

**A cold wind from the north and the making of Lembede's Afrikanism: Notes
on the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and the Philosophy of
Garveyism in South Africa**

<https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ft.v12i3.1>

Submission: March 14, 2023 Acceptance: Oct 24, 2023

Masilo LEPURU

Institute for Pan-African Thought and Conversation, University of Johannesburg

Email: lepurumasilo@yahoo.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9768-1022>

Abstract

Literature on the radical indigenous resistance tradition, which predated the emergence of Garveyism as a form of Afrikan philosophy of liberation is scarce in South African politics and history. Robert Edgar and Robert Vinson have contributed to the literature on the influence of Garveyism in South Africa in the 1920s. However, their scholarship does not delve into the emergence of the radical indigenous resistance tradition which was a reaction to conquest since 1652 in wars of colonization in South Africa. This paper seeks to remedy this gap by discussing this radical indigenous resistance tradition which we designate as the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. This paper will utilize the historical analytical framework to provide a brief outline of the cause and elements of this tradition. We will rely on historical research design to discuss how, upon its arrival in the 1920s, Garveyism regaled this radical indigenous resistance tradition. The first objective of the paper is to foreground the convergence of the intellectual and political endeavours of people of Afrikan descent (continent and diaspora) in their struggle against global white supremacy. The second objective is to contribute to the eventual hegemony of the combined radicalism of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism which is a marginalized issue in the literature on Afrikan nationalism and the Black Radical Tradition in South Africa. This paper will provide a brief intellectual portrait of Lembede to argue that through his political philosophy of Afrikanism he encapsulated the convergence of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism. This is in order to lay the foundation for the foregrounding of Lembede's idea of Afrika for the Afrikans as an alternative paradigm regarding the national question in South Africa.

Keywords: Lembede, Afrikanism, Marcus, Garvey, Garveyism, South Africa.

Introduction

There is a dialectical relation between the catastrophic coming of foreigners to Afrika, and the emergence of the tradition of resistance. We are not in this paper following orthodox Marxism (as formulated by the likes of Karl Kausty and Lenin relying on the writings of Karl Marx after his death) and its formulation of dialectical materialism and historical materialism which sees resistance as the struggle between antagonistic material classes (CASTORIADIS 1979, FROMM 1967). Rather, our approach is fully grounded in the Afrikan-centred paradigm (ANI 1994). This paradigm comprises of thought and scholarship which are premised on the Afrikan worldview and culture as formulated by the likes of

Marimba Ani (1994) and Vulindlela Wobogo (2011). Following the historical path blazed by Diop (1967), we posit that to have a solid comprehension of the emergence of the tradition of resistance on the continent and the diaspora, Kemet must be foregrounded (Kemet is the ancient Afrikan name for what is currently called Egypt). By foregrounding Kemet we imply according historical and methodological priority to the ancient highest expression of Afrikan civilization. This is because the first invasion laid the foundation for the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition on the continent, which we will discuss later, and Garveyism in the diaspora took place in Kemet around 1630 BC. By Garveyism, we imply a race-first ideology and grassroots (ROLINSON 2012) black mass movement (WEST 2002), which are attributed to Marcus Garvey as a Black Nationalist (MARTIN 1986).

This paper will not conduct a genealogical analysis of the relation between the idea of Kemet as the land of black people and the Black Radical Tradition, especially as formulated by Cedric Robinson (2000). According to Robinson, the Black Radical Tradition is a mass resistance tradition of struggle which traces its emergence to the enslaved Afrikans in the diaspora who resisted their enslavement and wanted to create a world premised on Afrikan ontology and epistemology (ROBINSON 2000). We will, however, rely on two conceptualizations of the Black Radical Tradition as formulated by Anthony Bougues (2015), which within the Caribbean context is the home of Garveyism; and Cedric Robinson (2000), within a location in which the Garvey movement reached its apex as it was spreading to South Africa in the 1920s. The overarching postulation of this paper is that when Garveyism arrived in South Africa around the 1920s as the highest expression of the Black Radical Tradition of resistance against white supremacy from the diaspora, it infused itself into an already existing tradition of resistance, which we designate the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition.

In this sense, we proceed from the fundamental premise that every thought emanates from experience, which informs it. The Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition, which emerged in South Africa as early as 1510 with the Battle of Salt River was a continuation of a long resistance tradition indigenous to Afrika since the first invasion of Kemet by the Hyksos around 1630 BC (CARRUTHERS 1999, WOBOGO 2011). Anton Lembede will be utilized in this paper as an example of an Afrikan nationalist who encapsulated the convergence of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism in the 1940s when he formulated the political philosophy of Afrikanism. By proclaiming that Afrikans are native to Afrika as their motherland and that they cannot be put on an equal footing with non-Afrikans, he was formulating the elements of what we designate the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and combing it with Garveyism's battle-cry of "Africa for the Africans, those at home and abroad" (EWING 2014). This tradition was reinvigorated by Garveyism in the 1920s, which Lembede embraced in the 1940s to formulate his political philosophy of Afrikanism. It is in this sense that we posit that Lembede's Afrikanism comprises the elements of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism.

The point is to demonstrate that Lembede was a diligent student of Afrikan history and thought as opposed to the caricatured portrait of him as a hopeless student of European Romantic thought, and South African white settler right-wing thought with its racism and fascism (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018, SOSKE 2017, GERHART 1978). By positing that Lembede's Afrikanism is a composite philosophy comprising of indigenous roots of resistance through the oral history and the infusion of the resistance tradition from the diaspora stemming from Garveyism, this paper seeks to eschew the treatment of Afrika/South Africa as an intellectual and political *tabula rasa*. The over-glorification of the coming of the Negroes to South Africa as role models and liberators (MASILELA 2013, VINSON 2006) tends to deprive the Indigenous people of their intellectual and political agency. Methodologically it foregrounds the diaspora at the expense of the continent (VINSON 2009).

This paper will strike a balance between the continent and diaspora (intellectually and politically). This implies that we want to formulate the idea of an intellectual interchange/dialogue between people of Afrikan descent who are victims of European domination due to the system of global white supremacy (MILLS 1997, WELSING 1991) and the global colour line (VINSON 2006). An intellectual and political interchange can only occur in a situation where two participants are sharing ideas. Afrikans on the continent did not wait for Afrikans from the diaspora to engage in a resistance tradition and formulate ideas about it. As much as Afrikans from the continent admired Afrikans from the diaspora, they exercised their own intellectual and political agency.

It is in this sense that we posit that it is not a contradiction in terms of arguing that Garveyism regalanised radicalism among Afrikans in South Africa rather than creating one *ex nihilo*. The seeds of a resistance tradition were already sown by the time Garveyism arrived in the 1920s in South Africa. These seeds were sown by conquest since 1652 by European conquerors in wars of colonialism (RAMOSE 2018), which accounts for the emergence of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition which predated Garveyism in South Africa. This paper is divided into four sections. We now turn to the first section.

Garvey and the Garvey movement

Anthony Bogues (2015) has, within the context of the Caribbean intellectual tradition, divided the Black Radical Tradition into the heretics and the prophets. The heretics are Afrikan thinkers who went through the process of Western education but rejected the orthodox Enlightenment traditions' racism and white supremacy. Many of these heretics were intellectuals and activists such as C L R James and George Padmore. Marcus Garvey is a figure of the Black Radical Tradition who combined both intellectual production and activism just like James and Padmore. For the purposes of Garvey's short portrait, we will rely on a book by Rupert Lewis called *Marcus Garvey(2018)*. Marcus Garvey was born on 17 August 1887 and died on 10 June 1940. According to Rupert Lewis (2018,1), Garvey's father was an avid reader who also collected many books. This led Garvey to inherit a love for reading and collecting his own books. Garvey began his activism in labour agitation and journalism. He furthered his education in England at Birkbeck College (RUPERT 2018).

The emergence of Garveyism and the Garvey movement can be traced to Garvey's extensive travelling and his experience of racism. As Rupert (2018,13) states it "Wherever he had travelled he encountered the predatory consequences of European capitalism and its global expansion, which had devastating consequences for Africa. He realized that the struggle was a global one and he elaborated a strategy to match the scale of the challenge". This strategy entailed the formation of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) and its paper the *Negro World* which spread around the globe to challenge global white supremacy. Garvey was a black nationalist who emphasized the standpoint of race rather than class (RUPERT 2018). Garvey foregrounded several ideas that Lembede inherited. This is how Rupert (2018,14) captures Garvey's philosophy of race "there was some difference I humanity, and that there were different races, each having its own separate and distinct social life". Garvey further argued that "Africa is still your only hope, that without an independent Africa- without a powerful Africa you are lost" (RUPERT 2018,37). "The Garvey movement was an historical praxis of anti-imperialist struggle geared towards the freedom of race" (RUPERT 2018,93) This is, in essence, the core of Garveyism which arrived in South Africa in the 1920s and was embraced by many Afrikans such as Anton Lembede in the 1940s in the form of "Africa for the Africans". We now turn to Lembede to discuss how he embraced Garveyism to formulate his political philosophy of Afrikanism.

Lembede and Afrika for the Afrikans in our lifetime

In this section, we want to utilize Lembede as an example of an Afrikan nationalist who encapsulated the convergence of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism. His political philosophy of Afrikanism embodies this convergence. The point of this section of the paper is to demonstrate the influence of Garveyism on Lembede. We will focus on ideas and evidence by other thinkers to argue that Lembede was influenced by Garveyism and the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. For this purpose, we will rely on a book called *Freedom in Our Lifetime (2015)* a collection of Lembede's writings as edited by Robert Edgar and Luyanda Ka Msumza.

Anton Lembede was born on 21 January 1914 on a farm in Eston and died on 29 July 1947, an untimely and devastating death, especially regarding the direction of Afrikan nationalism and liberation in South Africa. He studied for a BA, an LLB and an MA in philosophy. This was regarded as an intellectual feat by his generation such as his close friend A P Mda. Lembede proudly proclaimed that "I am proud of my peasant background. I am one with Mother Africa's dark soil" (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018,13). This is an early indication of his Afrikan nationalism which he called Afrikanism. The idea of the dark soil prefigures a race pride which was fundamental to Garveyism. Being one with Mother Afrika and dark soil is the prefiguration of his love for Afrika, which is also foundational to Garveyism. This was expressed very well by Garvey in an essay called *African fundamentalism* which Lembede would come across later while reading *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*.

Lembede became one of the leading intellectuals to draft the Youth League policy of the African National Congress in the 1940s. In line with racial nationalism of Garveyism, this policy which bore his influence stated that “the conflict in South Africa...was fundamentally a racial one between whites and blacks. Because whites had defined their domination in terms of race, this led blacks to view his problems and those of his country through the perspective of race” (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018,34). By this time Lembede was reading widely and would have come across the literature on Garveyism, which arrived in the 1920s. This formulation of the conflict in South Africa in terms of race rather than class is a manifestation of the anti-communism and race-first ideology (MARTIN 1986) in which the Garvey movement was embedded, and which Lembede embraced.

We know that Lembede regarded communism as a foreign ideology and saw adherence to it as a symptom of a pathological state on the part of Afrikans (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018). “There is ample oral evidence that Lembede was familiar with Garvey, and he frequently peppered his speeches with quotations from The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey” (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018, 41). It is a well-known fact that Garvey was influenced by the father of Pan-Africanism, namely Edward Wilmot Blyden. One of the ideas Garvey got from Blyden is race pride. “Lembede’s ideas, for instance echo those of Edward Wilmot Blyden, the West Indian educator who wrote on the creative and distinctive genius of the Negro race and the necessity for Africans to express racial pride (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018, 41). Thus, Lembede’s Afrikanism not only emphasizes race pride just like the Garvey movement but accentuated the uniqueness of the African spirit, thus formulating racial nationalism which excludes all non-Afrikans such as whites, Indians and some Coloureds who reject their Afrikan heritage.

Commenting on Lembede’s idea of *uncompromising* Afrika for the Afrikans Edgar and Ka Msumza (2018,57) state that “His (Lembede’s) advocacy of an exclusive African nationalism that Africans had to emancipate themselves psychologically and rely on their own leadership in order to challenge white domination...” This exclusive Afrikan nationalism, which was exemplified by the slogan of the Garvey movement in the form of “Africa for the Africans those at home and abroad” was the core of Lembede’s Afrikanism. Lembede encapsulated Garvey’s battle cry of Afrika for the Afrikans by stating that “Africa is a Blackman’s country. Africans are the natives of Africa and they have inhabited Africa, their Motherland, from time immemorial. African belongs to them” (LEMBEDE 2015,139). When Africans in the 1920s in South Africa envisioned the arrival of Garvey so that whites can be cleared out of Afrika (EWING 2014, VINSON 2009), they were expressing what Lembede will incorporate in his political philosophy of Afrikanism in the 1940s.

The Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition which we will discuss in detail in the next section, was spearheaded by *amaqaba* as Afrikans in South Africa who rejected whites and white culture as imposed by white settlers since conquest in

1652. These Afrikans who were mainly peasants held on to the idea that *abelumbi/abelungu* or whites are not *Abantu* or Afrikans/natives. For them, whites as *abelumbi/abelungu* were sorcerers and witches who deserved to be hurled back into the sea as their presence desecrated the land of the Afrikans. They emphasized the antagonism between *Abantu* and *abelumbi/abelungu* and called for whites to be hurled into the sea where they came from. Lembede "...mentioned men like Hintsana and Ntsikana who had tried for years fighting against superior weapons, to hurl the White man into the sea" (Lembede 2015: 128). It is in these words that Lembede captured the second element of the tradition which is the idea of "*bulala abathakathi*"/kill the wizards/witches (MPHAHLELE 2002). Lembede(2015,181) captured the first element of the tradition which is the antagonism between *Abantu*/Afrikans and *abelumbi/abelungu*/whites by arguing that "Africans are natives of Africa, they and Africa are one, their relation to Africa is superior to the relations of other sections of the populations...*it is evidently wrong to place Africans on a footing of equality with other racial groups at present residing in Africa*" (our italics). Lembede (2015,137) further argued that "Now from time immemorial Africa has developed her own peculiar plants, animals and man-the African Native or Aborigine...*This African spirit can realize itself through, and can be interpreted by, Africans only. Foreigners of whatever brand and hue can never properly and correctly interpret this spirit owing to its uniqueness, peculiarity and particularity*"(our italics). We now turn to the next section to discuss the cause and elements of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition as embraced by Lembede.

Azania and the catastrophic coming of European strangers

A race of invaders that arrived as "a cold wind from the north" (WOBOGO 2011) inaugurated Afrika's time of trouble by conquering Kemet in 1630 BC. The Hyksos who commenced the conquest of Afrika began in North Afrika which is still dominated by their successors-in-title, namely the Arabs. Southern Afrika on the other hand is currently dominated by another race, the Europeans, who became white settlers and have stayed through land dispossession since 1652. What these forces share is that they were invaders conquering black people who inhabited lands they named after their colour and race, which is black. According to Diop (1973), Kemet, which is in North Afrika designates the land of the blacks, or the land of black people. Motsoko Pheko (1984) posits that Azania, which was renamed South Africa by white settlers implies the land of black people (CHAMI 2021). While in this paper we are concerned with the conquest of Azania by these white strangers (KUNENE 2017) we contextualize this conquest in terms of *longue-durée* historical analytical framework. This is because the conquest of Kemet was not just an event but a structure (WOLFE 2006) of domination which persisted as each member of the strange race from the north took turns to dominate Afrika since the pioneering Hyksos laid the fundament with their conquest of Kemet.

The Portuguese attempted to enhance the structure of domination in 1510 when they embarked on a race war of land dispossession against the Indigenous people of Azania. The Battle of Salt River in 1510 marks the recommencement of race wars of colonialism by European conquerors as a strange race emerging from the sea who deserve to be returned to it through a liberation war. It is in this sense that Afrikans must turn the logic of elimination of settler colonialism (WOLFE 2006) against whites and other non-Afrikans. In line with the doctrine of Discovery which began with the issuing of the papal bull *Romanus Pontifex* in 1455, the white strangers embarked on a conquest of the land of the Indigenous people (RAMOSE 2018). This doctrine of Discovery contained conquest as one of its elements (MILLER 2011). Ironically, this doctrine also contained christianity as another element which was inverted by the religious faction of Garveyism in the form of the Israelites under Enoch Mgijima (EDGAR 1977, 1982).

In other words, we are aware that the Black Radical Tradition commenced in South Africa in the 1890s with Ethiopianism as a form of religious Afrikan nationalism, but due to the brevity of this paper we will confine ourselves to the arrival of Garveyism in the 1920s and its impact until the 1960s after the untimely and devastating death of Lembede in 1947. This is mainly because we are concerned with the secular dimension of Garveyism. But this does not imply that the religious dimension of the Black Radical Tradition can be divorced from its secular dimension as formulated through the political philosophy of Afrikanism by Lembede. We are aware that Lembede himself just like Garvey was a christian. This is one of the unfortunate limitations of the radicalism of Lembede and Garvey. This is because being grounded in the christian tradition as an element of the doctrine of Discovery, Lembede was not fully grounded in the Afrikan worldview and culture (ANI 1994) as fully expressed by *amaqaba* (*Amaqaba* are Afrikans who rejected whites and their culture which came with conquest) he was familiar with due to his peasant upbringing.

Lembede was not firmly grounded in what Kunene calls “African Cosmology” (Masilela 2013). But we believe that just like many thinkers had Lembede lived long enough, he was going to outgrow christianity. This is because he had already rejected communism as a foreign ideology (LEMBEDE 2015). We will not delve into a detailed analysis of conquest and the series of wars of reconquest of the land by the Indigenous conquered people conquered in wars of colonialism since 1652 (RAMOSE 2007). This is not to suggest that we prioritize structure at the expense of agency. While land dispossession as a form of material conquest is foundational to all effects of conquest, we will focus more on the epistemic ramifications of conquest.

This paper's fundamental point of departure is that conquest as a structure and not merely an event of the past took two forms, namely land dispossession and epistemicide (RAMOSE 2005). For the purposes of wars of resistance, it is important to note that there was a long series of wars of resistance for over “three hundred years” (JAFFE 1967). These wars of reconquest began as early as 1510 and continued until the 1890s when Ethiopianism began with its slogan of Afrika for the Afrikans. The last kingdoms which represented centres of Afrikan power

and indigenous resistance were demolished in the 1890s (MAGUBANE 1979, 1996) by the whites in wars of colonization (RAMOSE 2007). As Mazisi Kunene (2017, 216) states it “Have you judged correctly these bloodthirsty foreigners? Such people dig deep into a nation’s life. They strip the wealth and power that once was its greatness”.

By absurdly hoarding land dispossessed from the Indigenous people they made Afrikans to pose the ethical question “How can one man possess land as though it was life itself? Is land not the vast endlessness where man lives?” (KUNENE 2017, 215). The possession of land as though it was life itself was a manifestation of the culture of scarcity, which characterizes the “northern cradle” (DIOP 1973) and the “icemen inheritance” (BRADLEY 1991). It was also a manifestation of racial capitalism (ROBINSON 2000) which laid the foundation for the white settler “political economy of race and class” (MAGUBANE 1979).

By conquering the last kingdoms of the Indigenous people, the white strangers were violently introducing the former to a strange economic system built on racism and an irrational pursuit of profit. The destruction of the kingdoms in the 1890s represented the epitome of the attempted killing of *Sechaba/Isizwe* of *Batho/Abantu* by *abelungu*. The latter were regarded as *abelumbi* which implies the wizards or witches. This was because of the powerful and disastrous way these white strangers attempted to mercilessly destroy Afrika and the Afrikans. Thus, when *Batho/Abantu* were retaliating they were informed by the idea of “*bulala abathakathi*”/kill the wizards/witches (MPHAHLELE 2002) which we posit is at the core of the native sphere as opposed to the white settler sphere. The native sphere comprises mainly of the culture and ideas of Afrikan fundamentalists such as *amaqaba* while the white settler sphere is premised on European culture and ideas embraced by *amakholwa* led by their white masters. This idea of “*bulala abathakathi*” is the element of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition which was transformed into the battle cry of Afrika for the Afrikans (EWING 2014) with the arrival of Garveyism and both this tradition just like the Garvey movement pursued the *en masse* expulsion of all white strangers as opposed to co-existing with them as equals.

This is how Kunene (2017, 2016) captures the core of this tradition: “It was Mgobhozi the great hero who stood up and said...I feel it wiser to kill at once the fearful vermin (white strangers). Destroying it now before it devastates our lands and race”. The second element of this tradition was the antagonism between *Batho/Abantu* and *abelumbi/abelungu*. So, when Garveyism arrived in the 1920s this antagonism between *Abantu* and *abelumbi/abelungu* (i.e., *abelumbi/abelungu* are wizards and witches and are not *Abantu* and will never be *Abantu*) and the above-mentioned idea of “*bulala abathakathi*”/kill the witches/whites were the two dominant elements which were the core of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. It is in this sense that we posit that Garveyism did not create radicalism in South Africa upon its arrival in the 1920s. It merely regalanised a radical resistance tradition with indigenous roots and based on indigenous experience of conquest and white supremacy since 1652. We now turn to discuss the arrival of Garveyism in South Africa in the 1920s and its impact on South African politics and Afrikans.

Abantu/Batho and the New Negroes: Notes on the ties that bind

Scholarship on people of African descent tends to emphasize either the continent or the diaspora (VINSON 2019, HARTMAN 2004, MAFEJE 2009) . There is a need therefore to endeavour to strike a balance between Afrika and the diaspora. Most African-American scholars who write about people of Afrikan descent tend to marginalize Afrika in their analysis. On the other hand, Afrikans on the continent tend to marginalize the diaspora unless they are discussing the condition of people of Afrikan descent through the lens of Pan-Africanism. Because of the orthodox genealogy of Pan-Africanism as originating in the diaspora, Afrikans on the continent are compelled to foreground the diaspora. A current exception to this African American methodological flaw is Robert Trent Vinson. Vinson has conducted an extensive study on the relation between African Americans and Afrikans especially in South Africa. His extensive study is epitomized by his book *The Americans are Coming (2019)*. In this book Vinson provides an extensive analysis of the immense influence African Americans had on Afrikans in South Africa since the 1780s with Jubilee Singers' arrival in South Africa. This is way before the emergence of Ethiopianism in the 1890s through African American priests such as Henry McNeal Turner.

The ties that bind people of Afrikan descent such as race and global white supremacy are endowed with an extensive history. This paper will draw from Vinson's scholarship. The point is not to register a critical review of his scholarship but to build critically on his foundation. Suffice it to say that because of his lack of a nuanced comprehension of South African politics and history he could not make the significant distinction between several liberation traditions and their political visions. This fundamental flaw conduces Vinson to valorize the Congress tradition of Nelson Mandela and Oliver Tambo and to foreground it as part of the Black Radical Tradition in South Africa along the lines of Lembede, Robert Sobukwe and Steve Biko. We will correct this flaw by foregrounding Lembede within the Black Radical Tradition in South Africa (his Afrikanist stream as opposed to the Azanian stream of Sobukwe and Biko) outside of the Congress tradition thus correcting the conflation fallacy by Vinson. The Black Radical Tradition in South Africa as represented by Lembede is premised on several ideas.

These ideas include the foregrounding of the nationhood and sovereignty of Afrikans. Lembede foregrounds this by arguing that Afrika is the motherland of Afrikans as the natives and that Afrikans are one (LEMBEDE 2015). Sobukwe and Biko continued this thought by using the metaphor of the African tree and table, respectively (DLADLA 2018,2021). The emphasis on the majority status of the Afrikans and their right to determine the direction of power and societal organization is another idea that characterizes the Black Radical Tradition in South Africa (both the Afrikanist and Azanian streams). Lembede, Sobukwe and Biko are all clear about this majority position and its power. The fundamental disparity among these figures of the Black Radical Tradition in South Africa is their political visions (the Afrikanist vision and Azanian vision).

Lembede on the premise of the battle cry of Afrika for the Afrikans (EWING 2014), by extension Europe for the Europeans envisioned a “New Africa” (LEMBEDE 2015) without Europeans/white settlers and Asians/Indians as non-Afrikans (i.e., The *en masse* expulsion thesis of non-Afrikans). This was his *uncompromising* idea of Afrika for the Afrikans/Natives only, which was informed by the antagonism between *Batho/Abantu* and *abelumbi/abelungu* and “*bulala abathakathi*” as central to the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. This is because Lembede was familiar with the above-mentioned ideas through the oral tradition of Afrikan history as mastered by the likes of Mazisi Kunene. We know that Lembede was proud not only of Africa but his peasant background (LEMBEDE 2015, KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018), which would have exposed him to oral history.

Sobukwe and Biko, on the other hand, envisioned post-white supremacy Azania with whites who would be disrobed of their whiteness and their “settleness” by returning the land and pledging allegiance to Afrika and accepting Afrikan power (DLADLA 2021). These white strangers will cease to be strangers and become *Batho/Abantu/Africans* (i.e., the conversion thesis of non-Afrikans on Afrikan terms). They will no longer be the witches and wizards that they have been since time immemorial in terms of *amaqaba* and the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. This naïve and dangerous fantasy of the Azanian stream is called liberatory nonracialism (DLADLA 2018) as opposed to the hegemonic liberal nonracialism of the Congress tradition *ala* the rainbow nation fiction as epitomized by figures such as Albert Luthuli and Nelson Mandela. We will not waste our time on these two figures of the Black Liberal Tradition (pioneered by white settlers but led by *amakholwa* stemming from the white settler sphere) dominant in the so-called post-apartheid South Africa to the immense detriment of the Indigenous people.

It is the lack of this knowledge which makes Vinson’s scholarship on Garveyism and South African politics both useful and problematic. The arrival of the Garveyism in South Africa can be traced to black sailors who arrived in South African in cities such as Cape Town in the 1920s (VINSON 2019). This is how Vinson (2009,134) states it: “ a combination of black sailors, ships, and newspapers—the era’s most effective means of pan-African communication—transmitted Garveyism into South Africa.” These black sailors from the diaspora were the conveyor-belt of Garveyite literature as epitomized by the *Negro World*. So *Abantu/Batho* in South Africa met the ideas of Negroes through the Universal Negro Improvement Association’s newspaper. This newspaper, called the *Negro World* exposed *Abantu/Batho* to the tribulations of the Negroes in the diaspora. It did not take long before *Abantu/Batho* realized the common suffering they shared with the Negroes. Central to the ties that bind them (MAGUBANE 1987) is the global colour line (VINSON 2006) which was drawn by the system of racism/white supremacy (WELSING 1991).

This system of global white supremacy is premised on a racist social ontology which deprived both *Abantu/Batho* and the Negroes of personhood and humanity (MILLS 1997, WILDERSON 2020). Whites (the Pumpkin Race) arrogated to themselves personhood and denied it to the people of Afrikan descent (the Palm Race)(KUNENE 2017). The United States of America and South Africa are both white settler colonies which are premised on the “organizing grammar of race” and “logic of elimination” (WOLFE 2016). The Negroes were viewed by *Abantu/Batho* as both role models of modernity and liberators from white supremacy in South Africa (VINSON 2013). According to Vinson (2019), Garvey was aware of the condition of *Abantu/Batho* in South Africa. Apparently, Garvey even thought that segregation in South Africa was worse than other forms of racism in the world.

Garveyism, as diffused by West Indians and black sailors, was premised on the idea of Afrika for the Afrikans (EWING 2014). It is this battle cry that informed the sentiment of the Americans arriving and helping *Abantu/Batho* clear whites from South Africa (VINSON 2019). *Abantu/Batho* who admired the Negroes they called Americans believed that through Garvey they will have enough ammunition to kill whites in South Africa (VINSON 2006) and redeem Afrika for people of Afrikan descent. This is in line with the UNIA slogan which epitomizes race-first Black nationalism of Garveyism, namely “Africa for the Africans those at home and abroad” (MARTIN 1986).

The militancy of Garveyism embodied by the sentiment of ridding Afrika and South Africa in particular at the time of all whites is what regalanised the idea of “*bulala abathakathi*” and the antagonism between *Abantu/Batho* and *abelumbi/abelungu*, which reached its apex with Poqo’s one settler, one bullet battle cry in the 1960s. This is how Vinson (2009,135) states it: “Garveyism spread quickly in South Africa. In the port city of East London, there were persistent rumors that the “Americans” would arrive in ships with weapons to help Africans kill whites”. Vinson (2009,135) further states that “Garvey had predicted that the “bloodiest of all wars is about to arrive” and that the UNIA would soon force European colonizers to leave Africa.” Therein lies the substance and influence of Garveyism on Afrikans such as Lembede in South Africa. The radicalization and the endowment of *Abantu/Batho* with militancy exemplified the influence of Garveyism on Afrikans in South Africa from the 1920s.

Garveyism spread across South Africa since the first UNIA chapters were established in Cape Town (VINSON 2019). As many as 24 chapters were established in South Africa from the 1920s (VINSON 2019). While it commenced in Cape Town, Garveyism spread to the rural areas of Transkei and to cities such as Kimberly. We agree with Vinson (2006) that indeed due to its diffusion and Afrikan agency, *Abantu/Batho* were able to indigenize Garveyism. According to some scholars (EDGAR 1976) there was an infusion of millennialism into Garveyism in South Africa. The Wellington movement and the Israelites are an examples of how Garveyism regalanised and was indigenized by *Abantu/Batho* to confront white supremacy in South Africa. The Wellington movement, which

Afrikan women embraced rebuffed colonial authority by creating independent institutions such as schools and churches (VINSON 2019) in preparation of the elimination of all whites in South Africa. The Israelites attempted to restore land but were massacred by the Smuts government during the 1921 Bulhoek Massacre (EDGAR 1983).

Garveyism spread through local newspapers such as *Abantu/Batho*, *African world* and *Workers Herald*. Garveyism spread across South Africa and was premised on the idea “to regain their lost independence in a modern, regenerated continent of “Africa for Africans” (VINSON 2009,133). Through the help of the Negroes, *Abantu/Batho* will destroy white supremacy in South Africa and “A modern black state would replace the segregationist regime, ushering in a new dispensation: “You are not going to pay taxes nor dip cattle. . . Forces are coming, armies coming from America to drive the white people from Africa, to go to their own country” (VINSON 2009,142). We now turn to the last section to discuss briefly the unfortunate decline of this radicalism and militancy in “post-Apartheid South Africa”.

The death of Lembede and the decline of the radicalism of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism in South Africa

The unfortunate and untimely death of Lembede on 29 July 1947 marked the decline of the combined radicalism of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism in South Africa. The ideological influence of Lembede in the ANC Youth League was suppressed by his close friend and ideological rival, A P Mda. The uncompromising Afrikanism of Lembede, which was premised on the antagonism between *Abantu/Afrikans* and *abelumbi/abelungu/whites* (Afrika for the Afrikans/ the fallacy of non-European unity) and the hurling of the whites into the sea (*bulala abathakathi*)/ “white are not here to stay” was replaced with christian liberal humanism of Mda in the form of “broad nationalism” (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018). At the core of this broad nationalism as the antithesis of Lembede’s Afrikanism is the universal brotherhood of christianity and humanism, thus the idea that “white are here to stay” in South Africa.

“Mda inserted a section, “Two Streams of African nationalism”, in which he rejected the one variant of African nationalism identified with Marcus Garvey’s slogan- “Africa for the Africans”. It is based on the “Quit Africa” slogan and on the cry “Hurl the Whiteman into the sea”. This brand of African nationalism is extreme and ultra-revolutionary. Because Lembede often referred to Garvey in his speeches, this was a subtle way for Mda to signal a departure from some of Lembede’s positions” (KA MSUMZA AND EDGAR 2018, 53). The dangerous ramification of this naive ideological mess and unforgivable betrayal of Lembede by Mda was the sowing of the seed of radical liberalism which diverged from Garveyism and the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. Mda’s broad nationalism, which welcomed whites in South Africa, provided the seed for Robert Sobukwe’s African tree and Steve Biko’s Afrikan table metaphors (DLADLA 2021, MODIRI 2021). These two metaphors which embody radical liberalism are

a detrimental departure from Lembede's uncompromising Afrikanism. In this sense, unlike Lembede, Sobukwe and Biko were not Garveyites. These christian and humanistic metaphors are premised on the acceptance of whites provided, they pledge allegiance to Afrika and they accept Afrikan majority power and democracy. Instead of hurling the whites into the sea (*bulala abathakathi*) these metaphors register a naïve desire to accommodate whites on Afrikan terms. The Azanian critical tradition (a philosophical refinement of the Azanian political tradition of Sobukwe and Biko who adopted the name Azania in 1965 and rejected South Africa) as *forged* by Ndumiso Dladla (2021) and Joel Modiri (2021) encapsulates this dangerous betrayal of the combined radicalism of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism as embodied by Lembede.

This Azanian tradition whose seed was sown by Mda with broad nationalism is currently in ideological contestation with the Congress tradition (based on the Congress Alliance which adopted the Freedom Charter in 1955 and fights for a non-racial democratic South Africa *ala* "rainbow nation") regarding the resolution of the national question in South Africa. With the exception of POQO's battle-cry of "one settler ,one bullet" and Josias Madzunya who continued the tradition of Garveyism in the PAC but lost to Sobukwe's influence, Lembede's Afrikanism is marginalized. This paper hopes to resuscitate this Afrikan political philosophy of liberation as the final solution to the national question in South Africa. The fundamental objective is to revive the uncompromising sentiment and desire for the *en masse* expulsion of all non-Afrikans (such as whites, Indians and some Coloureds who reject their Afrikan heritage) in a *chimurenga*/ liberation war to restore a post-conquest Azania for the natives only.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper has discussed the catastrophic coming of *abelumbi/abelungu*/whites from the sea as marking the origin of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition. This tradition of resistance has indigenous roots and is based on the experience of conquest by the Indigenous people. The paper also argued that Garveyism which arrived in the 1920s merely regalanised this tradition rather than creating radicalism and militancy in South African among Afrikans of the 1920s. Finally, this paper briefly analysed how Garveyism influenced Afrikans and reintroduced the Black Radical Tradition among Afrikans from the 1920s. The paper used the example of Lembede to show that Garveyism influenced him in the 1940s to formulate his political philosophy of Afrikanism. It is in this sense that the paper posits the thesis that Lembede's Afrikanism is a combination of the Indigenous Fundamentalist Tradition and Garveyism and that his uncompromising Afrikanism must attain hegemony as the final solution to the national question in South Africa.

***The author declares no conflict of interest for this work**

Relevant Literature

1. ANI, Marimba: [Yurugu: An African-centred Critique of European Cultural Thought and Behaviour], 1994. Africa World Press: Trenton. Paperback.
2. BOGUES, Anthony. (2015). [Black heretics, black prophets: Radical political intellectuals], 2015. New York: Routledge. Paperback.
3. BRADLEY, Michael. [The Iceman Inheritance: Prehistoric Sources of Western Man's Racism, Sexism and Aggression], 1991. New York: Kayode Publications. Paperback.
4. CARRUTHERS, Jacob: [Intellectual Warfare], 1999. New York: Third World Press. Paperback.
5. CASTORIADIS, Cornelius: [Imaginary Institution of Society], 1987. MIT Press: Massachusetts. Paperback.
6. CHAMI, Felix. "The Geographical Extent of Azania". [*Theoria*,] 68 2021 (168), 12–29.
7. DIOP, Cheik. [Civilization or Barbarism: An Authentic Anthropology]. 1991. New York: Lawrence Hill Books. Paperback.
8. DIOP, Cheik. [The Cultural Unity of Black Africa: The Domains of Patriarchy and of Matriarchy in Classical Antiquity]. 1979. New York: Third World Press. Paperback.
9. DLADLA, Ndumiso. "The liberation of history and the end of South Africa: some notes towards an Azanian historiography in Africa", [South, South African Journal on Human Rights], pp. 415 – 440. 2018. Vol 38.No 1-2. DOI: 10.1080/02587203.2018.1550940. Web.
10. DLADLA, Ndumiso. "The Azanian Philosophical Tradition Today." [*Theoria*] 68 2021 (168): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3167/th.2021.6816801>. Web.
11. EDGAR, Robert. R and KA MSUMZA, Luyanda. [Africa's Cause Must Triumph: The Collected Writings of A.P. Mda], 2018. South Africa: Best Red. Paperback.
12. EDGAR, Robert. "Garveyism in Africa: Dr. Wellington and the American Movement in the Transkei". [*Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*], 6 1976(3).
13. EDGAR, Robert. "The prophet motive: Enoch Mgijima, the Israelites, and the background to the Bulhoek Massacre". [*The International Journal of African Historical Studies*] 15 1982(3), 401–422.
14. EDGAR, Robert. [The Fifth Seal: Enoch Mgijima, the Israelites and the Bulhoek massacre, 1921]. 1977, Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
15. EWING, Adam. [The age of Garvey], 2014. Princetown: Princeton University Press. Paperback.
16. FROMM, Ernest [Marx's concept of Man], 2014. Fredrick Ungar Publishing: New York. Paperback.
17. GERHART, Gail. M. [Black Power in South Africa]. 1978. University of California: University of California Press. Paperback.
18. JAFFE, Hosea: [Three Hundred Years: South Africa], 1952. New Era Fellowship: Cape Town. Paperback.
19. KUNENE, Mazisi. [Emperor Shaka the Great: A Zulu Epic. South Africa], 2017. University of Kwazulu-Natal Press. Paperback.

20. LEMBEDE, Anton. M: [Freedom in our Lifetime],2015.Kwela: South Africa. Paperback.
- 21.MAFEJE, Archie. [Africinity: a combative ontology], 2008. Codesria bulletin, nos, 3-4. Paperback.
- 22.MAGUBANE, Bernard. [The Ties That Bind: African-American Consciousness of Africa],1987. Africa World Press. Trenton. Paperback.
23. MAGUBANE, Bernard: [The making of a Racist State: British Imperialism and the Union of South Africa 1875-1910],1996. Africa World Press: Unites States. Paperback.
24. MAGUBANE, Bernard. [The Political Economy of Race and Class in South Africa], 1979. New York: Monthly Review Press. Paperback.
25. MARTIN, Tony. [Race First: The Ideological and Organisational Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association],1986. United States: Majority Press.
26. MASILELA, Ntongela. [An Outline of the New African Movement in South Africa],2013. Africa World Press. Paperback.
27. MILLER, Robert J. “SYMPOSIUM: The future of international law in indigenous affairs: The Doctrine of Discovery, the United Nations, and the Organization of American States. Oregon,” [Lewis & Clark Law School], pp 847-1138, 2011. Vol 15. No 4. DOI:law.lclark.edu/law_reviews/lewis_and_clark_law_review/past_issues/volume_15/number_4.php. Web.
28. MODIRI, Joel M. “Conquest and constitutionalism: first thoughts on an alternative jurisprudence”, [South African Journal on Human Rights], pp.300-325. 2018. Vol 38. No 1-2. DOI: 10.1080/02587203.2018.1552415.Web.
- 29.MODIRI, Joel. “Azanian Political Thought and the Undoing of South African Knowledges.” [Theoria] 68 2021 (168): 42–85. <https://doi.org/10.3167/th.2021.6816804>. Web.
30. MILLS, Charles. [The Racial Contract].1997. New York: Cornell University Press. Paperback.
- 31.MPHAHLELE, Letlapa. [Child of this Soil: My Life as a Freedom Fighter],2002. Kwela: South Africa. Paperback
- 32.PHEKO, Motsoko: [Apartheid: The story of a Dispossessed People].1984. Marram Books: South Africa. Paperback.
33. RAMOSE, Mogobe B. “Towards a Post-conquest South Africa: beyond the constitution of 1996”. [South African Journal on Human Rights], pp326-341, 2018. Vol 38. No 1-2. DOI: 10.1080/02587203.2018.1552415.Web.
34. RAMOSE, Mogobe B. “In Memorium: Sovereignty and the New South Africa”. [Griffith Law Review], pp 310-329, 2007. Vol 16. No 2. DOI:10.1080/10383441.2007.10854593. Web.
35. ROBINSON, Cedric. [Black Marxism revised and updated third edition: The making of the black radical tradition].2000. UNC press Books. Paperback.
- 36.ROLINSON, Mary. G. [Grassroots Garveyism: The Universal Negro Improvement Association in the Rural South, 1920-1927],2012. University of North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press. Paperback.
37. RUPERT, Lewis. [Marcus Garvey]. 2018. The University of the West Indies Press. Trinidad and Tobago. Paperback.

38. SOSKE, Jon. [Internal Frontiers: African nationalism and the Indian diaspora in twentieth-century South Africa],2017. Ohio University Press. Paperback.
39. VINSON, Robert. T: [The Americans are Coming: Dreams of African American Liberation in Segregationist South Africa],2019. Ohio University Press: New York. Paperback.
40. VINSON, Robert. T. “Up from Slavery and Down with Apartheid! African Americans and Black South Africans against the Global Color Line”. [*Journal of American Studies*], 52 2018 (2), 297–329.
41. VINSON, Robert. T. “Sea Kaffirs’: ‘American Negroes and the Gospel of Garveyism in Early Twentieth-century Cape Town”. [The Journal of African History], 47 2006 (2), 281–303.
42. WELSING, Francis C: [The Isis (Yssis) Papers: The Keys To The Colors. Chicago],1991. Third World Press. Trenton. Paperback.
43. WEST, Michael, O. “The seeds are sown: The impact of Garveyism in Zimbabwe in the interwar years”. [*The International Journal of African Historical Studies*] 35 (2/3), 335-362, 2002.
44. WILDERSON, Frank: [Afropessimism],2020. Liveright: New York. Paperback.
45. WOBOGO, Vulindlela [Cold Wind From The North: The Pre-Historic European Origin of Racism, Explained By Diop’s Two Cradle Theory].2011. New York: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. Paperback.
46. WOLFE, Patrick. “Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native”. [Journal of Genocide Research], pp 387-409, 2006. Vol 8. NoDOI:10.1080/14623520601056240. Web.
47. WOLFE, Patrick: [Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race],2016. Verso Books: London. Paperback.