



THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST



NUMBER THREE

SEPTEMBER 1960

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

Problems of a Continent in Revolution 2

J. GIRODOT

The Congo Marches to Freedom 10

I. POTEKHIN

Lenin and Africa 18

A. LERUMO

The Agony of South Africa 26

I. KUMALO

Nigerian Independence 36

B. PELA

The United States and Africa 40

Copies of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST will be part of Africa for 1s. 6d. (British Postal Order) a dozen. They are available from our London agent

Mr. Ellis Bowles,
52 Palmerston Road,
East Sheen,
London, S.W.13.

Articles or letters to the Editor may also be sent to

The African Communist is published, in the *African* solidarity, and as a forum for *Marxist thought* throughout our Continent, by the *South African Communist Party*.

Articles are invited for publication, as well as contributions on all themes of African interest.

Orders may also be placed for copies of this magazine. The price is one shilling and sixpence per copy, or for ten copies where they are ordered in quantities of ten or more.

As our Party is illegal, all correspondence must be sent to our London representative at the above address.

OUR MAGAZINE

Communism has become the vital social and political belief of our times. Already one third of mankind has chosen the road to socialism under the leading banners of the Marxist parties. Everywhere else, millions of men and women press forward to their liberation, inspired by the parties of Communism.

In this, as in so much else, Africa lags behind the world. The forces of imperialism, which have made Africa the "dark continent", have also kept the people curtained off from the liberating spirit of Communism.

This magazine, "*The African Communist*", has been started by the South African Communist Party, to defend and spread the inspiring and liberating ideas of Communism in our great continent, and to apply the brilliant scientific method of Marxism to the solution of its problems.

It is being produced in conditions of great difficulty and danger. Nevertheless we mean to go on publishing it, because we know Africa needs Communist thought, as dry and thirsty soil needs rain.

To you, the reader, we say, comrade and fellow-worker, wherever you may be, read and study this magazine. Pass it on to other fellow-workers and form groups to discuss it. These groups may become the foundation-stones of great and important Communist Parties in many lands that will bring salvation to your country.

The "*African Communist*" has been hailed with joy by revolutionary workers and intellectuals in many parts of our great continent. It has been, in the words of one reader, "like a ray of sunlight piercing through the dark."

"How can I get more copies?" ask other readers. "How can I send an article to your magazine?" This was difficult, because we could not put any address on our first two issues. Now we have overcome this difficulty by appointing a London agent for our magazine to whom you can write. His address appears on the inside back cover.

The magnitude of the problems sweeping over Africa cannot be underestimated. The tempo of the change is unequalled. But change brings new problems and challenges. Some of them are dealt with in this article.

EDITORIAL

New Problems of A CONTINENT IN REVOLUTION

AFRICA in 1960 is a continent in revolution. With dizzy speed, the era of direct domination over the peoples and countries of this continent is coming to an end. In one territory after another the old colonial orders are being dismantled and replaced by new governments composed of African leaders who, for the most part, enjoy a wide measure of popular support. Even in some areas where colonial rule and white privilege seemed most strongly entrenched the old colonial administrations are being modified and adapted, and hurried preparations made to transfer formal political power to African hands. The map of Africa is changing before our eyes, and the area of self-government extended to cover the whole continent.

A mighty, continent-wide tide of African liberation is surging from north to south, from east to west. The freedom struggles of individual African countries cannot be contained within their "national" boundaries, drawn by the imperialists. A common history of oppression going back over centuries of foreign rule, whether French or Belgian, British or Portuguese, unites the African people, regardless of their language and their past, or of which European power colonised them. The new independent States need to stand together to safeguard their new-won freedom and to help their African brothers still under the colonial yoke. There is a powerful urge towards co-operation of African liberation movements and union of the young African republics. All-African unity is an invaluable weapon against the forces of colonialism.

DANGEROUS ILLUSIONS

But the very speed of the striking transformation of Africa can and does give rise to certain widespread illusions which could be very dangerous. Some people seem to think that the struggle for African freedom has already been won, that it remains only to complete the process with a few "mopping up" operations, and

that the future progress by the peoples of Africa to full equality with the nations of the world will be an easy process, unaccompanied by storms, struggles and upheavals. There is an illusion that imperialism has surrendered, that the colonialists mean to give up without a struggle their vast sources of power and profit on this Continent.

There is the illusion that the winning of political independence, which is only the first phase of the African Revolution — though a vital and important one is the end of the freedom road, and not only the first miles along it, necessarily to be followed by far-reaching economic and social changes which will bring true emancipation to Africa and end its heritage of poverty, backwardness and dependence.

Again, airy and ill-defined talk of “Pan-Africanism” and the “African Personality” give rise to vague and mystical notions that the problems of our Continent are peculiarly and exclusively African, unrelated to those of other Continents and peoples, that our way forward will be unique and that the experiences of other peoples and countries are without meaning and value to us in Africa.

Of course, there *are* certain notably distinct features of the African Revolution, which we hope to deal with in future articles in this magazine. But, like the Asian states which embarked upon the road of independence after the second world war, and like recently independent Cuba, the emergent African republics have many problems common to all who seek to win their rightful place among the older and more developed countries. More: there are vital issues which face every country and people in the modern world. There is the key question of world peace, in an era where a new world war threatens the very survival of the whole of humanity. There is the crucial issue of our times — capitalism versus socialism — and which of these offers African states the better chance of overcoming the crippling heritage of imperialism. There are vital issues of foreign policy facing every new African state. These are some of the challenges facing African leaderships and statesmanship today.

WAR OR PEACE ?

African freedom and the battle for world peace are as closely linked as Siamese twins. Few Africans can be blind to the fact that those imperialist forces which have held Africa in bondage for centuries are those that today engage in vast preparations for war

and are responsible for the state of international tension in the world.

In 1956 Egypt, newly independent, asserted her sovereign right to nationalise her major asset, the Suez Canal. Britain and France, using Israel as a catspaw, and with the connivance of the United States, launched a war against Egypt and the world tottered on the brink of nuclear war.

Trying to hold on to her last outpost of empire, France has for six years fought a bloody and brutal war against the Algerian people.

Earlier this year, in a show of strength on the stage of world power politics and in Africa, France, exploded an atom bomb on African soil, though the test blast was condemned by the United Nations and the unanimous voice of the African people.

When Belgium rushed paratroopers into the Congo to try to wreck the newly proclaimed Congo Republic the first powers to rush to her aid were the United States (most powerful Imperialist power and leader of the war bloc), and Welensky's Central African Federation (one of the police forces of White supremacy on the continent).

The massive military machines prepared by the western states for the alleged reason of defence against 'Communism' can be and are repeatedly used to suppress the revolts of the African peoples against domination by European powers or white settlers, or to threaten the independence of those countries which have succeeded in gaining a measure of self-government.

As imperialism and colonialism and war are linked, so are the forces of socialism and peace and freedom tied together. The Socialist system of planned economies does not need to resort to munitions industries and war to solve its economic crises, and the Soviet Union has consistently been at the head of those forces trying to outlaw war and keep the peace. The Soviet Union took the unilateral decision to reduce arms and troops, to stop nuclear tests. She put forward disarmament proposals to the Big Powers and pressed for top level negotiations on disarmament.

The remarkable technical achievements of the Soviet Union, strikingly demonstrated by the 'sputniks' and 'luniks' and other feats of science destroyed the myth of Western technical superiority upon which the policy of 'cold' war was based. Logically the only

alternative to the 'cold' war was a policy of peaceful co-existence and the acceptance of the Soviet proposals for stage-by-stage total disarmament. The imperialist powers, led by the United States, ignored this logic and continued with the ruinous and dangerous amassing of weapons. And as the Summit Conference drew near and the prospects for peace were brighter than for years past, the United States took last desperate steps to wreck the peace talks and sent military planes on provocative spy flights over Soviet territory.

Imperialist military machines ranged against the Socialist countries are the same forces used to police the African continent and put down the freedom forces of the African Revolution. So at one and the same time the growing strength of the Socialist world weakens the world force of imperialism and helps the spurt forward of the peoples of Africa. Africa needs peace to enjoy her newly-won independence and she cannot stand aside from the battle for peace. Conversely, a blow to the war plans of the Imperialist countries helps immeasurably to loosen their grip on their colonial possessions.

THE CONCEPT OF 'NEUTRALISM'

Such concepts as 'neutralism', 'positive neutrality' and 'non-participation in power blocs' are popular at all-African conferences and in Asian countries. These concepts have a positive side. They reflect a moving away of the former colonies from the position of being imperialist dependencies or 'spheres of influence'. Following this concept the Afro-Asian 'bloc' has played a progressive role at the United Nations and many of its member countries have entered into closer relationships with the socialist countries on the diplomatic, economic, cultural and other levels.

At the same time 'neutralism' has harmful and negative aspects. It suggests the identification of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and other socialist countries with the imperialists, all as 'alien powers seeking to dominate and exploit Africa and the African peoples'. It suggests that African countries, anxious to safeguard their independence, must stand aside from not only the countries of imperialism but also those of the socialist world, that both forces are ranged against the African Revolution. Under cover of talk of 'opposing foreign ideologies', imperialist agencies like the Moral Rearmament Movement, and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions smuggle poisonous anti-Communist talk and policies into the African nationalist and trade union movements. These 'neutrals' are not neutral. They have

invariably turned out to be committed to the forces of imperialism trying to hold on to their spheres of influence on the continent, though in new shapes and forms.

Africa cannot be 'neutral' towards the imperialist powers which have conquered and degraded its peoples and are still striving in various ways, ranging from open warfare to subtle economic infiltration, to keep their stranglehold over the continent. Africans cannot regard these powers in the same light as the socialist countries which have consistently upheld the rights of the colonial peoples to self-determination, and which have given generous economic assistance — without strings attached — to all African and Asian states which have asked for it.

While 'neutralism' has played, and may still play for a short period, an objectively progressive and necessary part as a slogan of the *transition period* from colonialism, it must in the future increasingly become a reactionary slogan, under cover of which an anti-socialist and pro-imperialist policy is peddled.

Progressive movements in Africa recognise the genuine feeling in Africa for "positive neutralism", but must guard against these who would use this slogan to cause harmful dissension and splits in the African liberation front. The main thing is to unite all African freedom forces in the sharpest possible struggle against imperialism and colonialism in Africa and throughout the world. The Bandung spirit of Afro-Asian solidarity against imperialism must be carried to higher levels, and the closest possible friendship built, based on equality, between the countries of Socialism and the free states and the peoples of Africa.

NEW FOREIGN POLICIES FOR AFRICA

Despite the talk of 'neutralism' and 'non-alignment', African states even under conservative national leaderships, have not failed in the acid tests put before them. Moving like one man the states of free Africa have taken sides against every act of imperialist aggression in Africa, from the declaration of states of emergency in Nyasaland and the Rhodesias and South Africa to the armed Belgian intervention in the Congo, from the French atomic blast in the Sahara to the continuance of the war in Algeria.

For the nature of the anti-imperialist fight is that all liberation forces in Africa have to make a firm stand against the Western Powers. They cannot shelter behind formulae of 'neutralism'. When Africans and Arabs are being shot down in Leopoldville and

Algiers, and Congress leaders being detained in Blantyre, Livingstone and Cape Town, African states and movements unite in immediate support, moral and practical, of the victims of imperialism.

This is the great common interest — the fight to break the grip of imperialism on the continent — which cements together the foreign policies of the states and liberation movements of our Continent.

This struggle against imperialism, open or concealed, is the basis of the agreement reached at the All-Africa conferences at Accra and Conakry, at the conference of African States held at Addis Ababa and the foundation stone of the foreign policies of the new African states. Significantly the two most crucial issues on the agenda of the Addis Ababa conference were the Algerian war and the mounting campaign against the Nationalist Government of South Africa.

The Algerian war and the boycott movement against South Africa are the two touchstones by which international attitudes on African liberation are judged these days. States which stand aloof from support of the FLN freedom forces in Algeria or condemnation of the South African Nationalist Government are suspect in the eyes of Africa.

As the struggle against imperialism deepens in many parts of the continent more and more of the newly emerged African states have to produce a foreign policy that does not merely react to sharp imperialist prods and attacks here and there, but which takes on a more consistent pattern. And a consistent policy of opposition to all imperialist plans and intrigues hastens the time when African countries enjoying merely formal self-government must break the last connections with their imperialist masters and strike out for real independence.

The imperialist countries realise, too, the great changes coming over the continent have forced them to retreat from the positions of naked domination they held in Africa. But they are not running away in blind panic. They are retreating to carefully prepared positions. They wish to retain the thousand invisible strings of dependence which tie Africa economically to Western Europe and North America and, under cover provided by nominally independent African governments, to exercise innumerable subtle forms of continued control and exploitation.

The United States, the most powerful imperialist country, tries to use the anti-imperialist sentiments of the African people to

replace western European influence in Africa with that of the influence of United States monopoly capitalists and financiers. With its long years of practice in treating the nominally independent countries of South America as its economic colonies, the United States sees itself as well equipped to change the new Africa into an American dependency too.

While Africa is weak, while her countries are backward economically and militarily, there is the constant threat of disguised or even open attempts to reconquer and recolonise Africa. These attempts find their chief expression, their main hope and source of potential strength in the white settler communities which live in Africa, in Algeria, Kenya, and Southern Rhodesia and of course South Africa. For the countries of new Africa, measures to assist the emancipation of the people of South Africa and Central Africa and the victory of the Algerian people in their war are therefore more than acts of support and African brotherhood. They are vital measures to ensure the safety of Africa, and to remove a poison-bed of reaction which could infect the whole continent, and a storm centre of counter-revolution.

SOCIALISM IS THE ROAD

The winning of political independence is therefore only the first phase — although an essential and important phase — of the African Revolution. That revolution, if its gains are to be preserved and its benefits realised for the great mass of the people cannot stop short at this phase. It must continue, to wipe out all remnants of colonialism. It must bring about large scale industrialisation. It must spread the African revolution into the countryside to transform the life of the African subsistence farmer; it must move on to the elimination of backwardness, illiteracy, tribalism and feudalism.

African independence cannot survive in the present age until and unless its economic basis rapidly catches up with that of the advanced industrial countries of the world.

Sooner or later emergent Africa must see that the only way in which she can carry out this gigantic task of defeating backwardness and advancing into full freedom is through Socialism: the planned development of commonly-owned means of production.

The Soviet Union, the Peoples' Republic of China, in widely differing conditions and two different epochs showed that only

under socialist planning can breath-taking economic scientific and industrial advance transform two of the poorest countries of the world into two of the world's greatest powers.

It is this unprecedented industrial and technical development which has made it possible not only to bring new life to the Russian and Chinese worker and farmer, but also for the socialist countries to give invaluable help to the underdeveloped countries and former colonies, Africa included.

Economic and technical aid from the socialist countries differs fundamentally from the 'aid' offered by imperialist countries to underdeveloped Africa and Asia. Socialist aid is given on very generous terms — there are long periods of repayment and low rates of interest — (terms which capitalist businesses, concerned primarily with the export of capital at high rates of profit will not offer). Even more important is the purpose of aid from the socialist world and the conditions under which it is given. The imperialists offer aid in the shape of surplus consumer products and are anxious to keep the underdeveloped countries in a state of backwardness and dependency.

The socialist world is able and willing to help in the rapid industrialisation of the former colonies to enable them as quickly as possible to stand on their own feet and attain complete economic independence. The imperialists make all sorts of political and military conditions for their handouts to ensure that their 'beneficiaries' will remain within the western 'sphere of interest'. Socialist assistance is given without strings or conditions. Thus not only countries headed by militant peoples' leaders like Sékou Touré, moving in the direction of socialist planning and democracy, but even those ruled by feudal kings like Haile Selassie and anti-Communists like President Nasser benefit from Soviet aid. Socialist aid to underdeveloped countries springs from genuine concern in the welfare and social advancement of the peoples of the country concerned.

Thus the advance of socialism and anti-imperialist forces all over the world spurs forward and assists the advance of the peoples of Africa to freedom and independence. And the African Revolution saps still further the greatly weakened force of world imperialism and opens the way to full freedom for the peoples of this continent and the world at large.

The Congo Marches to Freedom

by J. GIRODOT

In the storm and fires of revolution, imperialist intervention and turmoil, a new African independent state, the Republic of the Congo, was born in July 1960.

For seventy years, the Belgian colonizers had been masters of this vast country of fourteen million Africans, whose rubber and ivory they plundered; whose diamonds, uranium and copper they looted; whose people they ruthlessly exploited in some of the most horrifying labour scandals in the history of the rape of Africa.

The Belgians always boasted that they had found the formula for the "model" colonial order, undisturbed and ever unchanging. The "formula" seemed simple: Hold on at all costs to "paternal" order, under which the African is a worker, but never a voter. The Civil Service was kept White and no African was ever admitted to any command post in the Police or the Army. Mission schools were opened, but not institutions for higher education.

When the Congo became independent on June 30, 1960, there was the spectacle of the very first African doctor ever graduating from the University of Lovanium, which is itself only six years old. And it has been estimated that this newly self-governing African State started life with just twelve senior civil servants, sixteen university graduates and virtually no Congolese in the service above the rank of clerk.

Above all else, the Belgians sought to keep a tight hold over the political activities of the Africans, and to stamp them out ruthlessly before they got too daring. Spies and informers kept a sharp watch on the activities of Congolese patriots, many of whom were arrested, deported and even murdered in the sickeningly familiar manner of colonialists striving to maintain their domination.

THE BELGIAN COLONIAL ORDER

In many ways, the Belgian order in the rich Congo has been a textbook model of Imperialism at work. There was the early conquest by force of arms and the expropriation of the land. One-third of Congo land was alienated for non-African occupation, though of the 109,000 Whites in the Congo, only one in ten was a

settler and the rest were Civil Servants or Missionaries.

Giant monopolies grew up, with strong international connections, U.S., British and West German, to exploit the immense labour and material resources of the country. By 1956, the value of foreign investment in the Congo was something like £1,000 million — 20% more than the 1956 value of direct foreign investment in the Union of South Africa — Africa's wealthiest country. *Of this capital, 80% to 90% was held by a small group of Belgian finance houses which gripped Congo production and exports in a tight monopoly.* 60% of the Congo's wage-earning population was employed in little more than 3% of the Congo's commercial undertakings. Here was a vast Empire of inter-locking private and State interests, presiding over which was the financial house of Société Générale. This group in which the Belgian Government owns a half share, controls the copper production of the great Union Minière mining group which monopolises copper, uranium and other metal deposits in the rich Katanga area, besides many other industries, commerce, banking, insurance and transport throughout the Congo.

Under Belgian rule, the traditional life of the people has been completely disrupted. One in every two adult African men has been drawn from farming his land into work on the mines, plantations, or in industry. Yet all the industrial development was not in the interests of the Congo people but in those of the Belgian and other foreign colonialists, who battered on this wealthy African territory. Here is the essence of the colonial system: the subjection of the Congo's economy, to the requirements of the Imperialist country. The Congo was the source of cheap raw materials and primary products, a market for the products of the imperialist country, a sphere for capital investment in search of super profits. Its inhabitants were not regarded as people, but as providers of cheap labour power..

What secondary industry has developed has been mainly to serve the needs of the mining industry, and to assist the transportation of the Congo's wealth overseas into her colonial masters' coffers. Industry is concentrated chiefly in the Katanga mining region and the export centre of Leopoldville.

The Congo has probably the largest African working class in the continent south of the Sahara, with the exception of the Union of South Africa. But the highest point to which Africans have been allowed to advance has been that of skilled artisans. Business control and management remained a monopoly of Whites.

The income of the Congo workers was about £40 a head per year, or one-tenth of the wage of the Belgian worker.

Characteristically, the Belgian colonialists developed only those of the Congo resources which could promise big and quick profits to them, without regard for the needs of a balanced economy. Hence, when after the war the world prices of copper and other raw materials fell steeply, the effects on the Congo were shattering. In the Katanga area, by early 1958 there were already sixteen thousand unemployed. In Leopoldville, by the time of the January 1959 outbursts, which formed the immediate prelude to the independence moves, thirty thousand out of Leopoldville's ninety-thousand workers were unemployed.

A PLANNED RETREAT

Suddenly, in January 1959, the spontaneous upheavals in Leopoldville brought home to the Belgian colonialists that they could not continue their regime in the Congo forever. Political parties and groupings sprang up everywhere. Under the influence of the developing and unfolding African Revolution, these movements rapidly developed from vaguely reformist demands, to bold and insistent claims for full independence and democracy. In the lower Congo, a passive resistance campaign started, which led to people simply refusing to pay taxes of all kinds, and ignoring summonses to come to Court. Belgium felt her grip rapidly loosening.

Belgium is one of the smaller capitalist countries, without the military and financial resources which even far bigger imperialist states like Britain and France have found inadequate to maintain their former empires in this era of dynamic change. Hastily, almost in panic, it seemed, the Belgian Government devised a new plan to meet this serious situation. African leaders from the Congo were summoned to Brussels, and within a short time agreement was announced that: "Full independence" would be handed over to an elected Congo government on June 30, 1960. In Washington, London and Pretoria, capitalist newspaper editorials bemoaned "rash and reckless surrender".

But was it really a surrender? Did the Belgian imperialists, the Societè Générale, the financiers and magnates who for so long had profited so handsomely from their ill-gotten gains in the Congo, really mean to give them up?

The London Times came nearer to the right answer to these questions, when on May 20, 1960 it wrote:

“June 30 is the magic date when the Belgians lay down their profitable burdens in the Congo and hope that the Africans will take them up *without interfering too much with the profits.*” (My italics J.G.)

The Belgians had to face up to the stark fact that too rigid a policy would lose them all in the Congo, almost overnight. Therefore, they sought by indirect means, to preserve what 19th century “old-fashioned” imperialism could no longer preserve for them.

The former Minister for the Congo, Senator Van Hemelrijk said, after his proposed political reforms for the Congo had been rejected, that he had always recognised that if Belgium lost the Congo, she would herself become “an under-developed country”.

“The drama was that those who thought I was busy losing the Congo were themselves contributing most towards that result”.

Again to quote the Times (May 21, 1960), speaking of the Societè Genèrale and the international oil & manufacturing companies such as Petrofina and Unilever:

“They recall their experiences of other countries, where independence seemed to herald disaster and yet where, after a brief falter perhaps, business and profits mounted at higher rates than before. They plan not for next month or next year but for the next twenty years, and with a gesture or two to placate the furies, they look forward to a prosperous future”.

A conference on Congo Economic Affairs held during May of this year set up a joint Congo-Belgian committee to consider the creation of a joint development corporation and an investment code “with proper safeguards for foreign investors”. Congo shares rallied on the Brussels stock exchange, after a measure was passed by the Belgian parliament enabling companies to transfer their assets outside the Congo to Belgian companies. It was decided in Brussels that the new Congo Government would be made a major shareholder in most of the big companies. *By these means the Companies hoped that their operations would remain profitable and — in the words of the Financial Times correspondent — that the new government will guarantee that they will not be “liquidated to the detriment of non-African shareholders”.*

THEIR PLANS WENT WRONG

Clearly, the Belgian colonialists had hoped that the "transfer" of power to Congolese representatives would not affect the fundamental economic dependence of the territory upon the metropolitan country, or the interests of Belgian capitalists in the Congo. In these hopes they were fortified by a number of practical considerations including the following:

After seventy years of skilful colonial rule, the various tribes and territories of the Congo population were seriously divided. There were no trained and experienced administrators, civil servants, politicians, professional people and other cadres among the Congolese. The only military force in the area, the *Force Publique*, was officered exclusively by Belgians. The colonialists relied heavily upon the influence and activities of such tried and proved henchmen of imperialism as Moise Tshiombe in the Katanga province, who was also engaged in intrigues with the Welensky racialist government in Northern Rhodesia, across the border.

By raising the anti-Communist bogey, the Belgian colonialists and their agents hoped to gain the support and assistance of other imperialist countries, such as Britain and the United States of America, in preventing any genuine moves towards full independence, which must include economic independence, in the new republic of the Congo.

Thus, the Belgian imperialists hoped that the "transfer of power" on June 30th would be a mere formal gesture, a piece of window-dressing, behind which they were to continue to exploit the resources and man-power of the Congo as before.

But they reckoned without many positive factors, which have rapidly transformed the situation in the Congo and brought their plans to nought. They reckoned without the spirit of the African Revolution, the spirit of unity and independence which is sweeping the Continent.

They reckoned without the new spirit which is abroad amongst the nations of the whole world, the solidarity of the Asian and African nations, and the existence of the mighty socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, which will no longer permit unbridled imperialist aggression at this period of the 20th century.

And, they reckoned without the African leaders in the Congo, who have refused to allow their divisions to be used as weapons in the hands of the colonialists.

The first rude shock to the imperialists came when, after the rigged elections, the two senior political leaders, M. Patrice Lumumbu and M. Kasavubu, healed their differences and agreed to work together for the benefit of the people — the first as Prime Minister, and the second as President of the new republic. When King Baudouin arrived at Leopoldville for the formal cession of independence, he was met with a united government. Instead of a humble speech full of pious platitudes, and expressing, as he no doubt hoped, the “gratitude” of the Congolese to the Belgians for conferring upon them the right to govern their own country, he was met with a militant and bitter speech of denunciation of Belgian colonial rule from the new Prime Minister, M. Lumumbu.

In its attempts to overcome as speedily as possible the dismal heritage of colonialism, and to “Africanise” the leading ranks of the Congo administrative, economic, military and other personnel, the new Lumumba government met powerful support from below in the shape of a spontaneous revolt of the African rank-and-file of the Force Publique against their Belgian officers.

Crude intervention by the Belgian government violating the newly-won sovereignty of the new republic was followed by country-wide disturbances and uprisings, in the course of which isolated attacks were made on many White settlers.

Capitalist newspapers in the imperialist countries printed wild stories of looting and attacks on civilians, but no real evidence was given.

The few casualties from the unleashing of the pent-up anger of Africans against their Belgian rulers were nothing compared with the ghastly years of Belgian colonial rule. And the key point was made early on by Patrice Lumumba: *had there been no Belgian intervention it is likely that the transition to freedom would have been as peaceful as in other African states.*

Events followed upon one another in the Congo in swift succession. Making a last-ditch effort to preserve Katanga, by far the wealthiest and most developed area of the Republic, for imperialism, M. Moise Tshiombe, local capitalist with close connection with Union Ministère declared himself “president” of an “independent” Katanga, and actually appealed to Belgium and the notorious Welensky government of Rhodesia for protection.

Pleading danger to Belgian nationals in the Congo, the Brussels Government sent troops into the Republic, who immediately began killing and assaulting the Congolese. The young Congo Government responded with strong and decisive actions. It denounced Belgian

imperialism's blatant aggression, in violation of solemn treaties on which the ink was hardly dry. It appealed to the United Nations, the Soviet Union and other countries for assistance against aggression. It demanded the immediate withdrawal of Belgian troops, and broke off diplomatic relations with Brussels.

The reaction was swift. A United Nations force of African troops came to the aid of the young Republic, headed by a contingent from Ghana, some brought in on Soviet planes. The Soviet Government sent a stern warning to Belgium that further aggression would not be tolerated.

Africans elsewhere in the Continent were swift to express their support for Premier Lumumba in his brave freedom-struggle. In neighbouring Rhodesia, oppressed Africans sent messages to Lumumba "the unity of the Congo must be preserved" (S.R. National Democratic Party) . . . — and to Tshiombe "3 million Africans of N. Rhodesia see you as an enemy of African unity . . . You are obviously the instrument of capitalist imperialism". (United National Independence Party).

A CRUCIAL TURNING-POINT

In many ways, the stormy birth-pangs of the young Congo Republic mark a crucial turning point in the rapidly unfolding drama of the African Revolution, the struggle for African freedom, unity and true independence.

Certain African nationalists have hitherto harboured illusions, seeing in the conquest of formal political independence the end instead of (as it is) only the beginning of African emancipation; believing in the newly-discovered "goodwill" of the Western imperialist countries, and swallowing the malicious anti-Communist propaganda made in Washington, London, Paris, Brussels, Pretoria and Lisbon; imagining that it was possible for African economic and social development — the essence of true independence and self-government — to sleep in the same bed with imperialist "investment" and exploitation.

After the July and August events in the Congo, can these naive illusions survive? Here, as in all great historical crises, the inner truth, beneath the surface appearances, has been laid bare. Here we have seen the "benevolent" mask of imperialism, conferring "freedom" upon the Congolese, suddenly stripped away, to reveal in all its ugly savagery and greed the real face beneath.

OUR TRUE FRIENDS

Here, in these vital Congo events, too, emergent Africa may learn who are its true friends, for it is truly said that only in times of trouble do we learn whom our friends really are.

While the American, British and French imperialists manoeuvred awkwardly, trying to conceal their support for and complicity in Belgian imperialist robbery, Premier N. S. Krushchov in answer to a cable sent him by Premier Lumumba and President Kassvubu, asking about possible Soviet aid in the event of continued Western aggression, sent a warm brotherly message to the Congo :

“I have followed with close attention”, wrote Comrade Krushchov “the heroic struggle of the Congolese people for independence. I know of the countless brutalities of the colonialists, of their exploitation of millions of people, and their efforts to seal the Congo off hermetically . . . The Belgians signed a friendship treaty with the Congo and then tore it up. The enemies of the Congo also threaten the independence of other young states in Africa. It is an attempt to set back the liberation of Africa.

“The old Congo was not only Belgian. It was the property of big American, Belgian, British and West German monopolies. The Congolese people have thrown far more than a Belgian imperialist yoke from their shoulders.

“The Soviet Union is opposed to the collective aggression which is now taking place in the Congo. The United Nations has already told Belgium to withdraw her troops.

“If the imperialist states continue with their aggression, and if those who encourage them continue to do so, then the Soviet Union will not hesitate to take suitable measures to end the aggression. The imperialist powers do not only seek to rob and plunder one peace-loving African state, they mean later to destroy other independent states. *That is why the question of the Congo affects the whole of mankind.*

“The Soviet Union’s demand is simple — hands off ! The Government of the Congo can rely on the necessary Soviet help in co-operating to win your just cause.

“From the depths of its heart, the Soviet Union wishes the legitimate Government of the Congo and the Congolese people success in their sacred struggle for the independence of their country”.

The future of the Congo is indeed a matter of vital importance to "the whole of mankind". And most of all it is of importance to the rest of Africa — for the defeat or dismemberment of the Congo would be a severe setback to our hopes and aspirations; while the advance and consolidation of the new Republic will open a splendid new chapter in the progress of all the Africans towards freedom and a better life.

That is why African patriots, wherever they may be, will regard it as their first and urgent duty to stand by our brothers and sisters in the Congo, fighting for the independence, unity and integrity of their new Republic.

(Note: This article is referred to in the Editorial in this issue).

Lenin and Africa

by I. POTEKHIN

Director of the Africa Institute, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences

In the extensive literary heritage left us by Lenin we find many statements and remarks concerning Africa. The history of the imperialist division of Africa by the European powers; the difficult position of the oppressed peoples, the harsh persecution of them by the colonisers and, finally, the first flashes of the liberation movements — all this found its reflection in the works of Lenin, great teacher and friend of all peoples enslaved by imperialism. V.I. Lenin made extensive use of African sources, as well as of sources concerning the countries of Asia, to work out the theory of the national-colonial revolution as an integral part of the general theory of the communist transformation of society.

When he was working on his classical work *Imperialism — The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, V.I. Lenin read and made abstracts of a tremendous amount of books on history and economics. A study of Lenin's abstracts shows with what thoroughness Vladimir Ilyich collected data concerning the plundering policy of the imperialist powers in Africa and other parts of the world. In the abstracts are facts, dates, statistics, while in the margins are angry, scourging descriptions of the colonisers, of their predatory methods of seizure and division of the African colonies: "They plunder ('divide') AFRICA", "They plunder ('divide') MOROCCO", "THEY EXCHANGE Morocco for the Congo".* "They divide the Congo (85). — They divide Uganda (90) — (17.6.189) exchange

*V.I. Lenin, Notebooks on Imperialism, Moscow, 1939, p.620.

for Heligoland: (Zanzibar for Heligoland)".*

V.I. Lenin mercilessly exposed the ideologists of colonialism, who falsified African history, concealing from public opinion the heroic struggle of the African peoples for independence. "Take", he wrote, "the history of those little wars which they (the imperialist. I.P.) conducted before the big war (he is talking of the first world war. I.P.) — 'little' because the number of Europeans who died in them was small, but hundreds of thousands were killed of the peoples whom they strangled, who, from their viewpoint were not even considered peoples (Asians, Africans — what peoples are they?); against these peoples this was the kind of war that they conducted: they were unarmed, but they were machinegunned. What sort of wars are those? Strictly speaking, after all, those weren't even wars, it can be dismissed from the mind".**

In his abstracts V.I. Lenin notes down facts of brutal suppression by the German imperialists of the peoples of South West Africa — the Hereros and Hottentots, the execution by the German colonisers in the Cameroons of the leader of the Duala tribe.

When Italy conducted her colonial war in Libya, V.I. Lenin wrote an article in the Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda*, on September 28, 1912, passionately exposing the crime of the Italian imperialists. He said:

"What was the cause of the war? It was caused by the mercenary interests of the Italian finance tycoons and capitalists, who need a new market, who require successes for Italian imperialism.

"What was this war? It was an advanced, civilised human massacre, the slaughter of the Arabs by the aid of the 'most up to date' weapons.

"The Arabs resisted desperately. . . . About 14,800 Arabs were killed". V.I. Lenin pointed out that nevertheless the Arabs would not submit to the Italian colonisers, that "it would take a long time yet to 'civilise' them by bayonet, bullet, the noose, fire and the raping of women".***

V.I. Lenin gave vivid accusatory descriptions of Cecil Rhodes, one of the most active, most militant representatives of British imperialism in South Africa, and of the Belgian King Leopold II, who had seized a tremendous territory in the Congo Basin. "Millionaire, finance king, chief culprit of the Boer War", wrote Lenin of Cecil Rhodes,**** and of Leopold II: "Businessman,

*Ibid, p.456.

**V.I. Lenin, Col. Works, v.24, p.370.

***V.I. Lenin, Col. Works, V.18, pp.309-310.

****Lenin, Col. Works, v.22, p.244.

financier, swindler, he bought the Congo for himself and 'developed it'. *

DIVISION OF AFRICA

The imperialist division of Africa was completed in the main towards the end of the 19th century. Noting this circumstance, V.I. Lenin wrote that "the colonial policy of the imperialist countries had COMPLETED the seizure of unoccupied lands on our planet. For the first time the world has proved already divided so that in the future there can be ONLY redivisions, i.e., transfer from one 'owner' to another, and not from ownerlessness to an 'owner'." **

When the struggle for the redivision of the world, already divided by the imperialist powers, led to the world war, Lenin came out in a most impassioned way against the chauvinist propaganda of the governments of the belligerent powers and the treachery by the leaders of the Second International, demonstrating the imperialist, annexationist nature of the war.

One result of the first world war, as we know, was that Britain, France and Belgium seized and divided among themselves the German colonies. The transfer of the German colonies to the monopoly possession of the European colonial powers was opposed — naturally in their own mercenary interests — by the American imperialists. However, the chief obstacle to the realisation of the imperialist plans for direct seizure of foreign territories was the great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, which proclaimed the principle of the equality of all peoples, the right of the nations to self-determination. The October Revolution not only shook the foundations of imperialism in the metropolitan countries, but also struck at its deep rear lines, undermining the dominion of the imperialists in the colonial and dependent countries. In order to hoodwink world opinion and camouflage the seizure of the former German colonies, the imperialist powers instituted the so-called system of mandates of the League of Nations they had set up.

V.I. Lenin exposed this ruse. ". . . When they speak of the distribution of mandates for colonies", he pointed out, "we know full well that this is the distribution of mandates for plundering and pillage, that this is distribution of the right of an insignificant section of the world's population to exploit the majority of the population of the earth". ***

*Lenin. Notebooks on Imperialism, p.469.

**Lenin. Col. Works, v.22, p.242.

***V.I. Lenin. Col. Works, v.30, p.138.

V.I. Lenin opposed the imperialist re-division of the German colonies and demanded the abolition of colonialism. Most interesting in this respect is the "Mandate to Deputies to the Soviet of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies elected in factories and regiments", which he drafted shortly after the February Revolution. At that time the central question in Russian political life was that of the attitude to the war. The Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, demanded the immediate ending of the imperialist war and the conclusion of a just and democratic peace, peace without annexations or contributions. In drafting the mandate to the workers' and soldiers' deputies Lenin did not lose sight of the interests of the colonial peoples, in particular the interests of the African peoples. He wrote in the "Mandate":

"Germany must renounce absolutely and unconditionally all her colonies, for colonies are constituted of oppressed peoples.

"Britain, by the terms of such a peace, must renounce forthwith and absolutely not only all the foreign lands she has seized since the beginning of the war (the German colonies in Africa, etc.; Turkish lands, Mesopotamia, etc. but also ALL HER OWN COLONIES".*

The workers' and soldiers' deputies were to demand that the imperialist powers immediately withdraw their troops from all these territories.

LENIN'S STAND

Against the despicable colonial system of imperialism Lenin consistently opposed the right of the peoples to independence and to self-determination. He allowed of no compromise on this question: every people, regardless of whether it was big or little irrespective of its level of social, economic and cultural development, has the right to live freely, to arrange its life and order its fate in its own way.

A consistent internationalist, Lenin always championed the principle of equality, friendship and co-operation among all peoples, gave support to the struggle of the oppressed peoples against their oppressors. He mercilessly scourged the right wing socialists of the colonial powers who defended the right of "the nation" to the exploitation of colonies. For instance, he wrote the Belgian socialists that "in actual fact they defend the demands of the Belgian bourgeoisie, who wish to continue their plunder

*Lenin. Col. Works, v.24, p.321.

the 15 million population of the Congo . . .”*

An irreconcilable opponent of imperialist wars, Lenin held that wars of the colonial peoples against imperialism were just. “National wars AGAINST imperialist powers are not only possible and probable, they are inevitable and PROGRESSIVE, REVOLUTIONARY . . .”** He regarded it as an indispensable duty of all who recognised the principle of self-determination to support actively and in every possible way the colonial peoples’ national liberation movement.

V.I. Lenin had profound confidence in the power of the African peoples, just as he had in those of other peoples enslaved by imperialism; he was confident, he knew, that they would put an end to the dark rule of colonialism and regain their lost freedom. He dreamed of the day when the peoples of the colonies would enter upon the broad path of independent creation and take part in world policy, together with all the other peoples of the world, on an equal footing.

Today we are witnessing the realisation of this great dream. First the peoples of Asia, followed by the peoples of Africa, broke through the barriers erected by imperialism, separating them from the rest of the world. The colonial system in Africa is collapsing under the powerful pressure of the anti-imperialist forces. The colonisers continue to resist stubbornly, they manoeuvre, resort to arms, but still they are compelled to surrender position after position.

The greater part of the African continent is still under the yoke of foreign occupation. But events are unfolding with astonishing swiftness. The liberation of the colonies is being accomplished as though by the laws of chain reaction. The Africans are still faced with a difficult struggle, but the immediate political object, the winning of independence by all the peoples of Africa — is already close.

One need only attend the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, or the conferences of its specialised agencies not only to understand, but also to feel the striking changes that have taken place in the world. The League of Nations of sorry memory hardly had any Asian or African countries in its membership, although it repeatedly discussed and decided the fate of peoples of Asia and Africa. And even in the early period of the United Nations existence the countries of Asia and Africa were hardly represented.

*Lenin. Col. Works, v.21, p.263.

**Lenin. Col. Works, v.22, p.298.

Today of the 82 members of the United Nations there are 20 Asian and 10 African countries. At the next session of the General Assembly at least another six African countries should be admitted to membership: Cameroons, Togo, Somalia, Nigeria, Mali and Madagascar. Before very many years have gone by the Afro-Asian countries will comprise the majority of the members of the United Nations.

NEW PERIOD

One after another the peoples of Africa are joining the family of peoples of the world, as equal members. The period of world history, when Africa was only the object of the policy of non-African countries, an object of strife and wars between the imperialist states, is coming to a close. A new period is beginning, when the peoples of Africa, to use the words of V.I. Lenin, will take part in "solving the fate of the whole world". This is a great victory for the African peoples and all people of good will share with them the joy of victory.

Construction of the new life is developing ever more widely in the countries of Africa which have won political independence. There are great difficulties in the way. Economic and cultural backwardness; the continued domination of foreign monopolies which still plunder the national wealth of these countries; the acute lack of funds to finance economic construction; resistance of the forces of internal reaction who refuse to make a complete break with the past, and a great deal more, hamper their advance.

The imperialists try to take advantage of these difficulties. In new forms and under new signs they seek to preserve the possibilities of enrichment through the exploitation of the peoples of sovereign African states. The struggle against imperialism does not end with the gaining of political independence. This was pointed out with ample eloquence by delegates to the Second Conference of African Peoples, held in Tunis last January.

The Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp are loyally following the great behests of Lenin, who said long ago, on the eve of the triumph of our revolution: "We shall exert every effort to come closer to the Mongols, Persians, Indians, the Egyptians . . . We will try . . . to teach them to go over to the use of machinery, to making work easier, to democracy, to socialism".*

Lenin's name, his ideas, are widely known in Africa. The colonisers have always put every possible obstacle in the way of the distribution of Marxist literature in their colonies, and they

*Lenin. Col. Works, v.23, p.55.

still do so. The Marxist book has found it very difficult to make its way in Africa. Yet today it is no longer an unusual phenomenon. The most important obstacle to the spread of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism in Africa is the illiteracy of the overwhelming majority of the population. It is to the advantage of the colonisers to keep the enslaved peoples in ignorance. But today there are already many educated people in the African countries, and these include advanced people who propagate Leninist ideas, even at the cost of personal sacrifice.

The Communist Parties of the metropolitan countries, particularly Britain and France, have made a valuable contribution to the spread of Leninist ideas in Africa. Many thousands of Africans, coming to the metropolitan countries, learn a great deal more about the communist movement, read Marxist literature, and return home enriched by progressive ideas.

In recent years we have also seen the appearance in African countries of quite a number of leaders who give themselves out to be Marxists but at the same time reject Marxist-Leninist theory as, allegedly, being unsuitable for African conditions. With an obstinacy worthy of being put to better use, these people keep talking about the distinctive features of the historical path of the African peoples, the specific features of the social-economic system in the countries of Africa, the special lines of the further development of the African peoples. But no one disputes all that.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The peoples of Africa have indisputably covered a most distinctive path of development, though this distinctiveness was caused not by any special features inherent in the African peoples and the African peoples alone, but by the interference of European capitalism. The social and economic way of life of the African peoples also has its own characteristic peculiarities. The forms of material and spiritual culture of the Africans are their own, and so on and so forth. Africa, perfectly truly, has its own face, its own individuality. All this is so, but this in no way proves that Marxist-Leninist theory is not applicable to Africa.

As we know, Marxist-Leninist theory is not a dogma; it stipulates the combination of basic principles with the concrete historical conditions in which these principles are put into effect. Lenin always fought against a dogmatic attitude to theory; he always demanded its creative application. This is what he said in his report to the 2nd All Russia Congress of Communist

Organisations of peoples of the East, on November 22, 1919:

“You have before you a task which has never before confronted the communists anywhere in the whole world. Basing yourselves on the general communist theory and practice what you have to do, in adapting yourselves to the specific conditions (which do not obtain in the European countries), is to be able to apply this theory and practice to the conditions where the main masses consist of peasantry, in which it is necessary to solve the task of the struggle, not against capital, but against mediaeval survivals”.*

The history of the peoples of the Soviet East during the years of socialist construction have brilliantly confirmed the correctness of these instructions of Lenin.

It is well known that in the level of their social-economic and cultural development these peoples were very much behind the foremost capitalist countries of the West. They had not passed through the capitalist stage of development; feudal and patriarchal-feudal relations, which are so characteristic of present-day Africa, predominated with them. The forms of their material and spiritual culture different considerably from the forms of culture of, for instance the Russian people. These peoples — and this applies, incidentally to all other peoples — have their own inherent distinctive features. They themselves also experienced national oppression by Russian landlords and capitalists. None of this, however, prevented them from making the principles of Leninism the basis of construction of their new life.

Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory in the construction of the new life, and getting tremendous help from the Russian people, the peoples of the Soviet Eastern republics have made a tremendous stride from poverty to abundance, from ignorance to the heights of human culture. According to the 1959 census, the Uzbek S.S.R. has per 1000 of the population, 13 persons with a higher education and 234 with a secondary education; the respective figures for the Kazakh S.S.R. are 13 and 239, for Kirghizia 13 and 227; Tajikistan 10 and 214, Turkmenistan 13 and 256. What highly developed capitalist country can boast of such a high level of national education? And yet before the revolution the population in the outlying regions of Russian was practically totally illiterate.

The authenticity of all knowledge, of all theories, is confirmed by practice. The practice of the Soviet Eastern republics demonstrates that Marxist-Leninist theory serves as the guiding star in the struggle for the happiness of mankind whatever the social-

*Lenin. Col. Work, v.30, p.140.

economic conditions. Africa cannot be any exception.

Lenin's name, his noble ideas of struggle against colonialism and all other forms of imperialist enslavement of the peoples, for national freedom, are becoming the property of ever increasing circles of people in the countries of Africa. They will inevitably become the property of all who dream of a better future for the working people.

(Translated from "Contemporary East", April, 1960.)

The Agony of South Africa

by A. LERUMO

APARTHEID

— the policy of naked domination and oppression by a minority of three million Whites over 12 million African and other non-White peoples of the Union of South Africa — has long been denounced by democratic men and women the world over. At one Session after another of the United Nations General Assembly, at the initiative of the African and Asian countries, backed consistently by the representatives of the socialist countries, the policy of the Union Government has been condemned as contrary to the U.N. Charter and a threat to world peace. Each time the condemnation has been more vigorous and forthright; the minority of imperialist countries which gave open or tacit support to the South African racists has diminished and become less blatant.

At first the United States of America used to shield the Nationalist Government of South Africa by supporting its claim that U.N. discussion of apartheid meant "interference in domestic affairs". But in the last year or so American advisers have told the State Department that this line was rapidly undermining U.S. influence in Africa. At the last General Assembly, in October 1959, only Britain, France and Fascist Portugal, the major remaining African colony-owners, opposed the strong resolution demanding a revision of the Union's racial discrimination.

World feeling against South Africa's Nazi white supremacists rose to unprecedented heights last March, following the bloody massacres unleashed by police at Sharpeville and Langa against African men and women peacefully demonstrating against the vicious pass laws and for higher wages. Mass meetings, from Peking and London to Cairo and Accra,

protested. A special session of the U.N. Security Council, without a single contrary vote, demanded that the Union Government review its oppressive policies to bring them into line with the Charter. At the time of writing, Dag Hammarskjöld, U.N. secretary-general is about to fly to South Africa, presumably to ascertain how far the Verwoerd Government has moved to comply with this resolution. His visit has been delayed over-long.

THE BACKGROUND

Sharpeville opened a new and fiercely intensive phase in the freedom struggle in South Africa. It is a struggle which has gone on for very many years.

The population of the Union is rather like a pyramid. At the top of the pyramid are the three million Whites. This is the largest non-African population in the whole of the continent of Africa. All Whites in South Africa enjoy special privileges, denied to all other sections of the population. They alone are allowed to *vote* for the Parliament (the House of Assembly and the Senate), for the Provincial Councils in the four Provinces (Cape, Transvaal, Free State and Natal) and the many municipal and village councils throughout the country. They alone are allowed to enter skilled trades and professions, and the upper ranks of commerce and industry and civil service. They own 87 per cent. of the land, and practically all the important natural resources of the country; they receive about ten times the wages of Africans; their children alone receive free and compulsory education; they live and are brought up in an atmosphere of absolute and intolerable racial exclusiveness and arrogance, the belief that Non-Whites are absolute inferiors and outcasts, intellectually, morally and in every other way being inculcated in them from childhood.

At the bottom of the pyramid are the ten million Africans. Here, in this time of the African revolution, are a majority of the population of a country, which is denied every vestige of democratic rights, freedom and human dignity. The notorious starvation wages paid to them are today admitted by the employers themselves and even by the Government — which does nothing, however, to ensure that more money is paid to Africans on the farms, mines, industries and commercial enterprises in which they work. Every African man and woman is forced to carry a “reference book” under the hated Pass Laws, which make non-possession of a pass a criminal offence, for which every year a million Africans are arrested and

sent to forced labour on privately owned White farms under horrifying conditions.

CRISIS SWEEPS THE COUNTRY

The African people, under the leadership of the African National Congress, and in alliance with freedom-loving fellow-South Africans of Indian, Coloured and even European origin, have put up a magnificent struggle against these disabilities, over a period of many years, and in the most difficult conditions. Events such as the famous 1952 Defiance Campaign, when 8,000 people went to prison, and the 1955 Congress of the People, when — surrounded by police — 2,300 delegates adopted the challenging Freedom Charter, have long been proud chapters in world, and particularly African, history of our times.

The Nationalist Party Government, headed successively by Dr. Malan, Hans Strydom and now Dr. Verwoerd, has stubbornly refused to make the slightest concession to any of the people's demands for freedom, for higher wages, and democratic rights. Instead they have steadily intensified oppression and aggravated the people's grievances. For example, they destroyed even the token representation once allowed Non-Whites in South African's all-White Parliament. They tightened up the pass laws, forcing even women, who were formerly exempted, to carry the pass books. They have introduced a system of legalised robbery, under the Group Areas Act (which was specifically condemned by the United Nations) to deprive Africans, Indians and Coloured people of their homes and their property and force them into ghettos.

The Nationalists turn a blind eye to the onward march of African and all colonial and former colonial peoples, which spell the inevitable doom of White supremacy. So far from moving with the times, or making at least token concessions to the people, they have brought in one measure after another to still the voice of criticism and suppress the organisations of the masses. In 1950 they passed the Suppression of Communism Act, which banned the Communist Party of South Africa, after thirty years of tireless work by that Party to organise the workers for freedom, equality of rights and opportunities, land and socialism. Under this and other laws, hundreds of tried and trusted leaders of the trade unions, the national liberation movements, the peace movement and other bodies have been proscribed, removed from their positions and jobs, deprived of citizenship rights, including the right to attend any gatherings, exiled to remote areas, raided by

the secret police, arrested on framed up accusations of treason, incitement, and other charges.

Inevitably such treatment has led to more and more frequent clashes between the people, especially the African people and the police. The situation has steadily become more and more tense. Already, towards the end of 1959, crisis swept the African township of Cato Manor, near Durban, when endless police raids drove the African people to desperation and violence; and massive political demonstrations swept through Natal. In December, 1959, the African National Congress, oldest and biggest African organisation, declared that 1960 would be a crisis year, and drew up a detailed plan of campaign against pass laws and for higher wages. The campaign was scheduled to start on March 31.

Ironically enough it was not the Congress Alliance, headed by the ANC, which for many years had been organising and leading the people for struggles against pass laws and for more wages, which sparked off the new and more intensive phase of 1960. It was a new organisation, the Pan-African Congress, formed as a right wing breakaway from the ANC, which until a few months before had deliberately avoided interesting itself in immediate issues such as wages and pass laws, on the grounds that they were not interested in "palliative measures". In a sudden change of front, and sensing the mass feeling on these two crucial issues, the PAC suddenly declared a campaign on these two matters. They called upon the people to march en bloc to police stations and surrender their passes on March 21.

This call had little response in most parts of South Africa. The African people were awaiting the expected call from Chief Albert Lutuli, respected president-general of the A.N.C. Yet in Cape Town, and in Sharpeville township, near Vereeniging, peaceful, unarmed crowds of Africans presented themselves at the police stations.

THE SHARPEVILLE MASSACRE

The cold blooded massacre by the White police of the Africans sent a shocked wave of horror throughout the world. At Sharpeville, standing on Saracen armoured cars, the police opened fire on the people with sten guns, rifles and revolvers. 68 Africans were killed. 186 were wounded, including 40 women and 8 children. It was stated by doctors at the enquiry which followed that the 68 people killed had a total of 117 bullet wounds. The police claimed they were

protecting themselves from attack, yet nearly all the bullet wounds of those killed and injured were in the back, showing that the people were running from the armoured cars at the time of the shooting.

Swift repercussions followed upon this act of mass murder. On March 28 the economy of South Africa ground to a standstill in all the main urban areas. Non-White workers struck work in response to the call of the African National Congress for a national day of mourning. Many thousands of Africans burnt their passes. Mass demonstrations took place in Durban and in Cape Town, where, following a prolonged general strike and the union-wide arrests of liberation leaders and democrats, 30,000 African workers marched to the Caledon Square prison to demand the release of their leaders. This vast peaceful demonstration, the greatest ever seen in the City, was induced to disperse after its leader, Mr. Philip Kgosana of the P.A.C., had been promised an interview with the Minister of Justice, Erasmus. (When Mr. Kgosana later presented himself for the interview he was arrested!)

Vast protest meetings took place throughout the world, in the African and Asian countries, in the socialist countries, and also in many capitalist countries. The overwhelming disgust and revulsion brought about an immediate meeting of the Security Council, which decided by nine votes to nil (Britain and France abstained) that the loss of life was due to the Union Government's racial policies, which were a danger to world peace. It demanded that the South African Government abandon apartheid, and appointed the secretary-general, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, to take steps to implement the resolution.

RULING CLASSES SHAKEN

The South African ruling classes were seriously shaken by the March events. Share values dropped sharply on the Johannesburg stock exchange, one expert (Mr. H. Fridjhon, *Sunday Times*, 24 April) estimating that the capitalisation value of shares fell by at least £600 million — about £70 million on one day alone — March 30. British and American imperialist circles, which are deeply involved in exploitation of South African, particularly gold, uranium and diamond resources, began to panic and to sell South African shares at reduced prices.

With increased boldness and outspokenness, leaders of commerce and industry began to press for a revision of Government policy, for a relaxation of the worst excesses and brutalities of the

apartheid policy; for wage and other concessions to urban Africans; and for steps towards "consultation" with the leaders of the African people. Even the notoriously conservative Chamber of Mines, the authentic voice of British and American imperialism in South Africa, and chief benefactor of the vicious "cheap labour" policy of the State, joined with the Chambers of Commerce and Industry to urge some sort of "new deal" policy upon the Government.

At the height of the crisis, even certain elements among the ranks of the ruling Afrikaner Nationalist Party showed signs of wavering in the fanatically uncompromising racialist policy the Party had hitherto followed. Twelve ministers of the Government-favoured Dutch Reformed Churches rejected the Government's enforced apartheid policy as "unethical, unbiblical and without foundation in the scriptures". The Nationalist newspapers *Die Burger* and *Die Vaderland* urged that the Government consider reforms. A Cabinet Minister, Mr. Paul Sauer declared that "there must be an important change" in the application of Government policy. "Immediate attention must be given to higher wages for Natives who work in urban industries". He even acknowledged that the pass system had been "only a source of trouble" to the African — though he did not say it should be abolished.

Indicative of this pressure from many sources to bring about a change of Government policy was the announcement, early on in the crisis, that police would temporarily suspend the never-ending arrests of Africans for pass arrests. It was clear that the Nationalist Party was deeply divided internally, between the advocates of concessions to the people, and those who had determined, whatever the cost, to intensify repression to the utmost.

THE VERWOERD LINE

But this pass concession, — which was rapidly withdrawn — was the single concession made by the Government to the powerful pressure of opinion at home and abroad condemning its policy. The Fascist-minded Verwoerd group, backed by the sinister and powerful society, the Broederbond, went all out for its uncompromising policy — to meet the demands of the people of South Africa and the democratic outside world with nothing but more repression, terror and the unrestrained rule of force.

A State of Emergency was declared suspending the operation of all citizenship rights, even for Whites, and establishing a rigid censorship.

The African National Congress — since 1912 the legally constituted and established spokesman of the majority of the people of South Africa — was declared an unlawful organisation, and with it the Pan-African Congress.

Two thousand men and women, leaders of the African National Congress, the Congress of Trade Union, the Pan-African Congress, the S.A. Indian Congress, the Congress of Democrats, the Liberal Party, and many others, were arrested under the Emergency Regulations and held in prison for more than three months without charge or trial, or even a chance of seeing their lawyers; interrogated by the Special Branch of the police. At the same time 18,000 Africans were arrested under the same Regulations — mostly young men accused of pass offences, many of whom were sent to secret camps and farm prisons after star chamber trials held behind closed doors without legal representation.

The *New Age*, the weekly paper which week after week had boldly exposed the crimes of the Nationalist Government, was closed down.

The army was mobilised, and with its backing the savage South African Police began a merciless campaign of terror and intimidation in the African townships, assaulting, insulting, arresting, sacking and looting at will. In the streets of Cape Town, a few blocks from Parliament, horrified onlookers saw young White policemen setting about African and Coloured people walking in the streets with their *sjamboks*, heavy rhinoceros-hide whips. A Member of Parliament told the House how he had seen an African clergyman thrashed in this way.

THE AFTERMATH — BITTER DISCONTENT

This article is being written several months after the new round of crisis broke in South Africa. The Government claims that it has restored peace and order in the country. True, in the major urban centres, the Africans — probably the most heavily-policed community anywhere today — find few opportunities of expressing their anger and hatred of minority White domination. The emergency regulations have now been lifted, but the repressive laws still remain.

When Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld arrives, as he is due soon to do, the Verwoerd Government will no doubt try to assure him that everything is now "normal" and peaceful. But what exists in South Africa today is not "peace". It is a country at war within itself: on top, an armed minority, ruthlessly defending its privileges,

trigger-happy and tense with fear; beneath, the great Non-White majority, simmering with bitter discontent, determined to win its rights to land, freedom and equality.

Despite the harsh repression and intimidation, new signs of unrest and political activity continue to ruffle the surface of the South African political scene. Serious demonstrations in the rural area of Pondoland, against the Government's vicious oppression of the peasants (the so-called "Bantustan" plan) resulted in a new police massacre, when six Pondos were killed and thirteen wounded. The police opened fire on a peaceful delegation of peasants carrying a white flag.

All the senior leaders of the African National Congress were put in prison, apart from a few who have, like Vice-President Oliver Tambo, been sent on Congress missions outside the country. Yet the A.N.C. has managed to preserve its organisation, and to regroup for illegal, underground work. It publishes an underground paper, *Congress Voice*, of which several issues have already appeared. On June 26, traditional day of struggle for freedom, A.N.C. slogans and leaflets appeared throughout the country.

The other partners in the Congress alliance have been crippled by arrests of their personnel, though not formally declared illegal. They too have been courageously working to maintain the various trade union, national liberation and democratic organisations. In Durban on June 26 a mass meeting was held by the alliance, attended by many thousands of African and Indian workers.

The Communist Party of South Africa, which had a magnificent 30-year record of pioneering struggle for the workers' rights and against racialism, dissolved itself in 1950, following the passing of the Suppression of Communism Act. Since then some members of the former Party, together with many new forces developed in the course of the struggle, organised a new party to cope with illegal conditions, and to further the noble cause of socialism and Marxism-Leninism in South Africa. This party — the South African Communist Party — issued a leaflet on July 14 in the main urban centres of the country, rallying the workers in the struggle against the Hitlerist Government, against pass laws and low wages, for freedom, land, equality and votes for all.

SOLIDARITY FROM OTHER LANDS

In their exceptionally hard and complex freedom struggle, the oppressed people of South Africa are greatly encouraged and

inspired by the many acts of solidarity and sympathy of democratic and freedom-loving people, not only in Africa and Asia, but throughout the world. At meetings of the United Nations, the African and Asian members, solidly and consistently supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist members, have year after year sponsored resolutions condemning South African racial discrimination. Year after year the majorities voting for these resolutions have grown greater, the minorities opposing them less; until last December only imperialist Britain, France and Portugal (all of which themselves cruelly exploit Africans in this continent) were left supporting apartheid.

At many African and Afro-Asian meetings and conferences resolutions have been adopted calling for an international solidarity-boycott of South African consumer products. Trade union and other progressive organisations in Britain, Scandinavia, West Germany and other European countries have also taken up this boycott, which has begun to assume the character of a great, popular movement of solidarity with the oppressed masses of South Africa. Among the foremost in Britain in campaigning for this boycott has been the Communist Party and its fighting newspaper the *Daily Worker*. It would be a splendid thing if the movement were taken up too by the militant leaders of the great trade unions in countries like France and Italy, and still more so by the powerful trade unions in the Soviet Union, China and other countries of the socialist camp, all of which have on many occasions expressed in other ways their solidarity with the exploited masses of South Africa in their struggles against the monstrous oppression which stifles their lives.

For independent African states in particular, the fight against apartheid is more than a question of sympathy and solidarity. South Africa is the most economically developed state in the continent. The imperialist countries which draw vast profits and strength from the exploitation of South Africa (despite their hypocritical gestures of sympathy with the victims of that exploitation) are the very same as those which oppress and exploit Africans throughout the Continent. With Algeria and Rhodesia, White South Africa is the very nerve-centre and heart of the hateful reactionary forces which seek to hold back the cause of African emancipation, to maintain the grip of imperialism in those territories which remain colonial, to encourage and prop up servile and corrupt forces in the newly-independent States, and — if they can — to intrigue and work for the reconquest of our Continent as a

colony of "the West".

As long as White domination exists in the Union of South Africa, it is a dire menace to freedom and independence throughout the Continent, a threat to every African everywhere. Conversely, the liberation of South Africa will be a tremendously important victory for Africa as a whole.

It is because Africans understand these basic truths that the South African delegation — representing the African National Congress, the Pan African Congress and the S.A. Indian Congress — was received with the utmost friendliness by the heads of state in their tour of Africa, by Nkrumah and Nasser, Tourè and Tubman, Emperor Haile Selassie and all other leading Africans, who assured them of their support. At the Addis Ababa conference of independent states, the proposals of the South African delegation were unanimously approved. These states will, among other steps : —

Raise at the United Nations the question of international sanctions against the Union to enforce decisions of UN Security Council and General Assembly which have been blatantly flouted by the Union Government;

Demand that the United Nations assert its trusteeship over South-West Africa, which has been unilaterally annexed by the Union;

Break diplomatic and trading relations with the Union of South Africa, and in particular aim to see that S.A. aircraft are denied facilities at African airports, that Arabian oil is not sent to S.A., and that the supply of cheap African labour from outside the Union, on which the mines so heavily depend, is cut off.

THE LAST WORD

Steps such as these, taken not only by African states but by freedom-loving and democratic people throughout the world, will undoubtedly be severe blows to the Nationalist Government — now busily trying to rally its supporters around the demagogic campaign for a Republic (for Whites only, of course!) They will, indirectly, hasten the day of South Africa's liberation.

But the last word will rest with the people of South Africa themselves. It is they, and no one else but they, who must and who will bring about their own liberation. The ruthless measures taken by the Verwoerd clique to suppress the expression of the intolerable grievances has not removed a

single one of those grievances, but only added to them. Neither the Nationalist Party nor any other of the Parliamentary White Supremacy Parties, such as the United Party, is capable of solving the profound problems and conflicts of the country. These problems cannot be solved without radical and far-reaching changes in the country, along the lines of the famous Freedom Charter adopted in 1956, which proclaims that the people shall govern, and shall share the country's land and wealth, that the doors of education and culture shall be opened to all, and that no laws and practices discriminated on grounds of race or colour shall be tolerated.

Inevitably, until these rights and freedoms are won, the present stage of premanent crisis will persist in South Africa, erupting into new rounds of disturbance and violence, people's resistance and State repression, each more severe and sharp than the last. For the Nationalist Party and other White Supremacists, living in this swift-moving African and world situation of the 1960's it is a losing battle. Their policies, based upon the reactionary and outmoded theories of race supremacy, are doomed to disgraceful defeat.

The progressive forces of South Africa, the African National Congress and its allies, the Pan-African Congress and all others who stand uncompromisingly for freedom and equality, can by reaching unity in mass revolutionary struggles hasten the day of victory and cut short the agony of South Africa. In all such struggles it is certain that the South African Communist Party will play, as it has in the past, a proud and indispensable part.

Nigerian Independence

by I. KUMALO

When Nigeria became independent on October 1st, the largest remaining British colony freed itself from the direct political grip of British imperialism. With an area of 36,000 square miles (four times the size of Britain) its population of over 35 millions is more than the total population of the remaining British colonial empire.

What is likely to be the impact of Nigerian independence on the all-Africa struggle for freedom? There can be no doubt it will stimulate the movement for liberation everywhere. Not only will it encourage the fight for independence in East and Central Africa

(and the freedom struggle in South Africa), it will also strengthen the resistance of the existing independent African States to the still remaining political grip of imperialism. *Over 60 per cent. of the African continent and peoples have now won their political independence.*

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

At the same time Nigerian independence presents some distinctive features, both positive and negative. After the formation of the African National Congress in South Africa in 1912, Nigeria was the first African territory south of the Sahara in which an organised liberation movement came into being. Starting with the National Democratic Party (N.D.P.), founded by Herbert Macauley, in 1922 it reached a new stage with the formation of the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (N.C.N.C.) in 1944 — still retaining its original title even after Southern Cameroons was no longer part of Nigeria.

The N.D.P. was largely confined to Lagos, the capital, but the N.C.N.C. from its formation was a nationwide movement — though its influence was mainly in the East and Western regions in the South. It was the only organised movement which took up the cudgels against the constitution pushed through by the Governor, Sir Arthur Richards (now Lord Milverton) which divided Nigeria into three artificial regions. It organised a national campaign of resistance throughout Nigeria in 1946, and in 1947 sent a strong protest delegation to London.

However, it did not succeed in preventing the imposition of the Richards Constitution, and in 1951 a new Constitution was proposed by Sir John McPherson (the new British Governor) which consolidated the regional system but also proposed a Federation Assembly for the whole of Nigeria. It is from this point that rival political parties came into being in Nigeria.

Speaking in Oxford on June 11th, 1957, Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe (popularly known as Zik) declared that,

“The N.C.N.C. felt strongly on this spurious idea of regionalisation and warned the country that it was an invitation to national disaster, because it was bound to disintegrate Nigeria as an historical fact”.

Life itself has proved the correctness of this analysis. The emergence of artificial regions gave rise to a narrow regional outlook and the formation of political parties concerned only with regional interests. In the north the Northern People's Congress

(N.P.C.) was formed to contest the 1951 elections, and in the west the Action Group emerged as the offshoot of the Yoruba Cultural organisation, the Egbe Omo Oduduwa.

The N.P.C. (which is led by Sardauna of Sokoto, now premier of the Northern Region) came into being as the political expression of the interests of the feudal Fulani emirs in the North, though within its ranks there are many sincere anti-imperialist elements. Through its control of the "Native Administration" the N.P.C. has all along been the medium through which the British strategy of "indirect rule" has been exercised in Northern Nigeria. The only political force opposed to it in the north is the Northern Elements Progressive Union (N.E.P.U.), led by Aminu Kano, and which is actively associated with the N.C.N.C.

In the west the Action Group (led by Chief Awolowa) has retained its majority since 1951 in the Western Assembly. It appears to be the political expression of wealthy Nigerian merchants, cocoa farmers, timber brokers, who are closely associated with the traditional chiefs. Its political outlook has always been coloured by regional interests and the cause of the Yoruba people, to the exclusion of other Nigerian peoples.

It is these separate regional interests, expressed by the N.P.C. and the Action Group, which was the main stumbling block at successive constitutional conferences in London from 1953 onwards. It has thus enabled the British Government to continually postpone Nigerian independence. What forced the issue finally at the London Constitutional Conference in October, 1958 was the insistent and rising demand of the Nigerian peoples.

What of the future? Nigerian independence comes into force with a coalition government of the N.C.N.C. and the N.P.C. in the Federated Assembly, and the Action Group in opposition. In the North the N.P.C. controls the government, as does the Action Group in the West and the N.C.N.C. in the East. In face of the different outlook of the political parties the unity which has been achieved is most remarkable. The conception of one united Nigeria is growing rapidly. No political party can now afford to ignore the determination of the people to achieve this. All the political parties have taken a firm stand against the French Atomic Tests in the Sahara and for a boycott on South African goods. If Nigeria is not yet in the forefront of the anti-imperialist struggle in Africa, it is certainly moving forward towards the front ranks.

DEFENCE PACT

However, there are differences both on foreign and home policy. The N.C.N.C. stands for "positive neutralism" and friendly relations with all countries. A year ago the Action Group openly advocated Nigeria siding with "the West" against the Socialist countries, but there are signs that this attitude is now being modified. The N.P.C. is also moving slowly towards an attitude of "neutralism" and for good relations with both East and West.

At the same time the present Nigerian Government has already committed itself in advance to military co-operation with the British Government. The official report of the final discussions in London in May, 1960 declares: —

"As was recorded in paragraph 83 of the Report of the 1958 Conference, the Federal Prime Minister and the Premiers were then at one with Her Majesty's Government in believing that there would be mutual advantage to Britain and Nigeria in co-operating in the field of defence. We have now discussed this question in more detail and have reached complete understanding. Each country will afford the other assistance in mutual defence. The United Kingdom will give Nigeria help in training, equipment and supplies. The United Kingdom and Nigerian Governments will give each other staging facilities for aircraft in their respective territories".

The extent of this commitment has not yet been disclosed. Dr. Azikwe claimed this was "merely a proposal which has no binding effect either legally or morally on the Federal Government" (May 3rd, 1960), but it is extremely doubtful if the British Government (or even the Nigerian Government) will accept this view. Strong pressure will be exerted by Britain to insist upon Nigeria carrying out this pledge, and it is only the pressure from the Nigerian people that can prevent the new Nigeria being drawn into military co-operation with Britain.

To a certain extent the appointment of Dr. Azikwe as a new Governor-General in November will be a barrier to British intervention in Nigeria. His consistent stand for a free and united Nigeria should make it clear that the Nigerian people will support him in any resistance to British intervention. On the other hand, the fact that he has now resigned from leadership of the N.C.N.C. means the weakening of the most progressive anti-imperialist forces in Nigeria.

SOCIALIST GROUPS

What Nigeria needs most of all is a strong all-national movement based on Marxist principles, which takes an independent stand on both home and foreign policy, free from being influenced from outside by imperialist pressure, or from inside by narrow regional interests. The news of formation of Socialist groups in key Nigerian towns like Enugu, Lagos, Ibadan, Port Harcourt and Kano is indeed welcome. What is most promising is that those hundreds of socialists associated with these groups come from the various political parties and are not confined to the N.C.N.C.—though it is not surprising that most of them are in the Eastern Region.

It is this kind of development which augers well for the future of Nigeria, pointing the way forward from regional interests to the common interest of Nigeria as a whole, working towards a united trade union movement, to the transition from political independence, to economic independence, to all-African unity in the struggle against imperialism and leading forward towards Socialism in Nigeria.

The United States and Africa

by B. PELA

“It is necessary steadily to explain and expose among the broadest masses of the toilers of all countries, and particularly of backward countries, the deception which the imperialist powers systematically practise by creating in the guise of politically independent states, states which are absolutely dependent upon them economically, financially and militarily”.

V. I. Lenin, *Preliminary Draft of the Theses on the National-Colonial Question*, (1920).

Shortly after the murder of peaceful demonstrators by the South African police at Sharpeville and Langa, the United States State Department issued a statement in which it “regretted” the violence and loss of life.

This statement was extraordinary because it came only five months after the U.S. Ambassador to South Africa, Philip K. Crowe, had said in a radio broadcast: “The United States and the

South African Government are partners in Africa", so identifying the U.S. with the bloody suppression of the people by the South African authorities. How are we to explain these apparently contradictory statements ?

TWO-FACED POLICY

The fact is that the U.S. is following a policy of treachery in Africa. On the one hand, it pretends to be the "friend" of all the African countries, showing "sympathy" and "understanding" for the African peoples' demands for freedom and independence, and, on the other hand, it actively supports the suppression of the people by the old colonial powers and the white settler minorities.

At the same time U.S. imperialism is the mastermind behind all kinds of phoney independence schemes, which will allow the U.S. monopolies to dominate newly "independent" African states.

In March 1960, the U.S. Senate's Foreign Relations Committee had an open hearing to question a number of leading U.S. officials on the weakness of U.S. policy towards Africa. The main report was given by Dr. Melville Herskovits, Director of African Studies at North-western University. U.S. policy he said, "should be guided by expectation of the primacy of Africans in all sub-Saharan Africa".

In other words, the U.S. has decided that despite the white settlers' opposition, African national movements are going to win south of the Sahara. The Herskovits report declares that "we need not desert our European associates who are colonial powers" (i.e. Portugal, Britain, France, Belgium) and at the same time outlines a plan which will effectively oust the influence of those powers from Africa. The recommendations include :

The U.S. should favour the issue of specific statements by "the responsible authorities about when and how self-government is to be attained, since the more peaceful the transition to self-rule, the greater the likelihood that present orientations toward the West will be maintained by the newly independent states".

The U.S. should greatly increase its grants for African exchange and educational programmes.

U.S. aid programmes in Africa should be reappraised "in order to determine their adequacy in the light of the needs of the area and of American interest".

These recommendations are already being implemented by the

U.S. Government. Joseph C. Satterthwaite, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, told a Congressional Committee in March this year that the U.S. should control the direction in which the African countries develop. He had in mind a new U.S. colonialism through greatly increased economic, military and cultural "aid". "The whole Continent is on fire", said Satterthwaite "but it burns with an uneven flame. It is fairly easy to recognise that the political revolution (in Africa) is at hand, and by and large its pressures are irresistible". According to this spokesman of U.S. imperialism there was "a need for reconciling the insistent upsurge of nationalism with means for an orderly transition from past to future".

Today the imperialists' apple-cart has been upset by the rapidity with which the African national-liberation movement is developing. "The wind of change is blowing through the continent," Macmillan warned the Europeans in Southern Africa, advising them to establish good relations with the local population before it was too late. Otherwise they, and the positions which they hold for the capitalist west, would be swept away.

The U.S., as well, has learnt from its failure to hold back the post-war liberation movement of the people of Asia, and therefore supports the view that "... the right course for the West is not to retreat or 'get out', but to find acceptable solutions in order to stay". (*The Idea of Colonialism*, Ed. by R. Strausz-Hupe and H. W. Hazard, N.Y. 1958, pp. 42-43).

Herskovits impressed upon the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the "favourable world reaction to the forthright statement of Prime Minister Macmillan . . . on South African racial policy". He urged that "we would be well advised to make our own position clear as emphatically, and in any event to range ourselves at his side whenever and wherever opportunity offers". The opportunity came with Sharpeville.

AID WITH SHACKLES

Satterthwaite underscored the Herskovits report by saying that present U.S. plans for "aid" to Africa "are not adequate in scope or size to be responsive to the dramatic changes taking place". The situation was "compelling recommendations for a new and creative U.S. approach". He demanded that "aid" to Africa be stepped-up to 157,500,000 dollars during the 1961 financial year.

No one doubts that the African countries need economic assistance for their development and the attainment of higher standards of living. But it is real and disinterested help they want, help which will throw off the shackles of imperialism which has caused the poverty and backwardness of Africa. One of the main objectives of U.S. "aid" to Africa is to turn it into a raw material appendage of the United States' militarized economy.

The *Magazine of Wall Street and Business Annalist* (1956) whetted the appetite of U.S. big business by reporting: "Africa is . . . the world's largest untapped reservoir of natural resources. It already leads other parts of the world in the production of industrial diamonds, gold, columbite, cobalt, beryllium and phosphate rock; it contributes a growing proportion of the world's output of copper, chrome, manganese, asbestos, uranium, tin and graphite. Some of its huge rivers, such as the Congo, the Nile and the Niger, could, if harnessed, provide the entire Old World with hydro-electric power. Its forests . . . could keep Western Europe in cellulose, plastics and industrial alcohol without much difficulty". Africa supplies the following percentages of the capitalist world's total: diamonds, 99; cobalt, 81; gold, 59; chrome, 40; manganese, 36; copper, 27; antimony, 42; phosphates, 32; asbestos, 17; etc.

The long struggle between the European powers for domination of these fabulous resources resulted in the dismemberment and colonisation of most of the continent, to vicious racial discrimination and national oppression, to the hunger and misery of the people. The growth of the national liberation movement has torn a big gap in the colonial system in Africa. But the African people are now faced with a new and most dangerous threat, that of U.S. neo-colonialism.

After the second world war a sizable part of Europe and Asia fell out of the capitalist system and formed with the Soviet Union a powerful socialist camp, whose strength is growing daily. At the same time, most Asian countries shook off colonial rule and embarked upon an independent course of progress. Africa was left as a major source of imperialist plunder. "This fabulous and challenging continent", wrote John Gunther author of *Inside Africa*, "is vital to the Western world not merely because it is important strategically and is packed with vital raw materials, but because it is our Last Frontier. Much of Asia has been lost; Africa remains. But Africa lies open like a vacuum . . . the richest prize

on earth". This is the "prize" coveted by the U.S. monopolies.

The aim of U.S. imperialism is ultimately to oust the old colonial powers and secure exclusive control over Africa. At the present time, U.S. imperialism is penetrating into Africa economically, politically and militarily.

ECONOMIC PENETRATION

Economically U.S. penetration takes a well-established pattern. First, "aid" is arranged through specialised governmental agencies of the U.S. By granting this "aid" the U.S. tries to appear as a benefactor of the African people. In fact the U.S. is trying to achieve a maximum of monopoly expansion at a minimum expenditure of government capital. Indeed, out of the total amount of U.S. "aid" — loans plus subsidies — granted to foreign countries from July 1, 1945 to December 31, 1955, only 0.6 per cent. (233 million dollars) was allocated to Africa.

Africa ranks very low as a recipient of U.S. "aid" in comparison with Western Europe, Asia and Latin America. And the aid which is received is used directly to serve, not the African people, but the economic, financial and military interests of the U.S. imperialists. U.S. "aid" classed under the heading "strategic and basic materials" goes directly to finance the extraction of strategic materials for military purposes.

Sums derived from an "overseas development fund" are largely spent on railways, strategic highways, ports and airfields, essential for the winning of super-profits by the big U.S. firms, and needed for military purposes. "Technical co-operation" funds have been spent on a geological survey of Africa (to discover its mineral resources), for the training of Africans for jobs essential for the Americans, and for "health", that is the barest sanitary conditions in areas where American personnel are engaged. "Development assistance" funds, another item of U.S. "aid", are used to finance those branches of the African economy in which the U.S. has a special interest, and they contribute to chaining the African countries to the U.S. economy as suppliers of raw materials. "Aid" to the North African countries has given particular emphasis to construction of strategic air bases and harbours.

At this first stage of U.S. economic penetration into the African country concerned, a thorough survey is made of the country's economy and prospects by U.S. diplomats, U.S. banks and other agencies. The U.S. then draws up a rough plan by which the local

government, using U.S. "aid", takes care of basic services, such as railways, harbours, and communications. In some cases the World Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, both U.S. controlled, pour foreign capital into the country to assist in this preliminary development.

This clears the stage for direct investment by American manufacturers in establishing their own plants or agencies. Shares are also bought in already established companies.

CAPITAL POURS IN

This direct U.S. investment is widely spread throughout Africa. But the most important U.S. investment is taking place in Southern and Central Africa, which are good suppliers of a number of raw materials essential to the West, such as uranium, gold, diamonds and copper. The manufacturing opportunities which the growing urban centres in South and Central Africa present, have also attracted U.S. big business.

To take South Africa first, because here U.S. investment is the largest and most important. U.S. capital is overshadowed by British capital (about 62 per cent. of all foreign capital in the country) which has been flowing into South Africa for a century or more, but which has slowed down appreciably over the last five or six years.

Official figures estimate that the book-value of U.S. assets in South Africa amounted to less than 90 million dollars in 1943. Most of the direct investments were in petroleum (20 million dollars), manufacturing (10 million dollars) trade or distribution (10 million dollars) and a mere 4 million dollars in mining and smelting, where the bulk of British investment lies.

By 1950 direct investments had almost trebled with the largest increase concentrated in mining and smelting (33 million dollars). In the next two years another 50 million was added to the total of U.S. investments in South Africa, and since then there has been an enormous increase of U.S. capital in mining, manufacturing and petroleum.

So large has been the interest in South Africa that there are more U.S. dollars there than in the Phillipines or than in Italy, Belgium and Turkey combined. Among the large companies with manufacturing or assembly plants in South Africa are: Ford, General Motors, Chesebourg, Colgate-Palmolive, General Electric, Kellogg,

Firestone, Goodyear and Coco-Cola. The U.S. Ambassador in South Africa said last October that U.S. investments in South African industry total more than £200 million.

Next in importance after South Africa comes Liberia, with whom American connections have always been strong. The main U.S. interest there is in mining and commerce. After Liberia, and possibly of greater importance in the future, is U.S. investment in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. By 1952 direct investments reached some 26 million dollars. Within two years the total had increased to 43 million dollars. The great bulk of this was used to exploit the Copperbelt miners. The U.S. controlled World Bank made a substantial dollar contribution to financing the 80-million dollar first stage of the Kariba hydro-electric project.

Some direct investments have also been made in what are traditional British "spheres of influence" along the West Coast, such as Ghana and Nigeria and as well in Ethiopia.

The annual rate of profit derived from the more than 2,000 million dollars of U.S. private investment in Africa, was as high as 21 to 25 per cent. between 1951 and 1958.

DIPLOMATS AND GENERALS AT WORK

Politically, America's industrial magnates are making ample use of U.S. embassies, legations and consulates to promote their plans for expansion. Before the war the U.S. had sixteen diplomatic set-ups in Africa, today it has 40. The U.S. embassy in Accra alone already has a staff of over 100. Leading Africans are being encouraged to visit the U.S. as guests of the State Department and other Government agencies, or under the so-called "leader-exchange programme".

The Kenya Office of the Africa Association in Cairo was led to complain that a number of Americans had given "advice" behind the scenes to some Kenyan delegates at the recent round-table constitutional talks in London. It was clear, said the Kenya office, that the aim of the Americans was to divide the African ranks and to induce the African delegates to betray their national aspirations.

Other agencies of the "cold war" such as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions have also assiduously spread the ideology of anti-communism in Africa, trying to divide the working-class movement, (see *The African Communist*, No. 2, 1960).

Militarily, the U.S. is spending large government funds to militarise the African continent on the pretext of promoting the

"security" of the U.S. and its NATO partners. *U.S. News and World Report* said: "You need only a quick trip through Africa to be impressed with its importance to U.S. defence plans". The U.S. imperialists hope to use Africa with its manpower and natural resources as a bridgehead for aggression against the socialist countries and those independent countries hostile to U.S. intrigues.

The U.S. spends a great deal on building military and naval bases. U.S. "aid" for the 1961 financial year will lay the emphasis of Libya, Morocco and Tunisia, in which the U.S. has special military interests. It has five major strategic air bases in Morocco, and a huge air field in Libya. NATO's biggest Mediterranean base is in Tunisia. The U.S. plans nuclear launching sights in the Sahara, and wants to utilise the strategic ports of Africa like Capetown, Durban, Mombasa, Beira, Dakar, Lagos, etc. South Africa produces more uranium than the U.S. and Canada combined and is thus of great military importance to the U.S.

The evidence is clear. The U.S. statement on Sharpeville was no "accident", nor was it a sincere message of sympathy and support for the oppressed people of South Africa. U.S. monopoly capital has an investment in *apartheid*, and in the continuation of the savage exploitation of the working people.

To penetrate more effectively into the dependent and colonial countries, U.S. imperialism has adopted a deliberate policy of playing up the slogan of "anti-colonialism", so as to provide the conditions for the expansion of the U.S. monopolies in Africa. They are using this "anti-colonialism" to force the Western colonial powers to make important concessions to the United States. Michel Debré, a champion of Franco-American "solidarity", had to admit that "American anti-colonialism actually serves to camouflage rather basic interests, which are those of power companies".

U.S. neo-colonialism looks forward to the disintegration of the old colonial empires, to "concessions" to the African people, and the complete domination of U.S. imperialism in Africa. While implementing this plan, the U.S. is forced to manoeuvre continuously. For reasons of "Western unity" it backs France, Britain and Belgium in their colonial exploits. On the other hand it is critical of the policy of "colonialism" and of the white supremacists

in South Africa.

An analysis of U.S. policy in Africa shows that behind these manoeuvres, lies a deliberate aim of perpetuating the colonial status of Africa, exploiting and robbing its peoples, and turning it into a base of aggression.