



Will The Real William Wilberforce Please Stand Up?

Produced in association with the *Pan-Afrikan Society* of London South Bank University

The Pan Afrikan People's Phone-in
Every Sunday 10pm – 12midnight

PAPP Galaxy Radio PAPP

99.5fm (London airwaves) and www.afwestation.com (internet)

Phone Number (for on air discussion): 07908 117 619

The Pan-Afrikan People's Phone-in is a space for themed interactive discussions conducted over the airwaves and cyberspace. The themes are focused around issues affecting Afrikan people both locally and globally.

The Pan-Afrikan People's Phone-in regularly features guests from revolutionary Pan-Afrikanist organisations. From time to time others including non-Afrikan guests will be invited to contribute. The activities of all guests will be examined on the basis of their relevance to Afrikan people locally and worldwide. Interviews and presentations with guests will set the scene for the more general discussion (in the second half of the programme) where listeners will be invited to phone in, ask questions and contribute.

Spread the word: Please tell all of your family, friends, fellow organisation members, colleagues, associates and other networks about the show. Encourage them to listen.

Will The Real William Wilberforce Please Stand Up?

Trickery in the name of Wilberforce

In its determination to lie to the British public by generally distorting the history of chattel enslavement, British imperialism has constructed a false saintly image around one of its own cadre. A character called William Wilberforce has been projected on to the centre stage of their interpretation of the history of the 'abolition of slavery'. In the worse cases of distortion, bogus 'historians' have deceived their readerships by giving Wilberforce the entire historical stage. He is presented to the people of the world as the person who 'abolished' the process of kidnapping and deporting Afrikan people from their homeland into slavery on the American continent. Wilberforce, raised to the status of superman, is presented as the individual (super hero) who single-handedly 'abolished' the whole institution of chattel enslavement. In this version of events, the fact that enslavement was imposed on Afrikan people by European imperialism is by-passed and ignored. However, whilst it is true that Wilberforce took some actions that affected enslaved Afrikan people, a closer examination of his activities reveals that he supported British imperialism's chattel slavery system by delaying and thwarting the progress of both the 'abolition of slavery' and the 'abolition' of the so called 'slave trade'.

British imperialism has cunningly used a set of hidden marketing techniques designed to trick all those who are ignorant or naive about the history of slavery. Their purpose is to mislead the public into believing that Afrikan people had no part to play in the destruction of the chattel enslavement system that was used to hold them in bondage. If they can maintain this false story, then it will help to disempower Afrikan people in the present day. Its constructed illusion contributes to Afrikan people believing that they do not have the power or ability to change current society for the better. Even those Afrikan people who feel a commitment to change, may be waiting for an individual super hero to come along and change society for them. Worse still they may be waiting for a non-Afrikan super hero, or more precisely a European imperialist super hero to sort their problems out. Certainly this is something that will never happen and any Afrikan people falling for this con trick will be contained just where British imperialism wants them - in a fantasy. In short, British imperialism would have successfully defended itself against any form of uprising or meaningful challenge from the Afrikan people that it has relentlessly and consistently oppressed for the last 400 years.

If we look behind imperialism's smoke screen, we find that the truth is very different. It was Afrikan people that abolished imperialism's system of kidnapping and deporting Afrikan people across the Atlantic and after that they went on to abolish the whole system of chattel enslavement. Afrikan people reached the point in struggle where their power simply could no longer be contained by imperialism. Their determined struggle for freedom burnt the fingers of imperialism so badly that it had to let go of the chattel enslavement system. Wilberforce's efforts were at best a side show in the process of this struggle. Imperialism's trick in ending

chattel slavery, was that letting go of chattel slavery really meant transforming slavery into a form which for a while seemed more palatable to its victims. It is now becoming increasingly clear to Afrikan and other oppressed people that slavery still exists. The time has now arrived for current generations to master the historical truth so that they can use it to change British society for the better.

Wilberforce: a man of class

Born in Kingston upon Hull on 24th August 1759 William Wilberforce was the son of a wealthy merchant (Web of English History). He was a Cambridge university graduate (Schama, 2006, p. 206) and clearly never knew poverty or even the nature of the hardships faced by ordinary working people; in colloquial terms, he was stinking rich. He inherited a landed estate from his mother (Web of English History), owned several properties and at one point was even landlord to the future Prime Minister of Britain (Howarth, 1973, p. 462). As a member of a family of wool merchants he also owned a chain of factories (Man's Unconquerable Mind). He was clearly a very busy man because on top of all of these interests, he was also a banker (Hart, 1998, p. 33). Wilberforce was truly representative of the elite class of British imperialism in that he was the embodiment of all of the sub-strata of the upper classes i.e. the aristocratic landed gentry, the factory owning industrial capitalists and the international finance capitalists.

There was clearly no doubt that he was a member of the upper class elite and the evidence that we have confirms that his allegiance was firmly welded to the interests of his class. For instance he was the Tory MP for Hull at a time when the masses of British people were not even entitled to vote; needless to say this was prior to the existence of any form of working class political party (Ferguson, 1998, p. 132); so he could harbour no claims of representing the 'common man'. His family were land and factory owning wool merchants. There is no doubt that he took his family's interests seriously since he operated as the official Parliamentary spokesman for the wool industry (Williams, 1944, p. 160). This also makes it possible that he would have perceived the cotton industry, with its abundance of unpaid labour stolen from enslaved Afrikan people, as a rival with a competitive advantage that was unfair even by primitive capitalist standards (Martin, 1999, p. 71).

Whilst he looked after his own interests in Parliament, he was manifestly opposed to the interests of poor white people in Britain. For instance, he supported the introduction of the Corn Laws (William Wilberforce 1759-1833). These were the laws which protected the profits of the landed gentry by banning the importation of cheaper foreign corn. Whilst his actions were consistent with his own class interests, the problem for Britain's working people was that his actions meant that they were unable to pay the prices demanded by the British aristocratic farmers for their 'home grown' corn. His position on the Corn Laws meant that working people were literally expected to starve. Wilberforce's body of upper class ideas, practices

and decisions were so antagonistic towards the working classes in Britain that at one point his house had to be guarded by armed police in order to protect him from their wrath (Web of English History).

Wilberforce did not limit his oppressive ideas to the working class only, he repeatedly demonstrated that he did not have a high regard for women. He was blatantly against the interests of women to the point of even opposing their right to vote (Ligali, 6/11/2006). Another example of his antipathy towards women came in 1788 when he was part of a Parliamentary committee that decided that women sentence to death should be hung instead of burned (Web of English History). This 'commutation' or 'softer form of state sanctioned killing' was not for the benefit of the women themselves or their grieving families. Instead, it was so that their bodies could be donated to medical science; obviously the burnt bodies of the women killed would have been too badly damaged to be useful for medical research. These examples of Wilberforce's pattern of behaviour towards the 'less fortunate' reveals a man who appears to have quite casually exploited and oppressed anybody outside his class, without even a moments hesitation.

With such an indiscriminate track record of oppressing people 'below' his class, it is perhaps surprising that British imperialism asks us to believe that Wilberforce's Christian convictions inspired him to take up the cause of Afrikan people – the most exploited and oppressed group of all and furthest 'below' his class. The kindest assessment that we can make of this obviously false supposition is that it is patently ridiculous. To dismiss it all we have to do is ask a few simple questions. For instance: Was Wilberforce not a Christian when he voted in favour of the Corn Laws that, if he had had his way, would have led to the starvation of poor white people in Britain? Was he not a Christian when he determined that women should not be allowed to vote or that women 'felons' should be hung instead of burned? Did he lose his Christian convictions when he made these decisions and miraculously regain them when he heard about the suffering of Afrikan people?

Why should his Christian convictions cause him to suddenly spring to the assistance of a group of out of sight down trodden Afrikan people and at the same time, fail to cause him to assist his own people whose plight was immediately before him? In other words, why did his Christian convictions fail to begin at home? The reason is simple: It is because he was driven by the desire to amass profits for himself and his peers; he was not driven by Christian convictions at all. The story of his Christian convictions inspiring him to save enslaved Afrikan people from their suffering was a fake romantic cover story concocted to deceive the naive. The cover story is wholly inconsistent with his behaviour towards all other oppressed people, particularly those with whom he had direct contact. There is no truth in this concocted cover story whatsoever. The truth is that he was told to 'take up' the plight of enslaved Afrikan

people by his boss the Prime Minister and the reason for 'taking it up' was so that he could secretly work to prolong the chattel enslavement system.

Wilberforce a drug addicted late comer to the abolition cause

Afrikan people resisted our enslavement from the very first day that European imperialism attempted to steal our people. However, it was not until 1776 that the world began to hear the first openly anti-slavery utterances of the British establishment. This happened when David Hartley condemned the 'slave trade' in the House of Commons (Hart, 2006, p. 1). It had taken British imperialism well over 200 years to begin to notice that there might be something wrong with kidnapping, deporting, holding in bondage, enslaving, murdering and otherwise abusing Afrikan people. Another initiative followed in 1783 when the Quakers petitioned Parliament against human trafficking (Hart, 2006, p. 1). Wilberforce was not involved in any of these early anti-slavery initiatives.

On 22 May 1787 a group of British people gave themselves the official sounding title of 'The Abolition Society' and declared their existence to the British establishment. The society gave the outward impression that it was against the enslavement of Afrikan people, although its activities often suggested otherwise. Interestingly imperialism's 'great saviour and hero' Wilberforce was not amongst the original grouping (Hart, 2006, p. 1). Nor did he end up joining the society of his own volition or as a matter of conscience. Instead he was 'recruited' and sent into the abolition movement by the then Prime Minister William Pitt (Ferguson, 1998, p. 132; Williams, 1944, p. 123). The fake cover story about his moral and religious conviction compelling him to work for the abolition of slavery was made up later.

The choice of Wilberforce for the anti-slavery 'moral crusade' was an interesting one. Throughout his adult life, he is reported to have suffered significant health problems (Howarth, 1973, p. 463). This is hardly surprising given the fact that he was a known drug addict. Apparently he was a junkie, unable to wean himself off his reliance on hard drugs. British historians inform us that:

"William Wilberforce ... took opium every day for 45 years." (Howarth, 1973, p. 562).

This evidence reveals the fact that Wilberforce demonstrated a greater level of commitment to the consumption of hard drugs than he ever did to the abolition of slavery. Evidence concerning whether he took hard drugs more often than he prayed is inconclusive. As if that was not enough, he was also known to indulge in drinking and gambling (Howarth, 1973, p. 457).

The appointment of a known drug addict and apparent drunkard as the champion of the abolition movement suggests that the British establishment had no real intention of abolishing the kidnapping, deporting and enslavement of Afrikan people. It also blows the cover off of the fake story that claims that he was inspired to save Afrikan people from slavery as a result of his Christian convictions. If Christianity was such an inspiration in his life, then why did it fail motivate and inspire sufficiently for him to refrain from hard drugs, gambling and alcohol?

Wilberforce: Government agent and bogus anti-slavery 'leader'?

The recruitment of Wilberforce by the Prime Minister is an important clue suggesting that he may have been appointed to perform a subversive role designed to hold up the abolition process. Pitt was determined that Wilberforce, a backbencher, should be the official spokesman for the abolition society and in that role, present the abolition bill in Parliament. This is very surprising since the bill would have stood a much greater chance of success if the Prime Minister had taken it on as part of government business, headed and presented by a cabinet Minister. If he had really wanted to abolish the 'slave trade' he could have used the full power of his office to make it happen. The truth is that the Prime Minister's situation was delicate in that he wanted to appear to be in favour of abolition, whilst in reality being doggedly opposed to it.

Pitt was forced into giving the false impression that he favoured abolition because of the growing awareness about: (i) the barbarity, wickedness and general evil of slavery, and (ii) the large number of deaths of British seamen, soldiers and other personnel overseas. The resulting and ever growing outcry from the British public for the abolition of the 'slave trade' increased the pressure on him and his government to act. This then created serious problems for a government that relied heavily on the income that it received in the form of taxes from enslavers and others who profited from the human misery of enslaved Afrikan people. Pitt's tactical response was to send in his close and trusted friend Wilberforce; so close that at one time they even lived in the same house (Howarth, 1973, p. 462). Wilberforce's role was to function as the society's mouthpiece with the latent agenda of containing, stifling, thwarting, delaying and otherwise redirecting the pressure on government so as to stave off the abolition of slavery.

There are signs that initially Wilberforce was not quite up to the task of infiltrating and undermining the organised structures and processes developed to achieve the abolition of slavery. It evidently became necessary to coerce him into stepping more fully into the bogus leadership role ascribed to him because in 1787 Pitt found it necessary to warn Wilberforce that:

"... if he did not bring the motion in [to the House of Commons], somebody else would ..." (James, 1963, p. 53).

The thought of somebody else stealing his limelight seems to have helped him overcome his reluctance.

Despite his shaky start, it did not take him long to blossom in his subversive role; there were deadly consequences for Afrikan people as Wilberforce used his position to destroy the 'Abolition Society's' infrastructure and hold up the whole 'abolition' process. For instance, on 2nd April 1792 the House of Commons approved a bill, brought in by Wilberforce, for the 'abolition' of the practice of kidnapping and deporting Afrikan people across the Atlantic. This bill was consolidated on 23rd April 1792 when the House of Commons agreed and approved an exact date for the legal 'abolition' of British involvement in the kidnapping and deportation process (Web of English History). The date agreed for 'abolition' was 1st January 1796. In effect, the most difficult phase involved in enacting new legislation had been overcome and all that remained in Parliamentary procedural terms was approval from the House of Lords and Royal Assent.

It was at this point that one of the most amazing U-turns in the history of British politics happened. After having defeated all opposition in the House of Commons, a nearly complete piece of legislation lost the support of its supposed advocates. The result of this stand down was that the bill did not progress any further. The sovereignty of Parliament had already been established at this point in history and neither the House of Lords nor the Monarch could have prevented a determined House of Commons from carrying through this vitally important piece of legislation. It must therefore be regarded as extremely surprising that Wilberforce and his friends chose this point to just pull the plug on the bill and drop it. One apologist for imperialism claimed that:

"... the zeal of [Wilberforce and his friends] slackened ..." (Web of English History).

The Afrikan historian Richard Hart gave a more honest appraisal when he explained that Wilberforce simply 'abandoned' the bill, leaving it to die an untimely death.

Imperialism's apologists excuse Wilberforce's abandonment of the bill on the grounds that he did not want to take an action that would be approved of by the Jacobins (Web of English History). However, the 'Black Jacobins' in Haiti had commenced their revolutionary war of liberation on 22nd August 1791 (James, 1963, p. 87). Furthermore, their European counterparts in France had started their activities aimed at changing the balance of power in their land even earlier on 14th July 1789 (Black, 1999, p. 87). The advocates of the bill were most definitely fully unaware of the activities of the Jacobins at the time that they initially introduced the bill into Parliament. We can therefore reason that if the excuse given by the apologists was genuine and consistent, then the bill would never have been introduced in the first place. The truth is that the 'abolition' bill was only introduced as a public relations

exercise and was never intended to succeed. Its advocates were caught by complete surprise when it reached as far as it did in the legislative process and responded by blatantly thwarting any further progress. If Wilberforce had been a genuine advocate for the 'abolition of slavery', then he would have increased his efforts during this critical Parliamentary phase in order to see the bill successfully through to legal enactment.

After killing the bill, Wilberforce's next mission was to get rid of the 'Abolition Society' itself. Though he had hitherto been working 'closely' with it, Wilberforce did not officially join the 'Abolition Society' until 1794 (Schama, 2006, p. 245). In retrospect, we can see that he joined the society in order to kill it off. He wasted no time in using the Afrikan revolution in Haiti as an excuse to wreck it. Wilberforce and his friends went so far as to cease virtually all 'Abolition Society' meetings. In their determination to ensure that the kidnapping and deportation of Afrikan people continued unabated, they deliberately did not meet regularly. Under Wilberforce's leadership, the society met only twice during the nine year period covering 1795 to 1804. The British historian Paul Foot explained that:

"During this period the Abolition of Slavery Movement in Britain almost petered out." (Man's Unconquerable Mind).

In short, Wilberforce and his friends had reached the point of successfully achieving the Parliamentary 'abolition' of the process of kidnapping and deporting Afrikan people from Africa and then jettisoned, not only the pursuit of the completion of the prospective Act of Parliament, but they also destroyed the whole organisational infrastructure that was supposedly designed to achieve 'abolition'.

There can be little doubt that Wilberforce's actions were wholly inconsistent with the objective of abolishing the so called 'slave trade' and liberating Afrikan people from chattel enslavement bondage. Wilberforce was really a fake abolitionist and his actions directly contributed to delaying British imperialism's 'abolition' of the kidnapping and deportation process by British imperialism from 1st January 1796 [when it was due to happen] until 25th March 1807 [when it eventually happened], a period of over 11 years. He stooped to even lower levels of deceit by using the Afrikan revolution in Haiti as a pretext for abandoning the 'abolition' bill designed to 'help' Afrikan people, a bill which had already successfully passed through the Commons (Hart, 1998, p. 62). The consequence for Afrikan people of Wilberforce's underhand delaying tactics was that British imperialism kidnapped and deported into slavery over a million more of our ancestors than would otherwise have directly suffered the human trafficking element of the *Maangamizi*. This evidence makes it clear that Wilberforce was no friend of Afrikan people; his actions were those of a blatant enemy.

Some readers might find it strange to think in terms of Wilberforce having operated as an under cover government spy working to subvert the abolitionist movement. However, we know that Pitt was really against the abolition of slavery because of his response to the Haitian revolution. When the world saw the Afrikan people in Haiti rise up and abolish slavery, Pitt failed to offer them either his government's support or even its official recognition. Instead he sent 60,000 British soldiers, mostly to die, in an unsuccessful attempt to crush the Afrikan people there in order to return them back into slavery (James, 1963, p. ix).

Pitt's actions must have been designed to maintain slavery, because he did not send his troops into nearby France to assist attempts to crush the revolutionary Jacobins who were fighting a similar cause. The British historian Paul Foot, himself the son of a former Prime Minister, raises this analysis to an even higher level. He says that:

"There was a chance that the French might be dislodged from the island by a slave revolt; and that the British might seize St Domingue, restore slavery there and make good British profits from it."
(Man's Unconquerable Mind).

Foot makes it plain that the aim of Pitt was to reinstate the system of chattel slavery that Afrikan people had abolished of their own volition. As part of their cover up, Imperialism's bogus historians appear to be asking us to believe that the British government was going to reinstate slavery in Haiti so that they could have the pleasure of abolishing it a year or two later. This is obviously nonsense; the exposure of the latent objective of the British Prime Minister Pitt is crystal clear for all to see. Pitt was unequivocally an emphatic supporter of the idea that Afrikan people in the Americas should remain enslaved and his motivation for this was profit.

Instead of correcting his close friend the Prime Minister and championing the cause of the Afrikan people fighting for their freedom in Haiti, Wilberforce publicly supported Pitt's decision to send British forces into Haiti in order to fully re-instate slavery on the island and abandoned the abolition cause (Hart, 1998, p. 62). Historian Richard Hart explains that Wilberforce:

"... did not wish the [enslaved Afrikan people] to participate in the abolition process as had occurred in Haiti, where [enslaved Afrikan people] themselves had brought their enslavement to an end." (Hart, 1998, p. 33).

There can be little doubt that Wilberforce's actions were specifically against the enslaved Afrikan people who were fighting for freedom. We know this because he had previously pronounced his opposition to Britain sending troops to fight against their own European kith and kin in North America (John Jay) and France (Howarth, 1973, p. 456). That they should

be prepared to go to such lengths is proof conclusive that both Wilberforce and Pitt were unequivocally and fundamentally opposed to the abolition of slavery. Any other utterances that they made were just anti-slavery rhetoric designed to camouflage their real agenda. It is just not possible for an honest and objective observer to consider these facts and reasonably draw any other conclusion.

In addition, there is documented evidence confirming that governments of that period in British history actively used their own under cover agents as spies against groups that they did not approve of. Afrikan anti-slavery and anti-imperialist heroes such as William Davison (Fryer, 1984, p. 213) and William Cuffay (Fryer, 1984, p. 243) were executed or otherwise persecuted as a direct result of the subversive activities of government sponsored undercover agent provocateurs. The Briton Arthur Thistlewood suffered a similar fate (Foot, 2002, p. 149).

As will be seen, Wilberforce consistently behaved in ways that ran counter to the objective of abolishing slavery. It is his consistent pattern of blatant anti-abolitionist, blatant racist and blatant sexist behaviours that lay him open to the accusation of being a subversive government agent. It is also interesting to note that all the time William Pitt, the man who appointed him, was Prime Minister all bills to abolish the kidnapping and deportation of Afrikan people failed to make their way through Parliament. It was only after the death of Pitt in 1806 that the abolition of the slave trade bill finally made it onto the statue book.

Racist Wilberforce opposed the abolition of slavery

Another of the methods used by imperialism to propagate its lies is to create or control organisations that pretend to champion particular just causes whilst, at the same time, adopting the hidden agenda of derailing or containing that just cause. The actions of the so called 'Abolition Society' were consistent with that pattern in that despite its progressive sounding name, it openly boasted that it did not seek the abolition of the enslavement of Afrikan people. For instance, on 12 August 1788 just months after Wilberforce started operating as its 'quasi-official' Parliamentary spokesman, the 'Abolition Society' issued its first public statement:

"... proclaiming that the abolition of slavery was not their objective' (Hart, 2006, p. 2).

The following year 1789, a Privy Council report concluded that free waged labourers were 3 times more productive than enslaved people (Ferguson, 1998, p. 132). There was an increasing realisation that enslaved people had no purchasing power and that this was as an obvious impediment to the development of the capitalist market system of distribution and exchange (Hart, 1998, p. 33).

The society appears to have been completely unmoved by the mounting sources of information and pressure supportive of the abolition of slavery. They still stubbornly refused to advocate for the abolition of slavery and on 31 January 1792 Wilberforce's friends in the 'Abolition Society' issued their second public statement:

"... proclaiming that the abolition of slavery was not their objective" (Hart, 2006, p. 2).

If these actions were not enough to demonstrate the desire of Wilberforce and his friends to hold back progress towards gaining the 'freedom' of enslaved Afrikan people then, on 29 March 1797 the case was sealed; three years after Wilberforce officially joined, the disingenuous nature of the 'Abolition Society' was confirmed when it issued its third public statement::

"... proclaiming that the abolition of slavery was not their objective" (Hart, 2006, p. 2).

From the point of view of Afrikan people, this is an aspect of Wilberforce's 'help' that we could have done without.

The success of the Haitian revolution and the Haitian declaration of independence in 1804 forced all of the imperialist nations to reconsider their approach to the enslavement of Afrikan people (James, 1963, p. 370). All of Pitt's and Wilberforce's attempts to support the maintenance of slavery on that island had ended in unmitigated disaster. The experience forced them and other imperialists to accept that they could be militarily defeated by enslaved Afrikan people. It also forced them to accept that if they continued to kidnap and deport Afrikan people to the Americas that they would be adding to the military might of the already powerful enslaved Afrikan people resisting their enslavers. This in turn would lead to the inevitable demise of their European kith and kin living in and colonising those lands.

Denmark wasted no time and abolished the 'slave trade' in 1802 (Greenwood, 1980, p. 64). Britain's response was slower: Since the 1790's the British Parliament had developed the habit of thwarting all attempts to abolish the kidnapping and deportation of Afrikan people into enslavement. Despite their military defeats at the hands of Afrikan people in Haiti. Some sections of the British establishment refused to accept the need to abolish. Over a period they began to accept reality, Britain changed stance and a bill for the abolition of the 'slave trade' was, though not for the first time, approved by the House of Commons in 1804. It was however, held up by the intransigence of House of Lords (Hart, 1998, p. 63).

When in 1807 the House of Lords finally capitulated under the overwhelming pressure to abolish the practice of kidnapping and deporting Afrikan people, Wilberforce attempted to put the breaks on the Afrikan liberation process by publicly denouncing the idea of emancipating

enslaved Afrikan people (Williams, 1944, p. 182). Following that, Wilberforce was to go on to prove just how reactionary he actually was when he and his friends delayed advocating the 'gradual emancipation' of enslaved Afrikan people until 1823 – 16 years (Hart, 2006, p. 2). It is clear that he did not feel it necessary to consult with enslaved Afrikan people since he expressed the opinion that we were not yet:

“... fit ... to bear emancipation ...” (Martin, 1999, p. 74).

Wilberforce's actions are clearly consistent with those of a person who was completely opposed to the idea of Afrikan people being freed from imperialist oppression.

Racist Wilberforce delayed the abolition of slavery

After the abolition of the 'slave trade' in 1807, the next logical step for those in favour of Afrikan emancipation was the immediate abolition of the institution of slavery itself. However, Wilberforce found curious ways of showing his 'support' for the cause of immediate abolition. In addition to openly opposing immediate abolition, he practiced behaviours which did not fall far short of those carried out by the racist fascists who controlled the abhorrent anti-human Apartheid system in South Afrika. For instance in 1816, when he claimed to be advocating for 'equality' and the 'emancipation' of Afrikan and other oppressed people, Wilberforce chaired a dinner of the friends of Afrikans and Asians Society and:

“... the token Afrikans and Asians invited to the gathering were separated from the other guests by a screen set across the end of the room.” (Fryer, 1984, p. 234).

Wilberforce was not shy in demonstrating his apparent 'compassion' for enslaved Afrikan people in other ways. For instance, he advocated the idea that Afrikan people should only be whipped at night – presumably so as not to adversely affect production, which took place mainly in the day (Hochschild, 2005, p. 314). Furthermore our 'great hero and saviour', who openly opposed the abolition of slavery, failed to oppose his imperialist colleagues who recommended that Afrikan people be bred like animals as a substitute to boosting the Afrikan population in the Americas through the kidnapping and compulsory deportation of our people – otherwise referred to as the 'slave trade'.

Following the rebellion of enslaved Afrikan people in Demerara in 1823, calls for the immediate abolition of slavery once again grew amongst the British public. Wilberforce and his friends had successfully held back the aspirations of those people genuinely desiring the immediate abolition of slavery until that year, but the pressure was now becoming too great. The mounting public pressure compelled Wilberforce and his friends to launch the Society for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery (SGAS) (Hart, 2006, p. 3). They launched the society as a last ditch tactic to further delay the prospect of ending the institution of slavery. Since it was

becoming clearer that they could not stop the progress towards abolition, they would drag it out and delay it for as long as possible. The SGAS advocated ideas and policies that would help slavery to survive for a further 100 years. Its members openly boasted that they wanted slavery to *gradually*.

“... die away and to be forgotten ...” (Williams, 1944, p. 182).

Wilberforce’s anti-abolition position was completely out of touch with the will of the British people and diametrically opposed to the majority of the membership of his own organisation. In May 1830 the SGAS passed a resolution for the immediate abolition of slavery against the wishes of its ‘leadership’ i.e. Wilberforce and his new side kick Buxton (Hart, 2006, p. 3). This was an important catalyst in the history of the abolition movement. Wilberforce and his friends had successfully delayed, suppressed and contained the demand for the immediate freedom of enslaved Afrikan people for over 40 years.

At the age of 74 when Wilberforce was bed bound and close to death, he mustered up the strength to say:

“Thank God that I should have witnessed the day in which England is willing to give £20m sterling for the abolition of slavery” (Howarth, 1973, p. 474/5).

This statement betrayed the truth about where and with whom his real interests were aligned. He was thanking God for the fact that members of his class would not lose out financially as a result of British imperialism’s enforced abandonment of the chattel enslavement system.

If he had genuinely supported the abolition of slavery as a means of achieving the emancipation of Afrikan people, Wilberforce would have openly rejoiced at the freedom of Afrikan people from enforced labour bondage. He would have insisted that £20m was paid to the ‘newly freed’ Afrikan people who for generations had had their labour stolen by the imperialists. However, instead of showing his gratefulness for the freedom of Afrikan people and seeking compensation for them, he expressed his gratefulness for his imperialist friends and allies receiving their £20m slush fund. A slush fund that they used to create and maintain a new style wage slavery system to replace the chattel system. Wilberforce’s display of overt loyalty to his class even at the point of his impending death added to the overwhelming body of evidence that goes to prove that he was a covert enemy of Afrikan people, not a friend.

Sexist Wilberforce opposed women’s groups advocating the abolition of slavery

In Britain, women were, after the Afrikan community itself, the most radical advocates for the abolition of slavery (Martin, 1999, p. 109-112). Whilst Wilberforce was openly advocating against the abolition of slavery, women’s groups were actively campaigning to achieve

immediate abolition. One example comes via Elizabeth Heyricke who wrote a pamphlet entitled, *Immediate Not Gradual Emancipation* (Martin, 1999, p. 110). Women were also prolific in the amassing of millions of signatures for anti-slavery petitions. More importantly, they led the mass boycott campaigns that damaged the economic interests of the plantation enslavers and their allies. Peckham Ladies Anti-Slavery Association is an example of a women's group that contributed to the organisation of the campaign to boycott West Indian sugar (Williams, 1944, p. 184).

Wilberforce actively opposed female anti-slavery associations and their role in organising boycott campaigns (Williams, 1944, p. 182). Wilberforce refused to accept women's signatures on anti-slavery petitions (Martin, 1999, p. 109). He tried to discourage and silence the political activities of women's groups working for the anti-slavery cause. If he was genuinely in favour of the abolition of slavery, he would have thanked and encouraged the various women's groups for the sterling work that they were doing to advance the cause that he claimed to stand for. In failing to do so he was demonstrating his overt sexism, whilst simultaneously harming the prospects of Afrikan people being freed from the bondage of imperialism. His undermining behaviour was clearly inconsistent with that of person sincerely working to achieve the abolition of slavery.

Furthermore, Wilberforce's personal treatment of women also leaves a lot to be desired. For instance, there is information suggesting that Wilberforce engaged in adulterous activities with at least one woman; a woman by the name of Agnes Bronte. We are informed that she:

"... moved to Whitby, where she soon became the mistress of William Wilberforce ... They used to spend Tuesdays together in his small fishing boat in Whitby Bay, when he used to demonstrate how [enslaved Afrikan people] were kept in chains on the long Atlantic crossing." (Agnes Bronte).

After graduating from her lessons in the sexually perverted and racist mockery of Afrikan people's suffering under the stewardship of Wilberforce she turned into a sexual misfit. The same author also informs us that:

"It is believed that Agnes Bronte's lifelong love of bondage derived from this period." (Agnes Bronte).

Wilberforce was married to Barbra Ann for over 30 years and they had 6 Children. Not only did Wilberforce's 'affair' with his 'mistress' Agnes Bronte constitute adultery, but it is also clear, unmitigated evidence confirming that he was little more than a 'dirty old man'. We are informed that Wilberforce was giving his perverted lessons to Agnes Bronte in 1833 (Agnes Bronte). At that time he was over 70 years old, whilst at only 20 she was young enough to be his granddaughter. Wilberforce's sex bondage training sessions with Agnes Bronte must

have contributed to her becoming a prostitute specialising in sexual bondage. Worse still she eventually moved beyond personal prostitution and became a 'high class' pimp, in her own right. She was the founder and manager a prostitution racket; her London based 'top people's' brothel colloquially known as 'the Bronte Dungeon', was a place where women were made to sell their bodies to men in order to make her a profit.

Whilst Wilberforce vociferously denounced the idea of women being involved in open political activity aimed at abolishing slavery, he made no such condemnation of the public exploitation of women as prostitutes in brothels. During the anti-slavery agitation period innocent Afrikan women were kidnapped, transported from their homes and held captive as sex slaves in British brothels. If he was genuinely against the enslavement of Afrikan people, he would have used his position in Parliament to help outlaw this most despicable of human abuses. However, instead of condemning this outrageous practice as a crime against the humanity of Afrikan women, he joined the exploitation process. He personally participated in systematically organised episodes of rape perpetrated against these defenceless Afrikan women, whose misfortune it was to be imprisoned in British imperialism's brothels. This aspect of his behaviour was brought to the attention of the public by cartoonists in the national press (Howarth, 1973, p. 456).

Behind Closed Doors



Brother Omowale

Wilberforce does not appear to have denied these public accusations, nor did he take legal action to protect his 'good name'. He would have had some difficulty defending himself given the fact that he was reported to have had at least one secret 'mistress' who was herself a prostitute. It is also worth noting that Wilberforce never ever claimed that Christianity 'inspired' him to engage in 'intimacies' with prostitutes. This should come as no surprise, because it is blatantly obvious that Christianity did not 'inspire' him to conduct himself in this

despicable and immoral way. It should be equally obvious that Christianity did not 'inspire' his alleged anti-slavery activities either. In both cases he was motivated by non-religious factors: The first was 'inspired' by lust and the second by greed. Yet another weakness in Wilberforce's 'inspiration' argument is that his belief in Christianity did not 'inspire' him to restrain from raping defenceless Afrikan women who were imprisoned and enslaved. The fake story of his Christian 'inspiration' fails on the grounds that it is simply too inconsistent to possibly be true.

Perhaps one reason why Wilberforce was so openly against the abolition of slavery is that it could have led to a personal 'loss of privileges' on his part, by denying him his unrestricted access to the group of disempowered Afrikan women whom he used as sex toys. Afrikan people have already suffered on an unprecedented scale as a result of slavery and other aspects of the *Maangamizi*. On top of that catastrophe, derisory insults are then added when characters such as William Wilberforce a rapist, 'dirty old man' and anti-woman moral tyrant are held up as the saviours and heroes that Afrikan people should be grateful to. It is obvious that Afrikan people are best placed to choose their own heroes and imperialism insults, not only Afrikan people, but all of the peoples of the world by holding up this calibre of anti-human beast as an object of admiration. In short, Wilberforce's perverted, misogynistic and racist behaviour falls significantly short of that which should be expected of anybody posing as an 'Afrikan liberator, hero and saviour'.

References

1. Black. Clinton , (1999), *History of Jamaica* , Longman
2. Ferguson. James, (1998), *The Story of the Caribbean People*, Ian Randle Publishers, Kingston, Jamaica
3. Foot. M.R.D., (2002), *Secret Lives: Lifting the Lid on the Worlds of Secret Intelligence*, Oxford University Press
4. Foot. Paul, (1991), *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, Socialist Worker Review, No.144, July/August 1991, pp.16-19
5. Fryer. Peter, (1984), *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain*, Pluto Press
6. Greenwood. R., & Hamber. S., (1980), *Emancipation to Emigration*, Macmillan Caribbean
7. Hart. Richard, (1998), *From Occupation to Independence: A Short History of the Peoples of the English Speaking Caribbean Region*, Pluto Press
8. Hart. Richard, (2006), *A talk on the subject of: The Slaves Who Abolished Slavery*, Centerprise Bookshop, Dalston, London, 11th October 2006
9. Hochschild. Adam, (2005), *Bury the Chains: Prophets and Rebels in the Fight to Free an Empire's Slaves*, Mariner Books
10. Howarth. David, (1973), *The British Empire; Volume 2*, BBCTV Time Life Books
11. James. C.L.R., (1963), *The Black Jacobins*, Vintage Books
12. Martin. Steve, (1999), *Britain's Slave Trade*, Channel 4 Books
13. Schama. Simon, (2006), *Rough Crossings: Britain, the Slaves and the*

14. Walwin. James, (1993), *Black Ivory: A History of British Slavery*, Fontana Press
15. Williams. Eric, (1944), *Capitalism and Slavery*, Andre Deutsch

Internet References

1. A Web of English History, <http://dSPACE.dial.pipex.com/town/terrace/adw03/c-eight/people/wilberf.htm>
2. Agnes Bronte 1813 - 1892, <http://freespace.virgin.net/pr.og/agnes.html>
3. John Jay: An American Wilberforce, <http://www.johnjayinstitute.org/index.cfm?get=get.johnjaypaper>
4. Ligali, (Monday 6th November 2006), Set All Free Deny Wilberforce Film Endorsement, <http://www.ligali.org/article.php?id=563>
5. Man's Unconquerable Mind, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/foot-paul/1991/07/toussaint.htm>
6. The Amazing Change, <http://www.theamazingchange.com/timeline.html>
7. William Wilberforce 1759-1833, Biography, <http://www.brycchancarey.com/abolition/wilberforce.htm>