting one half of one percent of the company's total revenues.

17. In one sense capitalists are correct that morality does not mix with business. Religion and philosophy are the domains of morality. Capitalism is about exploiting labor and resources in whatever possible for purposes of accumulation, nothing more. Morality therefore has no place within the system—unless it is directly in the service of the search for profits.

18. Regardless of what one may have thought about the "Sullivan Principles," it must be conceded that the author, given the time period, as Massie (1997) shows us, was unquestionably a remarkable individual. He would move from his poverty-stricken childhood in Charleston, West Virginia, through a gritty personal resolve—in part motivated by witnessing the inability of his grandmother to afford much-needed medical care and who exhorted him "Leonie, help your people, and don't let this kind of thing happen to anybody else" (p. 288)— to become at the age of twenty-eight the pastor of the African American Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia in 1950. Taking his church from one with a six hundred member congregation to one with five thousand, he along the way became thoroughly immersed in the task of trying to open economic doors for his congregants against the backdrop of the accelerating civil rights movement—his weapon of choice: the economic boycott of selected businesses (which he labeled "selective patronage") beginning in 1960, followed by a few years later the development of vocational training centers known as Opportunities Industrialization Centers, of which the first opened its doors in January 1964 in Philadelphia. Given the times, it is important to emphasize that these were nothing less than revolutionary initiatives. It is with this background of jobs-oriented grass-roots community activism that Sullivan eventually made his way, at the age of forty-nine, to the boardroom of one of the biggest U.S. corporations, General Motors. The appointment came in 1970—after the Chairman of General Motors James Roche had gone to meet with him in Philadelphia because Sullivan was too busy to come to New York as Roche had first suggested—and he attended his first board meeting on January 1, 1971 at which he quickly let other board members know that while he was not an economist and that he was simply a pastor, his interest in justice that his calling demanded, meant that he was "particularly interested in training programs and in black dealerships and in black and other minority employment opportunities at General Motors plants and among General Motors vendors and producers" (p. 293). Why did Roche want an African American (in this case Sullivan) to be on its board of directors? The answer is that it was part of an effort to deal with the rising tide of sentiment among some activist shareholders that U.S. corporations needed to be responsive to such concerns of the shareholders as human rights, racial justice, the environment, and so on, and expressed (in the specific case of General Motors) with the launch of Campaign GM by a group of young activist lawyers in 1970. The legal basis for the right of shareholders to make such demands on corporations had been established in the same year when Judge Edward Allen Tamm of the federal appellate court for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in favor of a group of physicians called the Medical Committee on Human Rights who had brought a lawsuit (*Human Rights v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 432 F.2d 659 [D.C. Cir. 1970]) against the Dow Chemical Company regarding shareholder proxy resolutions:

> We think that there is a clear and compelling distinction between management's legitimate need for freedom to apply its expertise in matters of day-to-day business judgment, and management's patently illegitimate claim of power to treat modern corporations with their vast resources as personal satrapies implementing personal political or moral predilections. It could scarcely be argued that management is more qualified or more entitled to make these kinds of decisions than the shareholders who are the true beneficial owners of the corporation; and it seems equally implausible that an application of the proxy rules which permitted such a result could be harmonized with the philosophy of corporate democracy which Congress embodied in section 14(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

For the executives of General Motors, Massie pointedly observes, "[t]he challenge… was to find someone who had sufficient standing in the black community to neutralize criticisms of the corporation yet who could be counted on to understand and support the basic principles of capitalism" (p. 287). For General Motors (as well as other major corporations doing business in South Africa) the problem was not simply of weathering what it must have initially thought was a tempest in a teapot unleashed by a bunch of misguided young radicals, together with a few churchmen, but the arrival on the scene of even such stodgy shareholder outfits as the huge financially influential institutional investor Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association, better known by its acronym as TIAA-CREF, in support of ethical investing convinced it that this matter was simply not going to go away. (It may be noted that initially TIAA-CREF was against disinvestment but in favor of ameliorative actions at workplaces but by around 1986 it was firmly in support of disinvestment. By this point its total assets amounted close to a staggering fifty billion dollars; in other words it had sufficient clout to make U.S. corporations sit up and listen.) As it turned out that the choice of Sullivan proved to be an astute one, though this may not have seemed to be so to Roche and his associates at the beginning. As already indicated, although Sullivan would later backtrack, initially he agreed with those antiapartheid activists who were demanding U.S. disinvestment from South Africa, including in this instance the withdrawal of General Motors from that country. What is more, he made his opinion on the matter public, to the great consternation of fellow board members, when breaking both rank and precedent he spoke at his first annual shareholder meeting of the corporation (convened on May 21, 1971 in Detroit) in support of a resolution asking for the withdrawal brought by the Episcopal Church. Becoming the first board member ever, according to Massie, to publicly part company with a corporation's policy, Sullivan courageously addressed the more than three thousand attendees stating:

[U.S.] industry cannot morally continue to do business in a country that so blatantly and ruthlessly and clearly maintains such dehumanizing practices against such large numbers of people.… I want to go on record, for all to know, that I will continue to pursue my desire to see that [U.S.] enterprises, including General Motors, withdraw from South Africa until clear changes have been made in the practices, the policies of the government as they pertain to the treatment of blacks and other non-whites.… although I know the position I take will lose today, you can be sure that I shall continue to pursue it tomorrow until black people in South Africa are free. (From Massie 1997: 294)

19. Another prominent U.S. African American leader who also reversed his position was Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP. He underwent a change of heart—after supping at a number of European tables in South Africa in 1972, it would appear—and proclaimed his opposition to the 1966 NAACP resolution calling upon the U.S. government to declare a moratorium on U.S. investment in South Africa.

20. These principles, in brief, were as follows: "1. Nonsegregation of the races in all eating, comfort and work facilities; 2. Equal and fair employment practices for all employees; 3. Equal pay for all employees doing equal or comparable work for the same period of time; 4. Initiation of and development of training programs that will prepare, in substantial numbers, blacks and other nonwhites for supervisory, administrative, clerical and technical jobs; 5. Increasing the number of blacks and other nonwhites in management and supervisory positions; 6. Improving the quality of employee's lives outside the work environment in such areas as housing, schooling, recreation and health facilities" (Sullivan 1985: 383–86).

21. Interestingly, the Sullivan Principles still live on today in the form of the Global Sullivan Principles of Social Responsibility—they were first introduced in November 1999 with the purpose of bringing, as the name suggests, corporate responsibility to the global arena (see the Leon H. Sullivan Foundation website at www.thesullivanfoundation.org).

22. Here are a few excerpts from the Manifesto (available in its entirety at the ANC website, www.anc.org.za):

- There comes a moment in the affairs of humankind when honor requires an unequivocal affirmation of a people's right to freedom with dignity and peace with justice.
- This is such a moment. The intransigence of white settlers in Zimbabwe and Namibia and the bloody repression of blacks in South Africa have created explosive environments which threaten world peace and raise the specter of an internationalized anticolonial war which could have an ominous impact on race relations in America and abroad.
- Inaction in the face of such a threat is betrayal of our future—betrayal of humanity, betrayal of the long line of black men and women who have given their lives in the struggle for freedom. Conscious of our duty to speak, and recognizing our responsibilities to humanity and to the revolutionary ideals of our forebears, we, the descendants of Africa, meeting in Washington, D. C., on this 200th anniversary of the first modern war for independence, proclaim our unswerving commitment to immediate self-determination and majority rule in Southern Africa.
- We do this because we are U.S. African Americans, and because we know that the destiny of blacks in America and blacks in Africa is inextricably intertwined, since racism and other forms of oppression respect no territories or boundaries.… [W]e know that blacks in America cannot overcome [racism and oppression] until all African peoples are free in Soweto and in Sydney, in Salisbury and in Sao Paolo, in Windhoek as in Paris, Ottawa and Nottingham are free.…
- The history of our common struggle and recognition that our cause is just have brought us this day to proclaim that:

  (1) We believe South Africa is the main barrier against majority rule in Southern Africa because of its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its refusal to implement economic sanctions against Rhodesia and its unwillingness to share political and economic power with blacks within its own borders.…
  (2) We totally support the liberation of Southern Africa from white minority rule by means of armed struggle, where necessary, and affirm the right of the African liberation movements to seek necessary assistance from whatever sources available to achieve self-determination and majority rule.…
  (3) Negotiations can achieve a genuine peace only when they occur between contending forces.…

(6) We reject any U.S. policy that stresses "Minority Rights" rather than "Human Rights" in Southern Africa, since minority rights in that context implies the preservation of European privilege.…

(9) We urge our government to recognize the People's Republic of Angola and support its admission to the United Nations.…

(10) We condemn the role played by the United States and other foreign corporations and banks, which by their presence and activities collectively have participated in the oppression of blacks and have undergirded the repressive white minority governments of Southern Africa.…

(11) We challenge the Judeo-Christian community, the labor movement, the media and the political, business, and civic leadership in this country to see that our government upholds its values and its historical commitment to self-determination, freedom and justice, and to understand that the appeasement of South Africa can only invite an escalated war that will exacerbate racial tensions in the United States.…

23. It should be pointed out, however, that TransAfrica did not view itself as a U.S. African American counterpart to the Israeli lobby. Hence responding to the question posed by Weil (1974) whether blacks can emulate Jewish-Americans in influencing U.S. foreign policy, TransAfrica stated flatly: "We do not seek to do what they have done. We do not seek to hold American policy or action to ransom in the interest of this or that policy or ambition of any foreign country. We can help lead our country to overcome past inequities and images, and help it to live in harmony and peace, and mutual respect, with the new nations and with those still struggling to be born" (from Jackson 1984: 165). (See also Mearsheimer and Walt [2007] on the nature of the U.S. Israeli lobby.)

24. See Stanford (1997) for more on Jackson's 1986 study tour and its significance in the context of Jackson's "citizen diplomacy" effort.

25. A variant of citizen diplomacy is "track-two diplomacy" where unofficial meetings between interested parties prepares the ground for "track-one" (official) diplomacy in circumstances where one or both belligerents to a conflict does not want to appear to be seen as "giving in" to the "enemy"—see Montville (1991), and Lieberfeld's (2002) application of this concept to the unofficial negotiations that preceded the official (Codesa) negotiations between the ANC and SAAG. (See also Rigby [1995] who looks at the role of citizen diplomacy in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.)

26. If the United States ever elects a black president then it will have to be somebody who can guarantee the preservation of white middle class privileges, but yet still remain popular among blacks too—a very difficult, but not impossible task (witness the election of L. Douglas Wilder to the governorship of Virginia in 1989). Here, compare also the nomination of U.S. African American Barack Obama as the Democratic presidential candidate in the 2008 elections.

27. The term 'hymie" is a derogatory term for Jews derived from the stereotypical Jewish name Hyman.

28. Jackson made a nation-wide apology on the night of July 17, 1984, at the Democratic national convention in San Francisco when he said that if in the low moments of his campaign he had hurt people through some word or deed then it was not his truest self. He then sounded a plea to both Jewish-Americans and U.S. African Americans saying that "We must turn to each other and not on each other and choose higher ground" (from Weisbord and Kazarian 1985: 3). The Jackson debacle raised a more basic issue: With respect to countries such as Australia, Brazil, Britain, Canada, France, Germany, South Africa, the United States and so on, a legitimate question may be asked here is whether such a thing as "black racism" at the structural level (not in terms of interpersonal relations) can really exist given societal contexts where monopoly of power (whatever form it takes) is maintained by whites through racist practices. For, modern racism ultimately implies the power to discriminate against others on the basis of color *such as to permanently affect the life chances of the victims*. Blacks in these societies are not in a position to practice such discrimination (whereas Jews often are). Consequently, when blacks in such racist societies express anger and frustration at their discrimination-determined powerlessness, one must ask whether it is legitimate to describe such behavior as "racist."

29. In fact some gave their lives in the process. Andrew Goodman and Mickey Schwerner were two such activists; they were murdered, together with a U.S. African American activist, James E. Chaney, by racists in Mississippi. Note, however, as musician Archie Shepp once observed, even in death the racists were discriminatory: they mutilated Chaney beyond recognition while sparing the others.

30. Of course this type of color-based paternalism is not unique to those of the Jewish left. Proclaiming that Marxism is inherently anti-racist, because modern racism is a function of the needs of a capitalist order, many white Marxists are often still unable to overcome the burden of their racist upbringing—especially in their day-to-day lives, which invariably must color their general theoretical and political outlook. The truth is that even Marx himself was not above racist portrayals of PQD societies. See, for example, his newspaper articles on the subject—an excellent collection of which are to be found in Avineri (1969).

31. Interestingly, Cruse (1969: 478) in going on to discuss the abolition of slavery issue also states, however, that the neutrality maintained by Jews, as a group (not as individuals), over the issue of slavery was understandable, "considering the hazards involved." Though mention should be made here of the fact that some Jewish-Americans were also involved in the slave trade itself (and some also owned slaves)—see Dinnerstein (1971); Korn (1969); Marcus (1970); and Smythe (1955–1956) for more information on this aspect of Jewish history in the United States. For an insightful study of Jewish views of black people during the period of Jewish involvement with Atlantic slavery see Schorsch (2004).

32. About Young's characterization as a conservative: Newsum and Abegunrin (1987: 19), for example, in a highly perceptive and very convincing study of Young, discussed him thus:

If those black Americans who consider Young a hero would look at history, they would see that Young's new middle class "social movement," like the civil rights movement, will not in the long run benefit the black lower classes, who are in real need of liberation.… What black Americans need to see now is that Young is an agent of petit bourgeois opportunism characterized by status-seeking social climbers and deference politics, manipulated by the corporate elites and a "Dixieland"-style "democrat" (former President Carter).…

Elsewhere in the same work (p. 2) they observed:

Young… represents the final compromise between the black petite bourgeoisie and the white ruling class. On one side of the compromise, the black petite bourgeoisie wants to gain an additional share of the American pie. On the other side, a pseudo liberal section of the white ruling-class elite uses charismatic black personalities such as Andrew Young to take advantage of world sympathy for black Americans and to promote the black American success image in order to entice Africa and the [PQD world] into a web of highly controlled imperialism.

33. About Western reluctance to accept Jewish refugees: Halevi (1987: 150) observes, for example, that even Jews, the ones who were already well established (assimilated) in countries such as the United States and Britain, were reluctant to see their brethren come and join them. Thus the Jews of Williamsburg in the United States would sign a petition at the beginning of the century asking that "folkloric" Jews from Russia not be permitted to settle in the United States—"Whence the classic "definition" of Zionism: an American Jew giving money to a French Jew for a Polish Jew to settle in Palestine," says Halevi.

34. Israel has now come to play the intermediary role between the United States and those heinous governments and organizations that the U.S. public may not be willing to associate with because of either gross violations of human rights of their citizenry and/or other highly nefarious conduct. As Beit-Hallahmi (1987b: 333) explains: "The USA can well appreciate the utility of having Israelis, efficient and enthusiastic, with no public opinion and "human rights" voices to worry about at home, perform the necessary 'strategic duty' for it." Israel's willingness to prostitute itself in the U.S. cause of supporting any regime in the world—no matter how despicable, immoral and illegitimate its rule—that professes to be anti-communist, is well captured in the following statement by an Israeli cabinet minister for economic planning, Jacob Merider: "We will say to the Americans: Don't compete with us in Taiwan; don't compete with us in South Africa; don't compete with us in the Caribbean or in other places where you cannot sell arms directly.… Let us do it. You will sell the ammunition and equipment through an intermediary. Israel will be your intermediary" (from Beit-Hallahmi 1987b: 333. See also the broadcast on U.S. television on May 16, 1989 of "Israel and the United States: The Covert Connection" by the U.S. Public Broadcasting Service as part of its *Frontline* series). This is no less than a gross perversion of the prophecy: "And Israel shall be a light unto the Nations!"

35. See the study by Rabie (1988) that documents how "more than 25% of all U.S. foreign assistance spent over the last two decades went to Israel [and] Israel's share of U.S. grants given to foreign countries has exceeded 50% since 1980," and how this aid has been an important basis for the development of the Israeli economy. For more recent figures and analysis see also Mearsheimer and Walt (2007), and a visit to the well-informed website called If Americans Knew (www. ifamericansknew. org) will also be an eye-opener. (For example, according to the site, in fiscal year 2007 the United States gave the Israelis 6.8 million dollars *daily*, while the comparable figure for Palestinians was 0.3 million dollars).

36. The massive inflow of Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union that began in 1990 had not only added ever-greater pressures on the Israeli state to seek continuation and augmentation of U.S. aid but had forced the Israeli state to unashamedly cast covetous eyes on the West Bank to find land for the new immigrants—thus lending credence to Halevi's observation. What is more, two decades on since his observation, the Israeli strategy of changing the facts on the ground (while talking peace) by a steady usurpation of Palestinian lands continues unabated, as is evidenced, for example, by the latest reiteration (as of this writing in early 2008) of the U.N. position on the matter—expressed by means of U.N. General Assembly Resolution No. A/RES/62/108 (adopted by the 75th plenary session on December 17, 2007 and published on January 10, 2008, titled "Israeli Settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the Occupied Syrian Golan"), which states, inter alia:

- Guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and affirming the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force,
- Recalling its relevant resolutions, including resolution 61/118 of 14 December 2006, as well as those resolutions adopted at its tenth emergency special session,
- Recalling also relevant Security Council resolutions, including resolutions 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, 446 (1979) of 22 March 1979, 465 (1980) of 1 March 1980, 476 (1980) of 30 June 1980, 478 (1980) of 20 August 1980, 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981 and 904 (1994) of 18 March 1994,…
- Noting that the International Court of Justice concluded that "the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (including East Jerusalem) have been established in breach of international law",…
- Expressing grave concern about the continuation by Israel, the occupying Power, of settlement activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, in violation of international humanitarian law, relevant United Nations resolutions and the agreements reached between the parties, and concerned particularly about Israel's construction and expansion of settlements in and around Occupied East Jerusalem, including its so-called E-1 plan, aimed at connecting its illegal settlements around and further isolating Occupied East Jerusalem, and in the Jordan Valley,
- Expressing grave concern also about the continuing unlawful construction by Israel of the wall inside the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem,…
- 1. Reaffirms that the Israeli settlements in the Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan are illegal and an obstacle to peace and economic and social development;…
- 5. Reiterates its demand for the immediate and complete cessation of all Israeli settlement activities in all of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan, and calls for the full implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 465 (1980);
- 6. Demands that Israel, the occupying Power, comply with its legal obligations, as mentioned in the advisory opinion rendered on July 9, 2004 by the International Court of Justice;…

However, arrogantly thumbing its nose at the United Nations (aided and abetted by the United States *to all intents and purposes*), the Israelis announced in late March plans for continued expansion of settlements in occupied East Jerusalem and the West Bank—thereby confirming, once again, that to the Israelis peace is not really in their interest at a time when a state of conflict implies continued access to both U.S. largesse and occupied Palestinian lands.

37. There is, however, a legitimate basis for suggesting that to the degree that Jewish-Americans have become part of the white mainstream they have acquired the same racist sentiments (directed at blacks) as those exhibited by whites in general. Non-racist Jews, especially among the younger generation of Jews, are becoming a rarity. And this is in spite of the fact that white America has not completely given up on its anti-Semitic proclivities.

38. To the Africans, Israel's occupation of a portion of Egyptian territory, and hence African territory, was simply unacceptable. As President Leopold Seder Senghor, himself a sympathizer of the Jewish cause, explained: "Because we share our continent with Arab-Africans, and because we feel that Africa ends at the Sinai, we have been deeply disturbed by the fact that since 1967, a part of Africa has been occupied by an outside power" (from Weisbord and Kazarian 1985: 98). Added to this factor was also the promise by the Arabs of Arab aid to replace Israeli aid; though it never really materialized on a scale that the Africans were led to expect. It should be pointed out here that until the October War, Israel had had generally warm relations with most independent African countries involving extensive Israeli aid quite out of proportion to its size. Ironically, Egyptian rapprochement with the Israelis, coupled with Israel's vacation of Egyptian territory did not spur other African countries, with the exception of those few that had traditionally been staunchly pro-Western, to re-establish relations with Israel. The stumbling block this time was Israel's escalating relations with South Africa. But here too there was a double standard: the Arabs (such as Saudi Arabia) and Africans (such as the Nigerians) never stopped their oil trade with South Africa even though they claimed to support an oil boycott of South Africa.

39. At another time, in an interview with the progressive Jewish magazine *Tikkun*, Jackson would state the following in response to a question put by Michael Lerner (the interviewer); but first the question:

> Let's get back to the double standard question. It turns out, if you study the actual realities of South Africa and military and economic aid, that, number one, a great deal of that military aid comes from Germany and France. But when you listen to most Black Americans, the focus is exclusively on Israel. Similarly, Saudi Arabia plays a major role in economically providing South Africa with oil and with other needed economic benefits, but there isn't any public outcry from Black Americans indicating and publicizing an upset with Arab countries for providing help to South Africa. Isn't there a double standard applied to Jews and to Israel?

Jackson responded to the question by saying:

> Here you have a situation where Israel gets about three billion dollars a year from the United States for three million people. All of Africa, a half billion people, gets one hundred and seventy-nine million dollars. There is a double standard where Israel is the substantial beneficiary and is not resisting that double standard.... Secondly, when the Congressional report came out about selling arms to South Africa [on April 1, 1987], I contacted the embassies of France and Germany and Britain as well, and when I went to Japan, I challenged Japan's expanding role in South Africa.... Whoever is doing business with South Africa is wrong, but Israel is such a substantial beneficiary, Israel is subsidized by America, which includes Black Americans' tax money, and then it subsidizes South Africa. Some of what America cannot do in South Africa directly because of the laws, it is doing through Israel as a conduit. (Jackson, Lerner et al. 1988: 40)

Notice though that implicit in the question put by Lerner was the argument that since others were dealing with SAAG, Israel also had the right to deal with SAAG. But in the area of human rights generally, the universality of the abrogation of these rights does not legitimate one's own similar behavior. All who were providing succor to SAAG had to be condemned, including Israel. Yet, on the other hand, the Israelis and/or their supporters had no right to respond by saying "why are you condemning us, when others are doing it too." The correct response ought to have been "Yes, you are correct; and we shall stop forthwith. Now let us try and get others to stop too."

40. The following is a chronology (based on Joseph 1988: 149–50) of the principal events in the path to the Israeli/South Africa alliance: 1948: South Africa becomes one of the first countries to recognize Israel as a sovereign country; 1953: the first head of state to visit Israel is South Africa's prime minister, Daniel F. Malan; 1971: Israel offers a token contribution to the Organization of African Unity to be used by its Liberation Support Committee, but it is rejected—the gesture, however, precipitates a temporary set-back in Israeli/South African relations; 1973: The October War leads to a break in Israeli relations with most independent African countries, thereby facilitating closer relations between Israel and South Africa; 1976: South Africa's prime minister, John Vorster, visits Israel and signs agreements of cooperation with Israel; 1978: Israeli treasury minister, Simcha Erlich, visits South Africa and proposes that in the event of an economic boycott of South Africa, South Africa use Israel as a means of accessing Western markets; 1979: A mysterious flash in the Indian Ocean is thought by many to be a nuclear test conducted jointly by the Israelis and South Africa; 1985: Izhak Shamir, Israeli foreign minister, tells Jewish-Americans that Israel has no intention of cooling its relations with South Africa, even as the United States begins to exert greater pressure on South Africa; 1987: A few days before a Congressional report is about to reveal that Israel is a major arms supplier to South Africa, Israel announces that it would no longer sign future arms delivery contracts with South Africa (For more information regarding these relations see also Adams 1984, and Beit-Hallahmi 1987.)

41. Even in Israel, says Harris (1984) the first Jewish settlement of the region now occupied by Palestine/Israel in the late second millennium B. C. involved the destruction of towns and villages of the predominant Canaanites and other Semitic peoples, and the conversion of those who survived the battle slaughter into "hewers of wood and drawers of water." Later in the first century AD, however, came the Romans who destroyed the Jewish Kingdom, precipitating the Jewish dispersion throughout the eastern Mediterranean. Those who remained became Christians as the Roman

empire was transformed into the Byzantine empire. It may be noted that in the seventh century another group of Semitic peoples arrived in the Levant and Palestine: the Arabs, who migrated out of the Arabian peninsula. They brought with them Islam which the Palestinians adopted over the next five centuries. The present Jewish settlers can trace their interest in the region following the formation of the World Zionist Organization in 1897 to deal with the problem of European discrimination and persecution in both eastern and western Europe—that is, well before the Nazi Holocaust. (For other sources that look at the similarities between Israel and apartheid South Africa see Bergman 1968; Farsoun 1976; Hunter 1987; Lee 1983; Mazrui 1983; McTague 1985; Moleah 1981; and Joseph 1988.)

42. It was not as if Weizmann did not know what was going on in South Africa in respect of the human rights of Africans. In late 1931 he had occasion to visit South Africa in order to raise money. It should also be pointed out here that the pivotal role Smuts played in getting the British to accept the principle of a national homeland, as embodied in the Balfour Declaration, for Jews in Palestine would lay the foundations for a relationship between Israel and South Africa that would endure for many decades. The declaration by the British government, dated November 2, 1917, through its Cabinet minister, J. A. Balfour, stated: "His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country" (from Stevens and Elmessiri 1976: 88).

43. Of course, he neglected to emphasize that the civilization he really had in mind was that of the imperialists (in this case the United States). In fact, it is absolutely amazing that even as the world approaches the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century there are western "intellectuals" today who are still coming out with the same old racist justifications for the domination and exploitation of PQD peoples offered at an earlier time, when European barbarity against African and other peoples knew no bounds, except that today they are clothed in newer guises, such as "progressive imperialism." Feuer, in advocating this newer form of the white man's burden was merely retracing steps that a number of Jewish leaders had advocated in an earlier period. Theodore Herzl, for example, in a letter written in 1896 to the Grand Duke of Baden said that when Jews returned to their "historic fatherland," they would be returning as "representatives of Western civilization" (the very civilization that was replete with Jewish pogroms and one that would later produce the Nazi Holocaust) whose task will be to bring "cleanliness, order and the well-established customs of the Occident to this plague-ridden, blighted corner of the Orient." To Herzl, a Jewish state in the Middle East was nothing less than "a wall of defense for Europe in Asia, an entrepot of Civilization against Barbarism" (from Elmessiri 1976: 9). These sentiments expressed by Herzl, were also shared by such other prominent Jewish leaders as Ben Gurion, Chaim Weizmann, and Abba Eban in the sense that they all saw the mission of the Jewish state as bringing "civilization" to a "savage" part of the world in the tradition of—and these are their analogies—the Conquistadors in Latin America, or the French Colons in Algeria, or the Yankees in South America (Elmessiri 1976: 6–13).

What is also of interest to note about this "civilizing mission" concept of these Jewish leaders was that in their minds those Jews who came from around the Middle East and the Orient—usually darker skinned than their European brethren (the Ashkenazi Jews) and referred to as the Sephardic Jews—were also considered as people in need of "civilizing." To many Jewish leaders like Abba Eban (himself an Ashkenazi Jew from South Africa), being Jewish really meant being European, a white. Thus, for example, he expressed fears that Israel could be overrun by Sephardic Jews and thereby force Israel "to equalize its cultural level with that of the neighboring world" (meaning Asia and Africa). He, therefore, cautioned that "far from regarding our immigrants from oriental countries as a bridge toward our integration with the Arab-speaking world, our objective should be to infuse them with Occidental spirit, rather than to allow them to draw us into an unnatural orientalism" (from Elmessiri 1976: 11). Even today the gulf between the two types of Jews remains wide: as Halevi (1987: 219) puts it: "The common identity of all Jews is the founding myth of the nation and a white lie, daily contradicted by experience and social praxis." He further notes that today in Israel a bizarre inversion of perspective has been foisted by the Ashkenazi. He explains: "The racist is he who sees in the Arab Jew the Arab, not the Jew: such is the perverse fiction that underpins the unity of the people and the state. While the Jew from Europe can take pride in his European culture, the Arab culture of the Arab Jew must be absolutely rejected, erased in the fiction of exile." (See also Shohat 1988.) It is on the basis of these type of attitudes where Zionism (Jewish Nationalism) is transformed into an extension of European imperialism that accusations have been made to the effect that Zionism is racism; in fact the United Nations did pass a resolution that stated this in the Fall of 1975 over, not surprisingly, intense opposition from Israel and her allies.

While accusations abound today concerning discrimination against Sephardic Jews by the politically and economically dominant Ashkenazi Jews (the most recent manifestation of this has been the complaints from some Sephardic Jews at the attention being lavished by the Israeli state on Jews pouring out of the former Soviet Union), it should be pointed out that many of the non-Jews who make these allegations in order to brand Zionism as racism, such as the Arabs, are less concerned about this discrimination than to use it as a vehicle for venting their own anti-Semitism. After all, since when, in the modern period, did the Arabs become friends of the Sephardic Jews, certainly not since the creation of Israel. On the other hand, as Joseph (1988: 119–20) shows, many of the discriminatory attitudes and practices against Arabs resident within the pre-1967 Israeli borders remarkably parallel those of apartheid South Africa in almost all areas of life—though, perhaps, justifiable, says Joseph, because Israel is not a secular state, but a religious one belonging to the Jewish faith. Yet, this fact that Israel is not a secular state, cannot justify the very racist sentiments Israeli Jews express about Arabs, such as that they are a "cancer" in Israel, or that they are dirty, or that they do not value human life, etc., that is attitudes that closely parallel those that Euro-South Africans had expressed in relation to blacks (Joseph 1988: 119).

What do the Israeli Jews think of U.S. African Americans? A glimpse is to be found in the statement by Moshe Dayan, a former defense minister in the Israeli government, who in advocating the merits of compulsory conscription

for the U.S. Army stated that because the U.S. Army was volunteer-based it comprised mainly black soldiers up to the rank of sergeant. And he felt that blacks, to use his words, "have a lower education and intelligence," therefore the U.S. Army should be trying to recruit "better blood and brains" (from Weisbord and Kazarian 1985: 160). To take another example: a Jewish-American "psychologist" working for the Israeli Army told an Israeli soldier, in the soldier's words: "American Jews who wanted to beat up Negroes but couldn't do so, would come here [Israel] and beat up Arabs, and that perhaps then "the Americans would learn from us how to deal with their Negroes" (from Halevi 1987: 226). Those Jews who vent such racist sentiments have clearly learned nothing from the European pogroms and the Holocaust in Nazi Germany. (For more on issues raised in this note, see also Finkelstein [1995], Glaser [2003], and Khazzoom [2003]).

44. For an analytical survey of African politics and resistance in South Africa from 1945 to the early 1970s, see Lodge (1983).

45. This is not to suggest by any means, that other internal developments were of no consequence; for large-scale social events are almost always multicausally-based. Hence the fact that by the time the Portuguese military coup had occurred there was already a stirring of political consciousness among the young in the form of the Black Consciousness Movement—which derived its philosophical inspiration from the U.S. African American Black Power theorists of the 1960s—launched by the black South African Students Organization, which saw as its immediate task the reversal of the psychological capitulation of the black masses, meant that the young were already on their way to becoming politicized (Hirson 1979). Added to the Black Consciousness Movement was also the politicizing effect of the dramatic emergence of black labor unrest in the Durban area in 1972/73 (aided and abetted by, among others, radical white students associated with the white National Union of South African Students) within the context of an economic recession and other economic contradictions that were beginning to come to a head in the early 1970s (Lodge 1983).

46. See Davis (1987), Hirson (1979) and Brewer (1986) for details. (The motion picture *A Dry White Season* provides a glimpse of what transpired during the Soweto Uprising—Hollywood style of course.)

47. Mary Frances Berry was a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Walter Fauntroy was a Congressman, Eleanor Holmes Norton was a law professor, and Randall Robinson was president of TransAfrica.

48. Although U.S. African American Studies has been taught in institutions of higher learning for close to half a century in the United States, the question is still often asked, What is U.S. African American Studies? It is important to emphasize from the outset that today U.S. African American Studies is no longer considered as simply U.S. African American history—U.S. African American history is only one component of it. Having said this, one must also note that U.S. African American Studies has as many definitions as the number of people willing to define it. However, there has been a clear movement in recent years toward defining it as an *interdisciplinary* field of study that considers as its subject matter anything and everything concerning the experiences of both people in Africa and the African diaspora—in relation to themselves, as well as to others—from whatever disciplinary perspective(s) one cares to examine these experiences: history, law, politics, literature, economics, education, the environment, science, medicine, music, religion; and so on. Moreover, the term African diaspora is considered to encompass all peoples of African ancestry in the United States (U.S. African Americans), the Caribbean (Afro-Caribbeans), Latin America (Afro-Latinos), Europe (Afro-Europeans), Asia (Afro-Asians), and so on. Given, then, this wide geographic focus on the experiences of all peoples of African ancestry, wherever they may have lived in the past, or wherever they may be living today, it should be noted that this field is also sometimes referred to as Africana Studies. In light of the foregoing, as the field continues to mature, the stress increasingly is on the study of interrelations between, on one hand, Africa and the African diaspora, and on the other, between Africa/African diaspora and other peoples throughout the world, and throughout history from antiquity to the present. Therefore, just as it is not simply U.S. African American history, it is also not just a variant of ethnic studies.

49. For sources that raise and discuss the issues indicated in this epilogue see also: Ackah (1999), Adebajo (2004), Adeleke (1998), Anthony (2006), Bracey (2008), Campbell (1995, 2006), Chrisman (2001), Conyers (2005), Drake (1984), Gaines (2006), Gilroy (1993), Henry (1976), Hickey and Wylie (1993), Joseph (2006b), Lemelle and Kelley (1994), Lusane (2006), Magubane (1987), Okpewho, Davies, and Mazrui (1999), Plummer (1996), Redkey (1969), Scott and Osman (2002), and Shipley and Pierre (2007). The sections on Nelson Mandela's first visit to the United States in 1990 in Lodge (2006), Nixon (1994), and Sampson (1999) should also be consulted.

50. See Lusane (2006) for a trenchant but highly cogent critique of the "Uncle Tommery," not his phrase, of Powell and Rice in the U.S. foreign-policy-making process. Of course, the right wing counter-insurgency of those petit bourgeois African Americans who have benefitted greatly from the very struggles they have sought to undermine is not restricted to these two. Consider, for example, the anti-civil-rights role of that rabidly conservative African American U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, who not only is not even fit to hold a candle to the brilliant Justice Thurgood Marshall—whom he replaced symbolically with his cynically-motivated nomination to the Court by George "Willie Horton" Bush, Sr. upon the latter's retirement in 1991—but whose jurisprudential legacy to date is, with rare exception, a most shameful testimony to the great damage that can be done by an unrepentant Uncle Tom. In one of the latest instances of the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of this man he dissented in two related cases—7 to 2 decision in one case (*Gomez-Perez v. Potter, Postmaster General* [argued on February 19, 2008 and decided on May 27, 2008]) and 6 to 3 in the other (*CBOCS West, Inc. v. Humphries* [argued on February 20, 2008 and decided on May 27, 2008])—in which the majority of the Court decided in favor of upholding the constitutionality of civil rights laws protecting employees from employer retaliation if they complain about discrimination in the workplace. His deep disdain for civil rights is further indicated by another recent (and what is probably a landmark) case *Boumediene et al. v. Bush, President of the United States, et al.* (argued on December 5, 2007 and decided on June 12, 2008) in which he dissented from the majority opinion that a person detained by the United States outside U.S. borders—e.g. Guantánamo Bay naval base—has the constitutional right to challenge his/her detention in U.S. courts (e.g., by petitioning for *habeas corpus*).